already seen over a $1 million drop in its budget) be continued or will they be dropped in favor of some different approach?

We already have one indication in the President's fiscal 1974 budget proposal which calls for a de-emphasis on health services delivery with a possible switch-over to Health Maintenance Organization. A total of $147 million for OEO health programs is required in the 1974 Budget for HEW, compared with the 1973 obligation of $165.2 million, a reduction of $18.2 million. When this account of $147 million is transferred to the HEW Health Services Delivery budget of 1974, one discovers a further cut in the overall Health Services Delivery budget of nearly $47 million. Further, the administration is proposing a reduction in the 1973 appropriation of some $45 million, bringing the total net loss to some $110 million.

The innovative "one-door" approach to health care for the poor that has been the hallmark of Community Health Centers may well be lost as the administration shuffles priorities in health care—with the result that the poor, with their very special set of health problems, will suffer. The successful South-Central Community Health Center in Los Angeles services about 500 people per month, and has demonstrated its importance of the community.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, a word about OEO Legal Services. Recent reports and news stories have indicated a definite Administration bias *against* OEO's *Legal Services'* "back-up" centers. Since this committee will soon be dealing with legal services legislation, I would like to make a few observations concerning the role these centers have played in our community and their critical relationship to the rest of OEO's programs.

Two centers in California—the Los Angeles-based Western Center on Law and Poverty, and the University of California at Berkeley's National Housing and Economic Development Law Project—serve as vivid examples of their fundamental value and importance. The "back-up" functions of the Western Center have included assistance in appellate litigation, training assistance, and clinical education assistance to law schools. The recent California precedent setting decision of *Serrano vs. Priest*, declaring unconstitutional California's school financing scheme, was a direct result of Western Center's skill and involvement. Also, the Western Center participated in the case of *Blair vs. Pitches*, wherein the California Supreme Court declared unconstitutional the practice of repossessing personal property upon the mere filing of an action by a creditor without a prior court hearing to determine the validity of the charge. These cases have profoundly altered the law, affecting significantly the lives of thousands of the poor by a single ruling.

The kinds of assistance and services these centers provide to legal service projects and to law schools are badly needed by individual projects and by lawyers who don't have the time or expertise to become proficient in every area of poverty law. The centers also play a role with the rest of OEO's programs. The "back-up" functions of the Berkeley project, for example, are directed at assisting lawyers working with Community Development Corporations. One of the recent successful CDC ventures they contributed to was the Salinas Valley "Strawberry Cooperative." It brought a group of migrant families from average incomes of $3500 per year to nearly $12,000, and provided the basis for future spin-offs of new cooperatives sponsored by the parent "Strawberry Coop."

"Back-up" centers like these fill a special need for Legal Services projects and for programs like Community Development Corporations attempting to help the poor. Efforts to help the poor always face legal problems. In many cases, developments in one area can be applied to others. In general, legal services lawyers cannot, by themselves, provide a broad range of expertise in every facet of "poverty law." The function of back-up centers is to assist by "filling in the gaps" and searching out new ways to handle legal problems faced by the poor. They help make the Legal Services program and all OEO's programs a unified operating system. When this Committee considers the Legal Services Corporation legislation, I would strongly recommend that specific provisions should be made for preserving and protecting the independence necessary to ensure the continual role of these centers.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that what I am worried about today is not only the decrease in federal funds. The President's Budget for 1974 represents more than a shift in priorities of spending the federal tax dollar. It demonstrates a radical reorganiaztion of our federal system of government.

This proposed new federalism represents a direct challenge to the institutional changes developed over the last five years in employment practices, education, and in medical and legal professions in improving the access of services to the poor. OEO brought the alienated and disenfranchised into the democratic process, gave them a window to government, provided them with hope at a time when hope was obscure. With the dismantling of OEO, not only the symbol of concern, but the actual involvement and commitment of the government will be suspended

Who will lobby for the poor in communities where the poor have no effective voice in the decisions of government? I urge this Committee to review carefully the full implications of the President's proposal before it accepts the demise of OEO, and to consider the possibility of enacting categorical funding legislation to preserve these programs which have aided the poor.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, thank you very much for your patience and courtesy in allowing me to present this testimony.

DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1973

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, today, I have joined with my distinguished colleague and good friend from the State of Washington, LLOYD MEEDS, in introducing an extension of the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970.

I feel that this act has played an invaluable role in this country's war against drug abuse, and it is absolutely vital that we continue this program.

The moneys that are authorized in this bill are an investment in the fight against the misuse of drugs, and the returns from this investment will be measured in saved lives and saved moneys for drug rehabilitation programs. This program is an intricate part of our continued efforts to curb drug abuse, and it deserves the full support of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, February 27, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Lawrence P. Fitzpatrick, national chaplain, the American Legion, Coin, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, plant our feet this day on a solid foundation that we may truly represent those who have sent us to this office. Give us a backbone of steel that we may stand straight and tall. Give us a voice strong and resonant that we may speak out to defend our Nation when and where she is right and to voice the need for change when and where she might be wrong. May our deliberations this day help bring peace to a world caught up in turmoil. God help us when we do right; God forgive us when we fail.

Be with each of us as we try to carry out the responsibilities that we alone can fulfill. Be with us this day and throughout life. 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 with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 345. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 345) entitled "An act making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. BROOKE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF U.S. GROUP OF NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. Group of the North Atlantic Assembly the following

Members on the part of the House: Mr. HAYS, of Ohio, Chairman; Mr. RODINO, of New Jersey; Mr. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; Mr. BROOKS, of Texas; Mr. BURTON, of California; Mr. ARENDS, of Illinois; Mr. DEVINE, of Ohio; Mr. MATHIAS of California; and Mr. RUPPE, of Michigan.

LEGION HONORS CONGRESSMAN GEORGE MAHON

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion Award for Distinguished Public Service will be presented this year to our distinguished and beloved colleague from Texas, Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

The Distinguished Public Service Award has been presented five times in the Legion's history to individuals in public life who have rendered outstanding service to the Nation. Prior recipients are the Honorable Carl Vinson, Georgia; the late Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Illinois; Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, Texas; former Speaker of the House of Representatives John W. McCormack, Massachusetts, and Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, Illinois.

Announcing the selection of Congressman MAHON as the sixth recipient to be honored by the American Legion, National Commander Joe L. Matthews said:

Congressman Mahon is being recognized for 38 years of outstanding service to the nation and its veterans as a member of the United States Congress. I can think of no other individual who is more deserving. As Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, he has shown compassion and concern for the needs of our sick and disabled veterans and their dependents. He has fought for a strong and viable defense posture for the Nation. George Mahon is a distinguished American patriot and I am delighted that the Legion has accorded him this honor.

Chairman MAHON'S career in public life began in 1926 when he was elected county attorney of Mitchell County, Tex. A year later he was appointed district attorney and was subsequently elected to that office three times. Upon the creation of the 19th Congressional District of Texas, Mr. MAHON became a candidate for U.S. Representative from that district and was elected in 1934. He has been reelected at 2-year intervals since that time. Only one Member of the House outranks him in length of service.

Mr. MAHON became a member of the House Appropriations Committee in 1939 and has served as chairman since May of 1964. The Appropriations Committee is the largest committee in the Congress and one of the most powerful. The chairmanship is one of the important posts in government.

Congressman MAHON is chairman of the Joint Senate-House Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures and a member of the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control. He is also a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

Presentation of the award to Chairman MAHON will be a highlight of the American Legion's dinner honoring the Congress at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C., on February 28. This dinner is a feature of the annual Washington conference, and over 2,000 Members of the Congress, Legionnaires, and guests are expected to attend.

INFLATION-RECESSION TRENDS

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the economic phenomenon of inflation-recession seems likely to become a classic affliction of Republican administrations. Disturbing trends in this morning's news add to my apprehension that this Republican administration is leading this Nation once again into another round of inflation-recession such as we experienced in 1969–70 and in 1957–58.

To ordinary Americans, inflation-recession means that prices are going up and job opportunities are going down. It means that additional thousands of Americans are going to be out of work and those lucky enough to have jobs are going to pay even more for groceries, rent, and other necessities.

Evidence of these disturbing trends comes today in the form of an increase in the prime lending rate and the fence-straddling by the administration on its wage-guidelines policy and its phase III game plan.

Tighter credit is going to mean less investment by industry and fewer jobs for Americans. The shocking rise in food prices last month has already impelled the AFL–CIO to say that it will ask for commensurate wage increases to make up the difference.

In response, Treasury Secretary Shultz and John Dunlop, the new Chairman of the Cost of Living Council, told the press that the administration would stick to its 5.5 percent wage guidelines—maybe. Meanwhile, the president of the AFL–CIO was also telling the press that administration officials had assured him that the guidelines would eventually be discarded.

Mr. Speaker, these conflicting statements show why this administration's credibility with the American people is at an all-time low.

I hope the Congress will exercise its responsibilities of economic review and make the adjustments that are necessary to guide the Nation away from recession and toward a sound and benevolent economic prosperity.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF FEDERAL RECORDS COUNCIL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 44, United States Code, section 2701, the Chair appoints as members of the Federal Records Council the following members on the part of the House: Mr. BURLISON of Missouri and Mr. FRENZEL, of Minnesota.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON STUDY OF BUDGET CONTROL

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, as you know, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN), and I are joint chairmen of the Committee on the Study of Budget Control. We have a special order scheduled for this afternoon where this matter will be discussed. I take this 1 minute to call attention to that and say that the prime purpose we will have in the discussion is to ask our colleagues to give to that committee the benefit of their views in connection with a series of hearings which we will conduct.

I proudly announce at this time that 32 rather independent members of this joint committee have come out with a preliminary report that is unanimous. It has to do with bringing together the facts that face us financially and how it got this way, as a good start to finding some solution, but it will all go down the drain, I say, unless we adopt a resolution putting it into effect.

At any rate, we will have a colloquy between the cochairman here, Mr. ULLMAN and I, as well as other members of the committee in the special order following the bill today.

I hope you will be here to take part in it and appear before the committee, also, to give us the benefit of your views.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 345, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1973

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 345) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, PASSMAN, NATCHER, FLOOD, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Messrs. ADDABBO, CEDERBERG, RHODES, MICHEL, and SHRIVER.

PERMISSION TO FILE A CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 345

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 345) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 93–33)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.J. Res. 345) "making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, and 5.

GEORGE H. MAHON,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO,
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,
JOHN J. RHODES,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ALAN BIBLE,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
NORRIS COTTON,
EDWARD W. BROOKE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 345) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Extends the expiration date of the continuing resolution for foreign aid to June 30, 1973, as proposed by the House instead of April 30, 1973, as proposed by the Senate. This action is taken most regretfully because of the present situation and attendant circumstances and this is not to be regarded as a precedent. It is not our intention to tolerate this practice in the future.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in a technical amendment of the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides an annual obligation rate of not to exceed $6,224,000 for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission during the period February 16, 1973, to June 30, 1973.

Amendment No. 4: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate, which repeals the termination date of May 15, 1973, for Customs preclearance activities included in Public Law 92–351. The conferees are agreed that Customs preclearance activities should be continued at the present level of operations until such time as the matter can be further considered and a long range policy determined.

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which requires the President to submit periodic reports on impoundments to the Congress.

Amendment No. 6: Changes section number.

GEORGE H. MAHON,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO,
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,
JOHN J. RHODES,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ALAN BIBLE,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
NORRIS COTTON,
EDWARD W. BROOKE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO MAKE IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 345

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time after today to consider a conference report on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 345) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman from Texas not receive permission to file a conference report?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the answer to his question is, "Yes."

I am now asking unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider the conference report any time after today. We have not yet prepared the report, of course, but we are going to go to conference this afternoon at 3 o'clock. I was asking unanimous consent that it would be in order to consider the conference report at any time after today, which I assume would be tomorrow, because the continuing resolution expires on the 28th of February.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Texas that I assume there are some Members of the House who might like a little time to ascertain what is in the conference report that is to be filed. So I would suggest to the gentleman from Texas that he come to the House tomorrow with that request if a conference report is agreed upon today.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. What will be agreed to in conference, of course, is not completely predictable. The House continued the foreign aid programs and the activities provided for in the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare bill until June 30. The other body continued the Departments of Labor-HEW portion of the continuing resolution to June 30, but continued the foreign assistance programs only until April 30. That would be a matter in controversy.

Also the other body added a proviso that makes it mandatory upon the President every quarter to give a report on funds which are being impounded or withheld from expenditures.

The Senate also added amendments providing financing for the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission and deleting the May 15 cutoff date for customs preclearance. That is the extent of the Senate changes.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman from Texas that those are highly important amendments that the other body has added. I would think it possible the gentleman from Texas might reach an agreement at midnight tonight, and call the bill up at noon tomorrow with little or no notice to the Members of the House. I would therefore state that if the gentleman from Texas persists in his unanimous consent request that I would be constrained to object. I have no desire to delay House consideration of the expected conference report, but I do want to know what it contains before it is called up for approval.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

OFFICIAL OBJECTORS FROM THE DEMOCRATIC SIDE

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce the official objectors from the Democratic side.

The official objectors for the Private Calendar will be the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BOLAND; the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. DAVIS; and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.

The official objectors for the Consent Calendar will be the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. ALEXANDER; the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. RONCALIO; and the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. ROSE.

JOINT STUDY COMMITTEE ON BUDGET CONTROL

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate Concurrent Resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) relating to the designation, administration, and expenses of the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control.

The Clerk read the Senate Concurrent Resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 8

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the joint committee established under title III of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit and

to place a limitation on expenditures and net lending for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973", approved October 27, 1972 (Public Law 92-599; 86 Stat. 1324), shall be known as the Joint Study Committee in Budget Control (hereafter referred to in this concurrent resolution as the "joint study committee").

SEC. 2. (a) During the first session of the Ninety-third Congress, the members of the joint study committee shall select two cochairman in lieu of a chairman.

(b) The joint study committee is authorized to procure the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof, in accordance with the provisions of section 202 (i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

SEC. 3. (a) For the period from March 1, 1973, through the close of the first session of the Ninety-third Congress, the joint study committee is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate not to exceed $200,000 to carry out the provisions of such title III. Of such amount not to exceed $25,000 may be expended for the procurement of such individual consultants or organizations thereof.

(b) During the first session of the Ninety-third Congress, expenses of the joint study committee paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate shall be so paid upon vouchers approved by either of the two cochairmen of the joint study committee.

SEC. 4. The joint study committee shall submit a final report of the results of the study and review made under such title III, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President pro tempore of the Senate, not later than the close of the first session of the Ninety-third Congress.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 23]

Ashley	Hawkins	Price, Tex.
Badillo	Hébert	Quie
Biaggi	Hogan	Rees
Blatnik	Hosmer	Regula
Burke, Calif.	Howard	Riegle
Carey, N.Y.	Kastenmeier	Robison, N.Y.
Chisholm	King	Rooney, N.Y.
Clark	Koch	Roybal
Clausen, Don H.	Long, La.	Ruppe
	Lujan	Satterfield
Clawson, Del	Mann	Scherle
Clay	McCormack	Seiberling
Collier	McDade	Smith, N.Y.
Dorn	Mailliard	Stanton, James V.
Foley	Meeds	
Ford, William D.	Mills, Ark.	Steed
	Mollohan	Symington
Frelinghuysen	Moorhead, Pa.	Teague, Calif.
Froehlich	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson, Bob
Gray	Murphy, N.Y.	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara	
	Patman	
Harvey	Poage	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 369 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1973

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce to the membership that I am introducing a bill today to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to increase the minimum wage rate under that act and to extend its provisions to additional employees.

This bill is almost identical to the one reported by the Committee on Education and Labor in the last Congress.

The notable differences between the two bills are:

First. The new bill proposes an eventual minimum wage rate increase, in time, to $2 and then $2.20, and the previous proposal was for $2 an hour. However, a year has passed, almost, since that bill was first presented to the House.

Second. The new bill does not contain a provision to provide relief for domestic workers and industries injured by increased imports from low-wage areas. I thought this wise because of the opposition generated from those areas of the country not affected by low-cost imports.

I intend to hold very brief hearings, and any comments or any information Members have the committee will be glad to receive.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX EXTENSION ACT OF 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 197 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 197

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3577) to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy concerning this rule and, as far as I know, no controversy on the matter in order, and, therefore, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

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

I am glad to note that this is an open rule and commend the Rules Committee for it. As far as those words of commendation are concerned, I hope that I will not have to eat them in subsequent productions by the Committee on Rules with respect to closed rules.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is grateful for the commendations of the gentleman from Iowa.

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

Mr. Speaker, in view of the colloquy that has just occurred, I might say that this is probably the first time in some 40 years that we have had an open rule on a tax bill. It provides for 2 hours of debate.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope and, I certainly think, the hope of this House that we can act responsibly, and I hope that if any amendments are proposed to tax bills, and this tax bill in particular, that they will pertain to the subject under consideration. I might say if we do not do that, we will have to take another look at these closed rules in the future as they pertain to tax bills.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that this bill that House Resolution 27 makes in order merely extends for 15 months the interest equalization tax, with a couple of slight amendments, and one of them, I might say, gives the President the authority to increase this tax to 1½ percent, which will make about $85 million more in the U.S. Treasury coming from outside the continental United States. I think it is high time we do just that.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3577) to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consid-

eration of the bill H.R. 3577, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHNEEBELI) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, before discussing the bill at hand providing for an extension of the interest equalization tax, let me make a few brief comments relative to the international monetary situation.

As you know, in the year before last, this country ran a deficit in its merchandise trade account of $2.7 billion, the first such deficit since 1888. In 1972 the deficit amounted to nearly $7 billion. As a result of this deterioration in the balance of trade and also the large balance of payments deficits over the past several years which piled up more and more dollars abroad—perhaps $70 billion—speculative pressure on the dollar reached a peak in the last few weeks. This pressure reflected the view that the dollar was overvalued, particularly with respect to the German mark and the Japanese yen.

In light of these circumstances, the President found it necessary to devalue the dollar by 10 percent. In addition, there was an agreement to permit the yen to float upward by another 5 percent.

This action was necessary to avoid a complete collapse of the international money markets and to give us some breathing space during which more rapid progress, hopefully, can be made in the international monetary negotiations. While I have grave doubts, I sincerely hope that this second devaluation will be sufficient to hold the line until more fundamental reforms in the monetary and trading systems can be made.

In this connection, I note from the press the administration plans to submit to Congress trade legislation providing authority to the President to deal with our pressing trade problems and to restore balance in our international trade account. The administration has also announced that by the end of next year, it plans to phase out the restrictions we presently have on capital outflows.

Today, we are considering the extension of the interest equalization tax, one of the measures limiting capital outflows. Under the bill as reported by your committee, the tax is continued through June 30 of next year.

Whether the Congress wants to extend the tax beyond that date—either to the December 31, 1974, date requested by the administration or for some longer period of time—is a question which can be settled next year when we are again considering the interest equalization tax.

The exchange rates adjustments, which I have discussed up to this point, are primarily designed to improve our balance of trade, although they also have an impact across the board as well. The interest equalization tax, on the other hand, deals only with capital flows as distinct from movements of goods and services. The control of capital flows at the present time is provided by the interest equalization tax in combination with two other programs: the reduction of direct investment abroad under the Commerce Department's Office of Foreign Direct Investments and restrictions of outflows of funds from banks under the Federal Reserve Board's voluntary foreign credit restraint program.

The interest equalization tax discourages capital outflows from the United States by increasing the cost for foreigners in obtaining capital from U.S. sources. It does this by imposing a tax which has the effect of increasing by three-fourths of 1 percent the interest rate paid by foreigners selling debt obligations or stock to U.S. residents. Under present law, the administration could raise this tax to the equivalent of a 1½ percent additional interest rate or lower it to zero.

The bill before us today extends the interest equalization tax from March 31 of this year until June 30, 1974. Whether it will be desirable to further extend the tax beyond this June 30 date is a decision we can make next year after we have seen what progress has been made in the negotiations on tariff and nontariff barriers.

Under today's conditions, however, a continuation of the interest equalization tax is clearly needed. This is shown by the fact that interest rates in the United States are considerably lower than those abroad. As of October 1972 for example, when the yield on U.S. Treasury bonds was 5.69 percent, the Western European government bond average was 7.19 percent.

For corporate bonds the differential between United States and foreign rates is also substantial. In December 1972, the U.S. rate on high grade industrials was 7.33 percent while the rate in the United Kingdom was 10.40 percent, the rate in France was 8.30 percent and the rate in Germany 8.58 percent.

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE TAX

The question usually raised about this tax is "has it really helped our balance-of-payments position?" I believe it is clear that the tax has decreased the foreign demand for U.S. capital and in this manner made our balance-of-payments deficit smaller than would otherwise be the case.

An indication of the deterrent effect of the tax is shown by the fact that in 1962, just prior to the imposition of the tax, purchases of new securities by U.S. residents from countries which are now subject to the tax were $356 million. In contrast, in 1971 only $3 million, and in the first three-quarters of 1972 $17 million, were purchased by U.S. residents from these countries.

Even though purchases by U.S. residents of securities subject to the tax decreased drastically, the opposite is true of purchases from countries not subject to the tax. These purchases grew from a level of $722 million in 1962 to $1.5 billion in 1971. If this same rate of growth had applied to purchases from countries subject to the tax, the 1971 level of purchase would have been $740 million. This is in contrast to the $3 million which was actually purchased in 1971.

So far I have discussed the effect of the tax in the purchases of new securities. The tax has also discouraged purchase by U.S. residents of outstanding securities held by foreigners. In the 3½ years prior to the enactment of the tax, the net purchase of outstanding foreign securities by U.S. residents amounted to $274 million a year. Since enactment of the tax, U.S. residents have actually been net sellers of foreign securities with net sales averaging $61 million a year.

While the interest equalization tax at best is a solution to only a very small part of our balance-of-payments problem, nevertheless, I think it is clear that we should not abandon it now. The bill, therefore, continues the tax until June 30 of next year. At that time, we will be in a better position to determine whether the tax appropriately fits in with our new program to deal with the balance-of-payments problems or whether it should be allowed to expire.

Apart from the extension of the interest equalization tax, the bill makes only three minor amendments.

The first of these amendments provides that where a domestic company or partnership elects to treat its debt as subject to the interest equalization tax, the value of the debt is generally not to be included in the U.S. estate tax base of a nonresident alien holder of the debt.

The second amendment provides that the stock or debt obligations of a less developed country shipping corporation are not to be excluded from the interest equalization tax by reason of the less developed country exclusion.

The third amendment provides that if a foreign issuer makes a significant investment of foreign funds in the United States, under certain conditions he may issue stock or debt to U.S. persons which will not be subject to the interest equalization tax.

These modifications are all minor modifications which do not in any way decrease the effectiveness of the interest equalization tax. They were all presented to us by the Treasury Department in the appearance of the Under Secretary of the Treasury before our committee.

I urge the adoption of this bill extending the interest equalization tax until June 30 of next year. The tax by itself deals only with a very small part of our international payments problem but it is one which we must continue at the present time if we do not want to worsen our balance-of-payments problems. I urge that you vote for the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 3577, extending the interest equalization tax until June 30, 1974. The need for a continuation of this tax can be clearly seen by a review of our current balance-of-payments situation which last year ran about a $3 billion deficit and by considering the effects its elimination at this juncture could have on our Government's current efforts to negotiate international monetary reforms.

The interest equalization tax is a balance-of-payments measure designed to equalize the differential between historically lower interest rates of the U.S. capital market and those of Europe. The tax, in effect, provides the equivalent of a ¾ percent per annum rise in interest costs for foreigners obtaining capital from U.S. sources, either from the sale of debt obligations with a maturity of 1 year or more or from the sale of stock. Its purpose is to increase borrowing costs for foreigners obtaining capital in the United States. It is not a tax to produce revenue since it raises less than $100 million a year, but rather it is being used to influence particular transactions, and to discourage the investment of our dollars abroad.

All of us want to move toward free market conditions in international capital markets by phasing out the interest equalization tax as soon as is practical. In his February 12 statement announcing the revaluation of the dollar, Secretary Schultz noted that the administration intends to phase out the interest equalization tax and the controls on foreign direct investment by December 1974, at the latest.

It is understood that the Federal Reserve Board will consider comparable steps for their voluntary foreign credit restraint program. Secretary Schultz went on to say:

> The phasing out of these restraints is appropriate in view of the improvement which will be brought to our underlying payments position by the cumulative effect of the exchange rate changes, by continued success in curbing inflationary tendencies, and by the attractiveness of the U.S. economy for investors from abroad. The termination of the restraints on capital flows is appropriate in the light of our broad objective of reducing governmental controls on private transactions.

In view of the continued deterioration of our balance-of-trade position, which in 1972 amounted to more than $6 billion, and the efforts to achieve fundamental reform in international monetary arrangements, now is not the time to eliminate the interest equalization tax. Even those witnesses testifying before the committee on the IET, who are opposed to it in principle, generally agreed that it should be continued during this current transitional period while efforts to establish a broader program which can restore a lasting balance in our international payments are vigorously pursued.

The bill before us extends the IET for 15 months, through June 30, 1974. The committee's extension of the tax for only a 15-month period indicates our continuing concern about long-term reliance on devices of this type in contrast to permanent arrangements which go to the underlying causes of our balance-of-payments problems. Hopefully, our efforts toward this end will soon bear fruit. Until they do, however, the IET, the Department of Commerce's foreign direct investment program, and the Federal Reserve Board's voluntary foreign credit restraint program will be relied upon not only to prevent further deterioration of our balance-of-payments situation, but also by our major trading partners as evidence of our sincere intention to redress our balance-of-payments position and as a contribution to continued international financial stability. The three programs are mutually reinforcing with the result that the elimination of one of them—like the IET—would endanger the effectiveness of the others as well as their total effect. This should not be allowed to occur.

We are today concerned about a short-term measure to assist the United States in its efforts to stem the flow of U.S. dollars abroad, while we undertake solutions that deal with the fundamental problems. The Smithsonian Agreement of December 1971, represented an important first step in this process. The subsequent proposals of the United States for international monetary reform, our work with the Group of Twenty—"G–20"—and the revaluation announced recently after consultation with our allies, are important steps indicating that the administration intends to work hard for fundamental solutions. Efforts to make our goods competitive through reducing inflation, both by a restrained budget policy and phase III controls, will be an important part of this effort. Additionally, the President has announced his intention to recommend trade legislation enabling the administration to negotiate with our trading partners for the removal of unfair barriers to the sale of our goods abroad.

All of our endeavors are crucial to a realinement of our balance-of-payments position and the establishment of equilibrium in international economic affairs. As we strive for results from these efforts we must maintain our current tools to deal with the immediate problems. The continuation of the IET for an additional 15 months is important at this critical juncture in our international economic relations.

I, therefore, urge approval of H.R. 3577.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago during House deliberation of legislation similar to the bill we are today considering, I said:

> One look at the United States balance of payments position should be enough to convince anyone that we need to extend the interest equalization tax.

Unfortunately, those words are as pertinent today as they were in 1971. In 1972, our balance-of-payments deficit was larger than any year prior to 1971, and our trade balance deteriorated about $4 billion from 1971. And the prospects for improving our position in the immediate future are not good. Accordingly, we need to continue measures—such as IET—which have a demonstrable effect on reducing the outflow of U.S. capital.

The tax first became effective in 1964, after the payments balance had been in a deficit position for 6 consecutive years and showed no signs of improvement. The theory was that this tax—which applies to the acquisition of foreign securities by Americans—would increase for foreigners in developed countries, the cost of raising equity in the United States. It would, therefore, help substantially to improve our balance-of-payments position, particularly in periods when our interest rates were low. It should be noted that U.S. interest rates are still lower than those in many foreign countries.

Since 1964, the IET has been extended on a temporary basis every 2 years. It is due to expire on March 31 of this year and the administration in January requested its extension. In the intervening period since January, the dollar has been devalued and new pressures have been applied for a meaningful rearrangement of the entire international monetary system. We all agree that this latter step is crucial to continued economic stability both at home and abroad and are confident that the administration will pursue this effort with renewed vigor and urgency. In the meantime, however, we must continue to insure that our Government has every available tool it needs to combat the balance of payments problem. The interest equalization tax is one of those tools.

The IET, the foreign direct investment program—administered by the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Reserve Board's voluntary foreign credit restraint program all serve to restrain the outflow of U.S. capital and must be continued, at least in the short run, until more basic international monetary solutions can be agreed upon. The elimination of one of these devices will only reduce the effectiveness and impact of the others. Such a result would be as unfortunate as it would be self-defeating.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Ways and Means gave careful consideration to the need for extension of the IET and decided that it should be continued for a period less than that requested by the administration. H.R. 3577 provides for an extension until June of 1974. This bill was reported by the committee prior to the recent dollar devaluation and statements by the Secretary of the Treasury announcing that the administration in future months would request the elimination of the IET as part of its effort to reach long term solutions to our balance of payments problem. It should be noted, however, that these solutions have not yet materialized and will not be in effect for some time with the result that for the present and the immediate future the interest equalization tax will continue to be a front line defense against the outflow of our capital. As a result, its continuation is essential.

For these reasons, I urge the approval of H.R. 3577.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, how does this tax apply to purchases of gold in this country, American held gold stocks, or does it apply at all?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. It does not apply at all because it affects only U.S. purchases abroad of foreign stocks and long term debt obligations. It is only the investment of U.S. money abroad that is

affected. This does not affect the purchases here.

Mr. GROSS. What are we doing with the gold stocks we have?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I think they are maintained at a pretty constant level of about $10.5 billion for the last several years. To the best of my knowledge, and this is I think under some other committee, our gold stocks have been at a rather permanent and substantial base of $10.5 billion.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. Is it not true that we are no longer converting our currency abroad?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. That is right. The gold stocks we have in the United States are being rather substantially protected. We are not trading in gold.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, in other words the gold stock we have, approximately $11 billion, is sterile. The gold is sterile and serves no useful purpose?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. As the gentleman knows, gold remains the basis for our own monetary system.

Mr. GROSS. How can it be a reserve if we refuse to sell gold or if we refuse to back our currency with gold? How can it have that value?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I think Congress took action legislatively to prevent a conversion of our gold certificates or our securities into gold domestically.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, there is no question about that, but I am wondering what purpose this despicable gold, as some people call it serves. Why do we have it or maintain it at Fort Knox or the Federal Reserve vaults in New York? Why do we keep it? Why do we not peddle it when gold hits $95 an ounce on the world market?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Probably at some future date we may permit a conversion of gold for our currency. We do not do it now.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope before this debate concludes that some knowledgeable members of the knowledgeable Ways and Means Committee would give some of us "ancients" some information with respect to what is being done with this gold, why we have it at all and why we do not get rid of it at $95 an ounce and capitalize on a product we evidently got for $35 or perhaps even $32 an ounce.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. As I say, this is not within the province of our committee, it is the Banking and Currency Committee, and if any members of that committee are present I would be happy to yield time to them.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further at this point?

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Chairman, I think the point is this. The issue of gold is not relevant to this particular bill. The interest equalization tax does not involve the purchase or sale of gold. In my understanding, on August 15 we suspended a redemption of American currency in gold to the central banks of other countries. It is only suspended however and therefore our gold reserve still remains of some significance. Whether we will ever go back to the redemption of currency in gold or not is a serious question, but pending the determination of that question I think it would probably be unwise for us to speculate with our gold in the money markets in order to take advantage of the current high values.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I would like to assure the gentleman from Iowa that I share his concern about our gold problem and about the reliability of our own currency.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, I am intrigued by the fact that the report on page 3 sets forth a table, with respect to gold, and discusses it at some length. Therefore, it must have some relation to this bill.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Apparently, as our balance of payments deteriorated, we transferred a large share of our gold abroad, but I think that stopped several years ago.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation only as a temporary expedient to measure one form of capital outflow from the United States.

It is contended by the administration that this legislation has worked—that the record discloses a reduction in the form of capital outflow which is taxed by this law.

As far as capital outflow is concerned, this determination is pure illusion. Although tax collections are down—while transactions subject to the tax may be less than they were a year ago—capital outflows from the United States substantially increased by procedures which bypassed the interest equalization tax.

As I stated in my supplemental views, this tax reached less than one-tenth of American capital going abroad—controlling $700 million in taxable investments while direct investment abroad for 1971 reached $7.8 billion, to which must be added the 1971 outflow of $2.1 billion from commercial banks. The 1972 ouflow from all sources is a national secret—it was never disclosed to our committee.

The Department of Commerce has not discouraged direct investment abroad. As a matter of fact, the Department merely maintains an inadequate record of capital outflows in direct investment.

It is shocking, but the administration seems currently dedicated to the proposition that the more American capital invested abroad—the better. The administration suggests that the interest equalization tax may not be necessary during the next year.

I find the administration's policy an incredible inducement to bleed America of its capital—at the very moment that interest rates are propelled upward because of capital shortages on the domestic scene. History clearly demonstrates that a domestic capital shortage is a short-cut to recession and depressed industrial activity and unemployment in the United States.

The Federal Reserve System has proven as impotent as the Department of Commerce in controlling capital outflows handled by commercial banks. I doubt that the Federal Reserve System can provide an accurate listing of capital outflows handled by commercial banks and their foreign subsidiary system.

The recent devaluation is a case in point. Our recent financial crisis was substantially a self-inflicted wound by Americans on Americans. Through our own banking system—with the Federal Reserve looking on—some skilled and privileged Americans attuned to the times, hauled in over a billion dollars in fat and probably untaxed profits created through currency speculation and the devaluation of the American dollar. This miserable American tragedy should not be permitted to occur again. The blood on which these vultures feast is our own.

Where are our senses in this kind of monetary mischief? What kind of fools are we to believe that America is better prepared to meet its current problems and rebuild our economy by transfusing our life-giving capital to other nations which enjoy better economic health than our own?

It is contended by the administration that capital investment abroad has resulted in income distributions in the United States. I defy those who support this contention to prove whether any decent or respectable portion of such income has ended up as substantial tax payments to the Federal Treasury. The fact is that such income is not repatriated—it remains abroad—floating around with $85 billion other Eurodollars ready to light on a tax shelter—or a tax-free island—or in money speculation. These free-floating American dollars invested abroad, which may one day call for American defense, have no patriotism whatsoever—they deserve no protection nor defense at the expense of the American people, if they are confiscated or expropriated.

The bill which we consider today and which terminates on June 30 of next year should be used as a vehicle to provide effective controls over all forms of capital shipments abroad. This Congress should set the conditions, the terms and the circumstances under which capital should move—or when it can move. Capital outflows in any form should not be countenanced, when such outflows contribute to escalating interest rates or a possible recession in the United States. At this moment, common economic sense suggests that export controls should be considered on capital outflows.

If our Nation should persist in dispatching its capital around the world—if we fail to restrain in some way our purchase of foreign assets and enterprise—the action which we fail to take may be taken by other countries.

Canada is currently taking official Government action to curb American investments—Australia is right behind—and these nations are among our best friends.

If we fail to prudently restrain the volume of American capital investment and outflow to other countries, they will enact legislation to accomplish that end.

There are many advantages in an interchange of investment among the na-

tions of this world. Such investment can create interreliance and stimulate trade between nations. But the timing, extent, or concentration of such investments may cause economic imbalance—develop controlled marketing to the detriment of all consumers—and may result in the takeover of specific resources or entire industries by alien purchase.

It is for these reasons that Congress must act to set legislative standards and guidelines to direct the nature, circumstances, and the extent of investment abroad by Americans and investment in America by foreigners.

It is my hope that Congress will utilize the time during which this Act is extended to enact a comprehensive bill on foreign investment and capital movement.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3577

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act of 1973".

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1954 CODE.—Whenever in this Act an amendment is expressed in terms of an amendment to a section or other provision, the reference is to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX.

Section 4911(d) is amended by striking out "March 31, 1973" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1974."

SEC. 3. OTHER AMENDMENTS.

(a) ESTATE TAXATION OF CERTAIN DEBT WHERE INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX APPLIES.—

(1) ESTATE TAX NOT TO APPLY.—The last sentence of section 2104(c) (relating to treatment of certain debt obligations for estate tax purposes) is amended by inserting "or section 861(a)(1)(G)" after "by reason of section 861(a)(1)(B)".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to estates of decedents dying on or after January 1, 1973.

(b) REPEAL OF EXEMPTION FOR SHIPPING COMPANIES IN LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4916 (relating to investments in less developed countries) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) ISSUES AFTER JANUARY 29, 1973, IN CASE OF SHIPPING COMPANIES IN LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES.—

"(1) REPEAL OF EXCLUSION.—Except as provided by paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), subsection (a)(2) shall not apply to acquisitions of stock or debt obligations of a corporation described in subsection (c)(1)(B) (relating to certain less developed country shipping companies) which were issued on or after January 30, 1973.

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR PREEXISTING COMMITMENTS.—Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply to an acquisition—

"(A) made pursuant to an obligation to acquire which, on January 29, 1973—

"(i) was unconditional, or

"(ii) was subject only to conditions contained in a formal contract under which partial performance had occurred; or

"(B) as to which on or before January 29, 1973, the acquiring United States person (or, in a case where 2 or more United States persons are making acquisitions as part of a single transaction, a majority in interest of such persons) had taken every action to signify approval of the acquisition under the procedures ordinarily employed by such person (or persons) in similar transactions, subject only to the execution of formal documents evidencing the acquisition and to customary closing conditions, and the acquiring United States person (or persons)—

"(i) had sent or deposited for delivery to the foreign issuer or obligor from whom the acquisition was made written evidence of such approval in the form of a commitment letter, memorandum of terms, draft purchase contract, or other document setting forth, or referring to a document sent by the foreign issuer or obligor from whom the acquisition was made which set forth, the principal terms of such acquisition, or

"(ii) had received from the foreign issuer or obligor from whom the acquisition was made a memorandum of terms, draft purchase contract, or other document setting forth, or referring to a document sent by the acquiring United States person (or persons) which set forth, the principal terms of such acquisition.

"(3) EXCEPTION FOR PUBLIC OFFERING.—Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply to an acquisition if—

"(A) a registration statement (within the meaning of the Securities Act of 1933) was in effect with respect to the stock or debt obligation acquired at the time of its acquisition;

"(B) the registration statement was first filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on January 29, 1973, or within 90 days before that date; and

"(C) no amendment was filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission after January 29, 1973, and before the acquisition which had the effect of increasing the number of shares of stock or the aggregate face amount of the debt obligations covered by the registration statement.

"(4) EXCEPTION FOR OPTIONS, FORECLOSURES, AND CONVERSIONS.—Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not apply to an acquisition—

"(A) of stock pursuant to the exercise of an option or similar right (or a right to convert a debt obligation into stock), if such option or right was held on January 29, 1973, by the person making the acquisition or by a decedent from whom such person acquired the right to exercise such option or right by bequest or inheritance or by reason of such decedent's death, or

"(B) of stock or debt obligations as a result of a foreclosure by a creditor pursuant to the terms of an instrument held by such creditor on January 29, 1973."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 4916(a)(2) is amended by inserting "(except as provided in subsection (e))" and after "less developed country corporation".

(c) EXCLUSION FOR SECURITIES ISSUED TO FINANCE NEW OR ADDITIONAL DIRECT INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) EXCLUSION FROM TAX.—Subchapter A of chapter 41 (relating to acquisition of foreign stock and debt obligations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 4922. EXCLUSION FOR CERTAIN ISSUES TO FINANCE NEW OR ADDITIONAL DIRECT INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—The tax imposed by section 4911 shall not apply to the acquisition by a United States person of stock or a debt obligation constituting all or part of an original or new issue (as defined in section 4917(c)) which was issued for the purpose of financing new or additional direct investment (as defined by the Secretary or his delegate) in the United States by the foreign issuer or obligor and which qualifies under subsection (b).

"(b) QUALIFICATION FOR EXCLUSION.—In order for any issue of stock or debt obligations to qualify for an exclusion under subsection (a), the foreign issuer or obligor (prior to the issuance of such stock or debt obligations) shall have established to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate, pursuant to rules or regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, that—

"(1) at least 50 percent of the total funds required for the direct investment involved will come from sources outside the United States;

"(2) such investment will be made for a period of at least 10 years;

"(3) during such 10-year period the aggregate amount of all investments in the United States by the foreign issuer or obligor will at no time be reduced below the aggregate amount of such investments as determined immediately after the investment to which the exclusion applies;

"(4) during such 10-year period the foreign issuer or obligor will comply with such other conditions and requirements as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe and make applicable to such issuer or obligor; and

"(5) during such 10-year period the foreign issuer or obligor will submit such reports and information, in such form and manner, as may be required by the Secretary or his delegate to substantiate compliance by the foreign issuer or obligor with the requirements of the preceding paragraphs.

"(c) LOSS OF ENTITLEMENT TO EXCLUSION IN CASE OF SUBSEQUENT NONCOMPLIANCE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Where an exclusion under subsection (a) has applied with respect to the acquisition of any stock or debt obligation, but the foreign issuer or obligor subsequently fails (before the termination date specified in section 4911(d)) to comply with any of the requirements enumerated in subsection (b) or made applicable to such issuer or obligor under paragraph (4) thereof then liability for the tax imposed by section 4911 (in an amount determined under paragraph (2) of this subsection) shall be incurred by such foreign issuer or obligor (with respect to such stock or debt obligations) at the time such failure to comply occurs as determined by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—In any case where an exclusion under subsection (a) has applied with respect to an original or new issue of stock or debt obligations, but a subsequent failure to comply with the requirements enumerated in or made applicable to the foreign issuer or obligor under subsection (b) occurs and liability for the tax imposed by section 4911 is incurred by the issuer or obligor as a result thereof, the amount of such tax shall be equal to the amount of tax for which all persons acquiring such stock or debt obligations (as part of the original or new issue) would have been liable under such section upon their acquisition thereof if such exclusion had not applied to such acquisition."

(2) PENALTY.—Subchapter B of chapter 68 (relating to assessable penalties) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6689. FAILURE BY CERTAIN FOREIGN ISSUERS AND OBLIGORS TO COMPLY WITH UNITED STATES INVESTMENT EQUALIZATION TAX REQUIREMENTS.

"In addition to any other penalties imposed by law, any foreign issuer or obligor with respect to an original or new issue of whose stock or debt obligations an exclusion from tax under section 4922 applied, but who fails to comply with any of the applicable requirements enumerated in or made applicable to such issuer or obligor under subsection (b) of such section and (under section 4922(c)) incurs liability for the tax imposed by section 4911 as a result thereof, shall, unless it is shown that such failure to comply

is due to reasonable cause and not due to willful neglect, be liable (in addition to the liability for tax so incurred) for a penalty equal to 25 percent of the total amount of such tax."

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 41 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 4922. Exclusion for certain issues to finance new or additional direct investment in the United States.".

(B) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 68 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 6689. Failure by certain foreign issuers and obligors to comply with United States investments equalization tax requirements.".

Mr. ULLMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to be proposed.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, there are no committee amendments.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming (Mr. RONCALIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting with my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GETTYS) and I do not mean to involve him in this, because these are my thoughts and not his, but it seems to me, my colleagues, that we are about to pass judgment on a piece of legislation, and I doubt very much if there are 15 Members of the 435 Members of this House who know what we are doing. I doubt very much if we know what we are doing.

I would like to ask the Members, can we say in good conscience that we really know what we are doing?

Mr. Chairman, I know $85 million were earned for the Treasury last year, but I do not know how many billions of dollars in bank loans went to Switzerland without taxation under exceptions in this bill. I want to know how many hundreds of millions of dollars went to Germany and Japan and other countries without taxation, probably being sold off for marks and francs today, and I know what this bill is going to do to attack the problem.

Why do we persist in such cursory treatment of such an important matter? Do we recognize, my colleagues, that we have abandoned our powers and still further allow an erosion of our right to the executive department, in this case the Treasury?

Mr. Chairman, this report says we will let the President determine whether there shall be an interest tax or no tax, and if so what amount. Why do we persist in further derogation of our powers to delegate this to the President again? Here we go again.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this bill, in the hopes that sooner or later we will return authority to this House, even if it means that we have to start at 8 o'clock in the morning to sweat out the complexities of our money problems abroad, instead of going through the theatrics we engage in today. This is the first open rule from Ways and Means since 1929, but for all the good it does, we might just as well have forgotten about that reform.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement putting the House on notice as to what is being done here by way of delegating extraordinary powers to the President.

Mr. Chairman, I am sick and tired of listening to Members of Congress, both in the House and in the other body, who continually rave about the usurpation of power on the part of the President. He is not usurping power; the Congress has been giving it to him year after year after year. There is scarcely a piece of major legislation that comes to the floor of the House that does not contain some variation of this language: "If the President deems it to be in the national interest" or "if the President deems it to be in the national security," he can do thus and so.

Mr. Chairman, I have been reading the Federal Register. I recommend to the Members that they take a look at it once in a while and note the "Presidential Determinations" that are being made under delegations of authority such as you are about to continue and approve in this legislation.

Just the other day for instance, President Nixon gave Spain another $3 million on top of $21 million last year despite the law which says an economically developed country may not get more than an additional $500,000 a year in military hardware or military services.

Who gave him this power? The Members of the House and Senate, and the Members are about to do it here again. So stop ranting about usurpation of power on the part of the President.

I am not talking about President Nixon alone. Congress has been doing this for years. It is a power no President ought to have and should refuse if extended to him. However, none of them refuse it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman for his observations and appreciate them very much. I respect the gentleman's years of dedicated effort to make this a better House.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the time has come to quit passing the buck. The buck stops here. The reputation of the House of Representatives is what is in the balance. I am proud of being a Congressman and I want my kids to be proud of it, too, but I do not think this will evolve if we continue to strive for reform, and then ignore the reform as we are doing with this legislation today.

We do this House no good when we pass legislation willy-nilly with erosion of our own authority and delegation of the lawmaking power to downtown bureaucracies, as we do in this bill today.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3577) to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 197, he reported the bill back to the House.

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

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 358, nays 23, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

YEAS—358

Abdnor	Camp	Eckhardt
Abzug	Carey, N.Y.	Edwards, Ala.
Adams	Carney, Ohio	Edwards, Calif.
Addabbo	Carter	Eilberg
Anderson, Calif.	Casey, Tex.	Erlenborn
Anderson, Ill.	Cederberg	Esch
Andrews, N.C.	Chamberlain	Eshleman
Andrews, N. Dak.	Chappell	Evans, Colo.
Annunzio	Clancy	Fascell
Archer	Clark	Findley
Arends	Clausen, Don H.	Fish
Armstrong	Clay	Fisher
Aspin	Cochran	Flood
Bafalis	Cohen	Flowers
Baker	Collins	Ford, Gerald R.
Barrett	Conable	Forsythe
Beard	Conlan	Fountain
Bell	Conte	Fraser
Bennett	Conyers	Frenzel
Bergland	Corman	Frey
Bevill	Cotter	Froehlich
Biester	Coughlin	Fulton
Bingham	Cronin	Fuqua
Blackburn	Culver	Gaydos
Blatnik	Daniel, Dan	Gettys
Boland	Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Giaimo
Bolling	Daniels, Dominick V.	Gibbons
Bowen	Danielson	Gilman
Brademas	Davis, Ga.	Ginn
Brasco	Davis, S.C.	Goldwater
Bray	Davis, Wis.	Gonzalez
Breckinridge	de la Garza	Goodling
Brinkley	Delaney	Grasso
Brooks	Dellenback	Green, Oreg.
Broomfield	Dellums	Green, Pa.
Brotzman	Dennis	Griffiths
Brown, Calif.	Dent	Gubser
Brown, Mich.	Derwinski	Gunter
Brown, Ohio	Devine	Guyer
Broyhill, N.C.	Dickinson	Haley
Broyhill, Va.	Diggs	Hamilton
Buchanan	Dingell	Hammer-schmidt
Burgener	Donohue	Hanley
Burke, Calif.	Dorn	Hanna
Burke, Fla.	Downing	Hanrahan
Burke, Mass.	Drinan	Hansen, Idaho
Burleson, Tex.	Dulski	Hansen, Wash.
Burlison, Mo.	Duncan	Harrington
Burton	du Pont	Harsha
Butler		Hastings
		Hays

Hébert	Mink	Shuster
Hechler, W. Va.	Minshall, Ohio	Sikes
Heckler, Mass.	Mitchell, Md.	Sisk
Heinz	Mitchell, N.Y.	Skubitz
Helstoski	Mizell	Slack
Henderson	Moakley	Smith, Iowa
Hillis	Montgomery	Snyder
Hinshaw	Moorhead, Calif.	Spence
Hogan	Moorhead, Pa.	Stanton, J. William
Holifield	Morgan	Stark
Holtzman	Mosher	Steele
Horton	Moss	Steelman
Huber	Murphy, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.
Hudnut	Myers	Stephens
Hungate	Natcher	Stokes
Hunt	Nedzi	Stratton
Hutchinson	Nelsen	Stubblefield
Ichord	Nichols	Stuckey
Jarman	Nix	Studds
Johnson, Calif.	Obey	Sullivan
Johnson, Colo.	O'Brien	Talcott
Johnson, Pa.	O'Hara	Taylor, Mo.
Jones, Ala.	O'Neill	Taylor, N.C.
Jones, Okla.	Owens	Teague, Calif.
Jordan	Parris	Teague, Tex.
Karth	Passman	Thompson, N.J.
Kastenmeier	Patten	Thomson, Wis.
Kazen	Pepper	Thone
Keating	Perkins	Thornton
Kemp	Pettis	Tiernan
Kluczynski	Pickle	Towell, Nev.
Kuykendall	Pike	Treen
Kyros	Poage	Udall
Landgrebe	Podell	Ullman
Landrum	Preyer	Van Deerlin
Latta	Price, Ill.	Vanik
Leggett	Pritchard	Veysey
Lehman	Quie	Vigorito
Lent	Quillen	Waggonner
Litton	Railsback	Waldie
Long, La.	Randall	Wampler
Long, Md.	Rangel	Ware
Lott	Reid	Whalen
McClory	Reuss	White
McCloskey	Rhodes	Whitehurst
McCollister	Rinaldo	Whitten
McDade	Roberts	Widnall
McFall	Robinson, Va.	Wiggins
McKay	Rodino	Williams
McSpadden	Roe	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Macdonald	Rogers	
Madden	Rooney, Pa.	
Madigan	Rose	Winn
Mahon	Rosenthal	Wolff
Mallary	Rostenkowski	Wright
Maraziti	Roush	Wyatt
Martin, Nebr.	Roy	Wydler
Martin, N.C.	Ruth	Wylie
Mathias, Calif.	St Germain	Wyman
Matsunaga	Sandman	Yates
Mayne	Sarasin	Yatron
Mazzoli	Sarbanes	Young, Fla.
Melcher	Satterfield	Young, Ga.
Metcalfe	Saylor	Young, Ill.
Mezvinsky	Schneebeli	Young, S.C.
Michel	Schroeder	Young, Tex.
Milford	Sebelius	Zablocki
Miller	Shipley	Zion
Mills, Md.	Shoup	Zwach
Minish	Shriver	

NAYS—23

Alexander	Gross	Roncalio, Wyo.
Ashbrook	Grover	Roncallo, N.Y.
Byron	Hicks	Rousselot
Cleveland	Jones, Tenn.	Runnels
Crane	Ketchum	Ryan
Denholm	Mathis, Ga.	Steiger, Ariz.
Evins, Tenn.	Powell, Ohio	Symms
Flynt	Rarick	

NOT VOTING—50

Ashley	King	Robison, N.Y.
Badillo	Koch	Rooney, N.Y.
Biaggi	Lujan	Roybal
Breaux	McCormack	Ruppe
Chisholm	McEwen	Scherle
Clawson, Del	McKinney	Seiberling
Collier	Mailliard	Smith, N.Y.
Foley	Mann	Staggers
Ford, William D.	Meeds	Stanton, James V.
Frelinghuysen	Mills, Ark.	Steed
Gray	Mollohan	Symington
Gude	Murphy, Ill.	Vander Jagt
Harvey	Patman	Walsh
Hawkins	Peyser	Wilson, Bob
Hosmer	Price, Tex.	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Howard	Rees	
Jones, N.C.	Regula	
	Riegle	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. King.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Collier.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Gude.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Koch with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Robison of New York.
Mr. Meeds with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. McKinney.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Seiberling with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Scherle.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Regula.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Breaux with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Walsh.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Patman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ULLMAN. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

THE NATIONAL CATASTROPHIC DISASTER INSURANCE ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there is a book with which we are all familiar. That book contains a chapter which we know well and cherish deeply. That book is the Holy Bible, and that chapter is Ecclesiastes and the words follow:

To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven; a time to be born and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to reap; a time to kill, and a time to heal; a time to break down, and a time to build up; a time to weep, and a time to laugh; a time to mourn and a time to dance; a time to rend and a time to sew; a time to keep silence and a time to speak.

My time for speaking out has come. Though this be a near revolutionary legislative proposal, and though it is virtually virgin ground being tred here; the time has come for careful and judicious consideration by this body of an all-risk, comprehensive, National Catastrophic Disaster Insurance Act.

For those of us who suffered the wrath of the most disastrous flood in the history of the Republic—Hurricane Agnes—we shall greatly note and long remember her tragic impact. For those of you who were not directly injured, but witnessed the disaster's effects through the media or by noting the enormous amount of recovery legislation passed by the Congress; you will also have reason to remember her impact. But for those who may have forgotten the tragedy, and the suffering, and the misery, a short history follows:

On June 23, 1972, the Greater Wilkes-Barre, Pa., area, the Greater Richmond Va., area, Corning and Elmira N.Y., and portions of seven States were for all intents and purposes destroyed. The list of flooded areas is too numerous to mention. In Pennsylvania alone, the business districts and large portions of residential streets in the cities of Pittsburgh, Harrisburg, Wilkes-Barre, Kingston, Danville, Bloomsburg, Reading, suburban Philadelphia, and scores of others were inundated by rampaging waters beyond anyone's control. The numbers of people evacuated totaled in the millions; the amount of property destroyed in the billions; the families displaced from their place of residence in the hundreds of thousands; and the number of individuals who had insurance against such a happening could be counted on your left hand. No one had insurance. This is a sad fact. In Wilkes-Barre alone, where 100,000 people were evacuated at 5 o'clock in the morning with no warning—where 45,000 of those people were to return to destroyed dwellings—where 1,700 businesses were wiped out overnight as well as countless acres of farmland and rural and vacation homes—in this relatively small area only two individuals had purchased flood insurance. In all good conscience, we can never let this happen again.

In case any of you may have the idea that what I am relating here only cost the people of Pennsylvania and the seven other Hurricane Agnes affected States, you are sadly mistaken. The failure of these disaster victims to have insurance coverage against their losses has caused the citizens of the rest of the 50 States to bear the burden of that recovery through their tax dollars. Furthermore, that disaster has cost the House of Representatives and the other body countless legislative hours and staff hours in the passage of legislation to speed help to these people. It has cost the administration through the Office of Emergency Preparedness, the Farmers Home Administration, the Small Business Administration, and many other Federal agencies which become active in a disaster, an enormous sum of money. The taxpayers of this Nation pay for and are now paying for the over $300,000,000 in Small Business Administration loans as a direct result of the Agnes disaster and this in the Greater Wilkes-Barre, Pa., area alone.

The Farmers Home Administration also provides for disaster loans at low interest and this cost is also borne by the American taxpayer; not to mention the immense administrative staff which must be hired, trained, and kept in existence to process and maintain the SBA and FHA loan programs at the disaster site. Huge grants are neccessitated for many public and private institutions; and those institutions not covered under law and who did not have insurance ended up with nothing—and this included such worthy people as the YMCA, the Catholic youth center, and the Jew-

ish community center in the city of Wilkes-Barre.

I mean in no case to denigrate the massive and inspired Federal relief effort which in large degree saved the Agnes disaster area from even worse catastrophe; however, I merely point out that the costs of a disaster—no matter its geographic location—are borne under the current setup by all of the American people through their hard-earned tax dollars. The costs of a disaster must be borne in one form or another. The present Federal disaster assistance program takes the taxpayers money, runs it through an often unresponsive bureaucracy, and after many discretionary decisions, returns part of it to the taxpayer. Such lack of responsiveness, such discretion and expense, such enormous cost to the Nation's citizens without full valued return is an outrage. In all good conscience, I repeat, we can never let this happen again.

The $64,000 question is, What is the solution? That solution is not as difficult as it may seem at first glance. Clearly what is needed is nothing less than some form of comprehensive national disaster insurance to cover all forms of catastrophe including floods, hurricanes, windstorms of all types, earthquakes, mudslides, and also manmade disasters such as atomic accident. Such a response to the disaster problem—a better than $4 billion problem in 1972 incidentally—would provide a systematic and certain means of making payments available to the homeowner and the businessman as a matter of right, and not on the basis of charity. An insurance approach gives the taxpayer what he wants—protection against loss secured at his own initiative.

In its report to the Congress concerning the Federal disaster program, the administration on January 1 of this year states that its further report, "containing the findings and recommendations of the further study on the feasibility of establishing a more comprehensive disaster insurance program" shall be presented to the Congress on March 1, 1974—1 year from now. I introduce my bill—the National Catastrophic Disaster Insurance Act of 1973—today, February 27, 1973. The need for such a law was graphically demonstrated by 20 feet of water in downtown Wilkes-Barre, Pa., last June—I could not hope to improve on that display of nature's fury to show the acute need for this legislation now. The recent shaking by the well-known earthquake zone near Los Angeles, Calif., merely points out to all of us that this program is needed by the citizens of this Nation now, not 1 year or 2 years from now when no one knows how many countless citizens will have been displaced—their homes and businesses ruined—and without even the benefit of the opportunity to purchase insurance against the possibility of such disaster. Notwithstanding the attractive features of the current flood insurance program, it has been demonstrated to be not working up to par, and indeed provides for no insurance against such common perils as earthquake and catastrophic windstorms. With the bill I introduce today, provision is not only made for all such perils but in addition such coverage is mandated on each and every property and liability insurance policy currently in effect nationwide.

First, this bill creates the Office of Federal Disaster Insurance within the Federal Insurance Administrator's Office in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Charged with the responsibility of administering this act and implementing a nationwide catastrophic insurance program, the Assistant Administrator to utilize the private insurance sector and secure their cooperation in the administration of this program.

Second, the bill creates a national disaster insurance fund which will act as the pool from which the Administrator shall supervise disbursements for claims under the disaster insurance law, and into which premium payments and other collected funds will be maintained. This national disaster insurance fund would have a tripartite funding formula as follows: First, it would consist of a surcharge to be added on to all property and liability insurance premiums written nationwide with the exception for equality considerations of workmen's compensation, bonds, and health insurance; second, it would further consist of a 1-percent levy upon all repayments to the Farmers Home Administration and the Small Business Administration of their outstanding disaster recovery loans; and third, and it would consist of such sums as may be authorized and appropriated by the Congress. The initial authorization to start the fund would be $1 billion—a sum to be later repaid to the Treasury when sufficient reserves exist in the national disaster fund. Furthermore, the administrator would have full authority, acting through the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, to issue and purchase Treasury notes and other obligations with a view toward maintaining the fund at a workable and feasible level. As a longstanding member of the House Appropriations Committee, I will personally urge upon that committee the requisite $1 billion appropriation to get the fund off the ground.

The program would work as follows: After a determination of the required surcharge on insurance premiums—and the amount of such surcharge could vary to reflect regional, statewide, or national variations in risk—the Administrator would impose such a surcharge on all such premiums nationwide and immediately there would be an extension of coverage of disaster insurance to each and every property insurance policy nationwide. Such an extension of coverage could be the full amount of property insurance in effect or a percentage thereof, depending on the size of the insurance fund, and would be determined by the administrator. Under no circumstances could such an imposed surcharge exceed 5 percent, and the extension of coverage would reach the full face value of property insurance in effect as soon as the insurance fund became large enough to sustain an anticipated loss.

The States and municipalities would be consulted by the Administrator with respect to the particular kinds of disasters which would be covered under this act; with respect to the nature of and limits of loss or damage to be covered; with respect to the classification, limitation, and rejection of any risks which may be necessary; with respect to the extent to which disaster insurance should be subject to deductibles or coinsurance provisions; and with respect to zoning and other land use provisions.

Indeed, no catastrophic disaster insurance would be made available for any property which failed to meet land use and other ordinances aimed at restricting land development or occupancy in disaster-prone areas. In those areas determined as special catastrophic disaster risk areas, reasonable efforts would be required so as to preclude excessive losses at the time of catastrophe.

Certain safeguards are part of this bill to insure that no duplication of Federal benefits shall exist. No person insured under the Catastrophic Disaster Insurance Act would be allowed to recover Federal funds under the Small Business Administration or Farmers Home Administration loan programs.

Also, should private insurance companies establish a catastrophic disaster insurance program of equal scope as the one presented here before June 30, 1975, the Federal program would cease operation and be supplanted by the private insurance plan.

One last vital point—included in this bill is a clause making benefits retroactive to June 1, 1972. Under no circumstances whatsoever is this a giveaway. It is no more so a giveaway than was the reconstruction of Europe twice after two wars and the anticipated reconstruction of another country after a more recent war. It is no more so a giveaway than the drive toward economic prosperity which resulted in the loans to Lockheed Corp. and the Penn Central Railroad. It is no more so a giveaway than the billions upon billions which this Nation has altruistically poured out to less affluent nations worldwide. It is no more so a giveaway than the farm subsidies, and the airline subsidies, and the shipping subsidies, ad infinitum.

Disaster insurance will soon be part and parcel of all fire and property ininsurance written nationwide; and the victims of the greatest natural disaster in the history of the Republic—the victims of Hurricane Agnes—will have been unjustly, and by a particularly cruel quirk of fate, excluded. It is their real suffering in human and economic terms which is to be the catalyst for action on the part of the Congress in the disaster insurance field. These victims are mostly members of that economic class that is so neglected—the so-called middle class. They have homeowners insurance with mortgages in the best American tradition, and they have a deep and abiding faith in their Government. When their homes and businesses were destroyed and their lives shattered by the Agnes floods, their only response was to immediately begin the tortuous road toward recovery; and when that task of digging out

of the mud finally ends, in all good conscience we can never let it happen again. We cannot disappoint their faith. With this in mind, with the fervent prayer that the dark shadow of catastrophe be ever apart from our and our neighbors door; but with the practical knowledge that tomorrow may bring disaster, I maintain that the scope of the law must be made to fit the scope of the disaster—and I ask your support in that effort.

I include the following:

APPENDIX 1—NATIONAL CATASTROPHIC DISASTER INSURANCE ACT

(Figures below relate to the seven state Hurricane Agnes Disaster, seventy percent of the damage of which was in Pennsylvania. Source: Office of Emergency Preparedness.)

AS OF JANUARY 31, 1973

Small business disaster loans

Home loans:	
Applications	120,285
Approved	$580,475,363
Business loans:	
Applications	11,547
Approved	$389,921,205
Total forgiveness for business and home loans (estimated)	$635,995,000

Farmers Home Administration

FHA emergency loans:	
Applications	13,588
Approved	$65,648,639
Forgiveness	$21,377,359
FHA rural housing loans:	
Applications	872
Approved	$3,720,140
Forgiveness	$1,774,289

Total property damage (estimated)

Private	$2,622,764,853
Public	404,439,804
Total	3,027,204,657

APPENDIX 2

Q. Why is this bill needed if the National Flood Insurance Act covers 80 percent of all disasters which occur?

A. There are several noteworthy departures from the flood insurance program: The flood insurance program requires that participants seek out such protection, and the result has been non-participation as evidenced by Agnes. DJF bill includes automatic coverage for all insureds. Further, under flood insurance program, one cannot purchase enough protection—the limitation of $5,000 for the contents within a business is of course absurd. Under DJF bill, one can virtually have coverage up to the face value of his property insurance. In addition, through absorption of the existent flood insurance program, the DJF bill will cover the eighty percent of disaster now under law and also include the twenty percent, e.g. earthquakes which are not covered.

Q. How will one "purchase" disaster insurance?

A. You don't purchase this insurance. Once the administrator determined the amount of surcharge on insurance premiums in your region or state, you are automatically covered as an "extension of coverage" of your existing property insurance.

Q. Won't the addition of a surcharge on existent insurance contracts constitute an interference with those contracts and thus be illegal?

A. No. The surcharge will not take effect until ones insurance premium comes up for renewal. Even though some individuals will not be immediately surcharged, they will be nevertheless covered. When their contract comes up for renewal, they will then be surcharged.

Q. Won't serious inequities exist since people in Vermont will have to pay for California earthquakes, and it is unlikely that people in Vermont will have a disaster which people in California will have to pay for?

A. The bill recognizes differences in disaster risk and empowers the Administrator to charge a varying surcharge on insurance premiums to reflect actuarial risk on a regional or state-wide basis. Thus, it is anticipated that the Los Angeles city dweller can anticipate a higher surcharge than the New York city dweller due to earthquake risk. However, or the service rendered, and with a five percent ceiling on the surcharge, it is well within most people's means.

Q. Couldn't the fund be virtually wiped out by several major disasters one after the other?

A. No. The Administrator can at any time determine that the scarcity of monies in the disaster insurance fund require that only a set percentum of disaster losses be paid. For example, man X has homeowners insurance which he is surcharged two dollars annually for to include him in the national disaster insurance program. He has forty thousand dollars worth of property insurance. The Administrator of the Federal Disaster Insurance Office has determined that due to recurring losses to the disaster insurance fund, only fifty percent "extension of coverage" will be allowed if a disaster should strike in the near future. Man X's home is destroyed in a tidal wave in Oregon the next day. The man has fifty precent extension of coverage on his forty thousand dollar property insurance policy and would thus receive twenty thousand dollars from the disaster insurance fund.

NOTE.—It is anticipated that the disaster fund will begin in this manner, i.e. paying a percentage of loss at first as the fund grows and eventually paying full value of the property insurance as the fund matures.

Q. What kinds of property are included in this program?

A. Homes and businesses, industry and some private institutions included in Public Law 92-385, the Agnes Act. Some structures will be excluded on the recommendation of local authorities, e.g., those which violate zoning laws which are meant to minimize disaster losses, or such other structures which the State and local authorities may determine.

Q. Won't this bill merely protect the playboy who has his beach cottage and can now build where he wishes without fear or financial loss?

A. Stringent land use provisions are anticipated in this bill. Special catastrophic disaster risk areas are to be identified by the administrator and unless reasonable efforts are made at avoiding disaster losses, no insurance coverage shall be allowed.

Q. Can't the private insurance companies provide this type of coverage?

A. While I would hope the answer could be yes, it is no. The risks are too great and the potential loss too huge for private insurance companies to assume this task under current law. The larger the insurance "pool" from which one draws upon to pay out beneficiaries after a disaster loss, the more likely that the pool can absorb losses. A pool such as that envisaged in my bill, coupled with the provision for extension of coverage, should provide adequate padding in case of several concurrent disasters.

Q. What types of insurance premiums is it anticipated will be surcharged?

A. The types of premiums to be surcharged are limited to property and liability insurance with the noted exceptions of motor vehicle insurance which is already covered in 99 percent of the cases because of the comprehensive nature of such coverage, and health insurance, workmen's compensation, and bonds for equity reasons.

Q. How much money will the surcharge develop for the fund?

A. That depends. It depends on what level the administrator determines is feasible, on what the needs of the fund may be—and remember, these can vary on a statewide, nationwide, or regional basis as far as the percentage of surcharge. For example: if the surcharge was on property coverages such as fire, extended coverage, burglary and theft, homeowners, commercial multi-peril, and most of the liability and casualty coverages, the Pennsylvania bureau of regulation of rates and policies estimates the following contributions to the national disaster insurance fund:

[Figures in millions of dollars]

Year	1 percent loading	2 percent loading	3 percent loading	4 percent loading
1973	119.8	239.5	359.3	479.1
1974	126.0	252.0	378.0	504.0
1975	132.2	264.4	396.6	528.8
1976	138.8	276.9	415.3	553.7
1977	144.6	289.3	433.9	578.6
1978	150.9	301.7	452.6	603.4
1979	157.1	314.2	471.2	628.3
1980	163.3	326.6	489.9	653.2
Total	1,132.3	2,264.6	3,396.8	4,529.1

Of course it should be noted that these are not the sole source of maintenance of the fund—the one percent of all funds collected by the Treasury as a result of paybacks from BA and FHA disaster loans are also included as is authorization for an initial one billion dollar appropriation.

A REFRESHING SPIRIT IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks, while the House of Representatives has been engaged in organizing the 93d Congress, the leadership team of Speaker CARL ALBERT and Majority Leader TIP O'NEILL has emerged as a vital force for reasoned reform.

This morning, the Washington Post took note of the laudable efforts of the Democratic majority in an editorial aptly entitled, "A Refreshing Spirit in the House." The editorial refers to the "emergence of Speaker ALBERT as a strong, effective, reform-oriented party leader." I am proud to be associated with leadership of such unquestioned ability and foresight. I commend the Post article to you all.

A REFRESHING SPIRIT IN THE HOUSE

In a remarkable show of sustained energy, the House Democratic caucus has just completed a series of reforms which could produce lasting and salutary changes in the structure and operations of the House of Representatives. The goal has been, as Speaker Carl Albert said recently, "to find more effective, more open and more democratic ways to meet our responsibility." Though the full impact of the reforms cannot be measured yet, the Democrats have moved toward that goal much faster and more harmoniously than seemed possible when the 93d Congress convened on Jan. 3.

The thrust of the reforms has been to strengthen the role of the party caucus, to open choice committee and leadership posts to more members, and to make the expanded party and committee leadership more ac-

countable. In its most recent step, the caucus voted last Thursday to create a policy committee composed of the party's House leadership and a cross-section of the rank and file.

Two other reforms advanced last week could have tremendous impact on the way business is conducted in the House. First, the caucus agreed to restrict the use of closed or no-amendment rules for considering bills on the House floor. The new procedure, which will primarily affect tax, trade and social security measures from the Ways and Means Committee, is designed to ensure that amendments backed by a majority of House Democrats can be offered on the floor. Even more revolutionary was the caucus' endorsement of a proposed change in the House rules which would require all committee meetings, including voting sessions, to be open to the press and public unless members of a panel should vote, in the open, to close a particular session. Several House committees have already adopted similar "sunshine" rules, and the all-embracing reform should be approved by the full House without delay.

All in all, the House Democrats have agreed to an impressive body of reforms. Their achievements testify to the majority of the Democratic Study Group as an influential force, and to the emergence of Speaker Albert as a strong, effective, reform-oriented party leader. Perhaps most significant is the changed attitude of most of the committee barons of the House, who are now going along with changes which they had refused to entertain for years. It is not yet certain that this new spirit will survive through the stormy passages of reforming the appropriations process and overhauling the committee structure of the House. But the record so far is heartening to all who favor the rejuvenation of the House as an effective, open legislative body.

WEATHER MODIFICATION IS EXTENSIVE AND SHOULD BE CONTROLLED

(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, today, I am introducing a comprehensive weather modification control and regulation bill. The day of the yellow-slickered itinerant who sent up skyrockets while awe-stricken onlookers waited expectantly for rain, has departed.

In an article contained in "Public Administration Review" authored by W. Henry Lambright, of Syracuse University, it was stated that:

A recent presidential panel called weather modification one of the possible new trend-setting developments of the 1970's. It is now the scientific consensus that man has a sharply limited, but potentially quite significant capacity to affect local weather conditions. He can, in certain cases and under specific conditions, dissipate cold fogs, increase rainfall and convert hail into less dangerous forms of precipitation. There is some evidence he can blunt the destructive power of hurricanes and suppress lightning. He is carrying out research that may someday lead to weather and climate modifications on a large scale.

Mr. Speaker, today modification research projects are being carried out by all major Federal agencies and a number of States, counties, and universities. Additionally, a substantial number of commercial weather modification firms are doing business. Federal projects and lead agencies include: National Colorado River Basin pilot projects, Bureau of Reclamation; national hurricane modification project, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; national lightning suppression project, Forest Service; national cumulus modification project, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; national hail research experiment, National Science Foundation; national Great Lakes snow redistribution project, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; national fog modification project, Federal Aviation Administration.

There are no Federal restrictions or control on this activity although the unending belt of weather clearly is a matter of Federal as well as State concern and responsibility. Some scientists have even halted their experiments, deciding modification of weather was so dangerous on these early experimental stages as to be outside their scope.

Modification is continuing, however. Some 29 States do have laws on the subject, but many of these pertain only to State-sponsored feasibility studies.

There is comparatively little protection for the citizen who does not want his individual rights to natural weather infringed upon.

The art of weather modification is still highly imperfect, but rapid strides are being made on a wide scale. I believe the time has come when we must recognize the perils as well as the possible benefits.

In the 1970 National Research Journal, Ralph W. Johnson, professor of law, University of Washington, wrote:

But weather modification is not yet a completely operational activity and in its present stage of development the creation of an entirely new and independent regulatory agency for its management would seem premature. At the same time it is certain that the organizational pattern established now is likely to have a substantial effect on the patterns of the future. Care must therefore be taken to assure that the optimum patterns are created now.

I believe modification of the weather is occurring today both at experimental and commercial levels, sufficient to warrant safeguarding both people, property, and the integrity of the experiments themselves.

The bill I am introducing recognizes the individual State's rights in this matter and their concern in the field. While it would require a Federal permit for commercial modification projects, it also requires that the permittee previously obtain a State license.

The bill provides for basic requirements in experiences or education of the operator, and would create a system of bonding of licensees to protect the populace. It is my position we should not subject the people to damaging mishaps which result from mistaken approaches to modification.

The bill adopts extensive portions of present reporting requirements but expands these as well. It provides for suspension or revocation of permits should atmospheric conditions become unsafe or the operator evidence his inability to follow the permit requirements.

Additionally, and over a period of time, the Secretary of Commerce would be required to establish a comprehensive computerized system capable of analyzing weather conditions both natural and modified and also capable of projecting results on natural weather of modification efforts.

This bill also contains a title dealing with the international aspects of weather modification. At the present time there are occasions when U.S. citizens go abroad to modify weather in foreign countries. Also, there have been occasions when our Department of Defense has acted directly at the request of certain foreign countries to engage in water modification over their soil with questions resulting as to policy controls of our civilian government. Tentative efforts are being made to develop international control and oversight. My bill would assist in this important effort.

There is now great difficulty in accurately predicting the outcome of weather modification efforts just as there is great difficulty in proving the degree of results which have been obtained. Court cases are pending which involve disasters allegedly arisen out of weather modification at a time when we have an insufficient body of facts or law on this extremely important subject. I believe we should correct this shortcoming.

Dr. Edith Brown Weiss who is a staff member of Brookings Institution informally conferred with me on numerous occasions since I began work on this bill. Doctor Weiss is working in international weather modification and has delivered scholarly papers on weather modification. She writes:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 26, 1973.

Hon. FRANK EVANS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVANS: As one who has studied the political and legal problems of weather modification for some time, I believe there is a need to enact Federal legislation in the field of weather modification.

Under certain weather conditions, weather modification activities may conceivably be hazardous rather than beneficial. In some cases they may have effects down wind in other areas, even across state borders. Federal legislation could help avoid these problems and help protect those who believe they could be adversely affected by weather modification activities.

I should make it clear that these are my own views and in no way should be attributed to the Brookings Institution, its trustees, officers and other staff members.

Sincerely,

EDITH BROWN WEISS.

COMMENTS ON VISIT OF GOLDA MEIR TO UNITED STATES

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

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to welcome Prime Minister Golda Meir of Israel to the United States. She represents a democratic nation which is the best hope for democracy in the Near East.

We are as a people sympathetic to the goals of Israel and her courageous fight

for survival against great odds from 1948 until the present time. Israel is surrounded by nations which seek her life and yet, Israel endures while living in unspeakable tension.

This tension exists because the Arab world will not recognize Israel's right to live. This tension is fueled by incidents such as the mailing of letter bombs to Jews, chosen at random from the directories of organizations dedicated to Israel's survival. We have had some experience with this kind of thing. The British have had more. Random terror dishonors the Arab cause.

The murder of Israeli athletes in Munich by Arab terrorists was not an act of random terror. It was a deliberate act seeking to inflame tension in the Middle East. It succeeded in doing that.

It is against this background that the incident over the Suez Canal front line involving the shooting down of a Libyan plane which had drifted into Israeli air space. The plane was in fact a passenger transport, whose pilot had lost his way and found himself and his aircraft over Israeli military positions. Israeli pilots had tried to radio and/or signal the Libyan pilot to no avail. He did not respond.

At this point it is easy to blame the Israel fighter pilots for firing on the Libyan plane. However, it is only just to note that at supersonic speeds it is all but impossible for Israel pilots to act as mindreaders.

The passengers were victimized by the contributory negligence of the pilot who did not know he was over a war zone, who thought Israel jets were Egyptian Migs and did not respond to perfectly normal attempts to reach him by radio.

This terrible incident took place because of the terrible tension in the Mideast, the maintenance of which is part of the foreign policy of the United Arab Republic.

At long last with the separate visits of an Egyptian official and Golda Meir within days of each other, some of this tension may be alleviated. What is more, we can hope that these meetings with President Nixon may be the first step toward peace and away from the permanent condition of war and near war in the Near East.

I hope that at long last the Arab nations can bring themselves to say that Israel has the equal right to exist. With such a statement there may be a foundation for permanent peace in the near future.

I have long admired the life and work of Golda Meir. It will be wonderful to renew an acquaintance with a very old friend of the United States. I wish her God's speed in her mission for peace.

TRAGEDY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Middle East during the past week has been as tragic, and at once remarkable, as any period in recent memory. It is tragic because of the needless shooting down of a commercial Libyan airliner, killing over 100 passengers. The outrage of the Arab world has been acknowledged by the acceptance by the Israelis of partial responsibility for their mistake and their willingness to compensate the survivors and families of the dead. Such a candid admission of responsibility for this act is the hallmark of a great nation.

Even more remarkable, in my judgment, has been the reaction of the Arab world. Although there have been understandable cries for revenge from relatives of those who died, the leadership of the Arab countries has reacted with the responsibility and judgment truly befitting great nations. For the Arabs, such a reaction deserves the gratitude and commendation of all citizens of the world.

Arab leaders, especially Lybia's Col. Muammar al-Qaddafi, are truly on the firing line. It is Arabs who were killed, and Arab families who now demand revenge. The leaders of the Arab nations are confronted with a seething Arab world demanding an eye for an eye. For them to stand solidly on the side of restraint and peace and against an emotional outpouring from their people is truly the essence of statesmanship. No more can it be said that the Arabs do not long for peace.

What is most remarkable to me, however, is the virtual silence of Members of the U.S. House and Senate on this subject. How well I remember the days immediately after the Munich massacre when Member after Member appropriately took the floor to denounce that infamous bloodletting.

The shooting down of the Libyan jet was no less bloody. Many more lives were lost. It was no less an act of national policy. Perhaps it was more so. Yet unfortunately, Members of the House and Senate remain silent.

Our silence is unfortunate because it reduces our credibility in the Arab world. The balanced, even-handed policy the United States has pursued in past years is frustrated by our unwillingness to condemn both sides when the peace is broken in the Middle East.

Soon the Congress will have to consider a military assistance bill containing aid for Israel. In Arab eyes, that aid will be viewed as a sign of our one-sided support for Israel and our total rejection of the legitimate interests and concerns of the Arab peoples.

Such a conclusion would indeed be unfortunate, and I believe wrong. But the silence of the Congress during the last week makes such a conclusion understandable.

PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES FOR CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTIONS FOR PROPOSING AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to improve procedures and provide more definite guidelines for calling constitutional conventions for proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States pursuant to article V of the Constitution. This bill is essentially the same as Senator ERVIN's (S. 215) which passed the Senate by an 84 to 0 vote on October 19, 1971. No substantive changes were made in sections 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, or 11.

Senator ERVIN, in explaining his reasons for the proposed legislation, stated:

> My conviction was that the constitutional questions involved were far more important than the reapportionment issues that had brought them to light, and that they should receive more orderly and objective consideration than they had so far been accorded. Certainly it would be grossly unfortunate if the partisanship over state legislative apportionment—and I am admittedly a partisan on that issue—should be allowed to distort an attempt at clarification of the amendment process, which in the long run must command a higher obligation and duty than any single issue that might be the subject of that process.

In the American Bar Association's Special Constitutional Convention Study Committee Interim Report of August 1972, they state that this legislation "seeks to deal with the manifold issues arising under article V."

The study committee listed such questions to be dealt with as the following:

First. If the legislatures of two-thirds of the States apply for a convention limited to a specific matter, must Congress call such a convention and is the limitation binding on the convention?

Second. When is Congress required to call a convention on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States?

Third. What constitutes a valid application which Congress must count?

Fourth. What is the length of time in which applications for a convention will be counted?

Fifth. How much power does Congress have as to the scope of a convention? As to procedures such as the selection of delegates? As to the voting requirements at a convention? As to refusing to submit to the States for ratification the product of a convention?

Sixth. What is the role of the President and State Governors in the amending process?

Seventh. Can a State legislature withdraw an application for a convention once it has been submitted to Congress, or rescind a previous ratification of a proposed amendment or a previous interpretation?

Eighth. Who is to decide questions of ratification?

Ninth. Are issues arising in the convention process justiciable?

The need for clarifying legislation in this field is selfevident and suggestions as to further possible improvements shall be welcomed.

RESTORING FOOD STAMP ELIGIBILITY TO NEEDY AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED

(Mr. MELCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced legislation I proposed in Janaury to correct an inequity that is part of the Social Security Amendments of 1972. I am happy that a bipartisan group of my collegues in the House have chosen to join me in sponsoring this legislation.

The new supplemental security income—SSI—program federalizes assistance to the needy aged, blind, and disabled. However, those who participate in the program are prohibited from receiving benefits under the food stamp and commodity surplus programs, even though they may be eligible.

Basic benefits of the SSI program are $130 for an individual and $195 for a couple. The income levels for food stamp eligibility are $178 per month for individuals, after allowances, and $233 per month for couples. These food stamp income guidelines are not decided by pulling figures out of the air; they are carefully calculated to reach those most in need of benefits. To cut off the needy aged, blind, and disabled who are eligible for benefits under one Federal program simply because of their participation in another Federal program is unwarranted and discriminatory.

The legislation introduced today will establish the right of SSI program participants to apply for food stamp and commodity surplus programs if their incomes fall within the guidelines set by these programs. In this small way, I hope we can begin to keep the promise that those who cannot help themselves can live free from want.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, we have concluded the business of the day. The Rules Committee resolutions which were reported by the Rules Committee today will come up tomorrow. They would have taken a two-thirds vote today, but tomorrow they will take a straight majority vote. This includes an addition to the bills on the whip notice, House Resolution 205, the Select Committee on Crime.

On Thursday we will take up the other bill which was on the calendar, H.R. 3298 the rural water and sewer grant program, from the Committee on Agriculture.

We will be waiting upon Mr. MAHON tomorrow if he returns with his conference report on continuing appropriation.

That is the legislation for the remainder of the week.

CAMPAIGN SPENDING AND CONGRESSIONAL TERMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PEYSER. Madam Speaker, I have called for a special order today on two areas I believe are of the utmost importance to the Members of Congress. I certainly would welcome any comments any of the Members would like to make on what I believe are two very vital issues. One of them deals with the question of campaign spending, and the other one deals with the question of the length of the term of office of Congressmen.

I should first like to talk to the campaign spending issue. We have all just finished the massive paperwork which the campaign spending legislation, that most of us voted for last year, requires.

In the first place, the campaign spending bill we enacted, did not achieve most of its objectives which we had set for it. I shall specifically refer to a number of situations.

One which we were very concerned about was men of wealth being able to control the campaign just through money. We legislated in our campaign spending bill a limit of $25,000 for an individual's family, and we defined the family, as the wife or husband, the parents, the brothers or sisters of the candidate running.

Now, I suppose we thought this was all right and that we were covering all bases. I find out we did not cover uncles. By not covering uncles, it suddenly opened up the situation for somebody who has a rich uncle to have no limitation at all as to the amount of money he could put into a campaign for his nephew.

We also uncovered another situation, that of lending money. Somehow it was felt we were getting control of this situation because presumably nobody in the family could lend money after they had given their $25,000. This is basically true, but we found in a number of situations that money was loaned to political committees, and there was no method as to how the money was to be repaid, no indication of whether any interest would or would not be paid. Therefore, loans made to committees by "friends of the family," so to speak, at the end of the time simply go off the books and disappear, and nobody has any way of knowing whether that money ever will be repaid or, if it is repaid, who is going to repay it.

So we find another very obvious glaring loophole in this regulation.

The regulation did not speak to any limitation on the problems of mailing or on the problems of the use of computer telephone banks, and so we ended up with a situation where someone with a great deal of money could still, in effect, spend unlimited amounts with no real controls as to where the money came from.

Yet this was the whole purpose of the legislation.

Now, there is one other problem—and this is a problem, it seems to me, that all of us should be vitally interested in—and that is the problem of the filing system.

Any of us who went through this campaign—and, of course, we have all the winners here; but winners and losers alike were faced with the same problem—any of the Members who went through this campaign know the problems that were developed in filing for each committee that was in each campaign operation. And the filing went on and on and on.

In my case we filed over 400 reports at the end of this campaign.

Now, this is perfectly ridiculous. This is not providing the public with protection; it is not providing anything, but it is creating a monumental bookkeeping headache that ends up having gross inadequacies, because many of us, in fact most of us, are not accountants and are not bookkeepers, and we end up with all these reports, coming up with a hodgepodge of figures. Frankly, I do not believe it proves anything.

I do not think we should have such a filing system. I think we should file at the end of the campaign, showing where the money came from, and the total amount received, but the current amount of filing we have been going through is costing the taxpayer and will cost the taxpayer millions of dollars in personnel, personnel who are hired to work on these returns, with computers, and with the whole problem of trying to make head or tail of these reports.

To me it just does not make sense, and it seems to me it ought to be changed.

So we come down to the question: What do we do about all this?

At this time I am not proposing any legislation. What I am saying is that the only way we are going to have a realistic control in campaign spending is to set a flat limit on the amount of money that can be spent on a campaign. Above and beyond that limit no moneys may be spent.

It makes no difference, as far as I am concerned, where that money comes from, because at this point there is no point in legislating that a family can only give $25,000 if they can find six different ways of having that family's money get into the campaign anyway.

Thus, I suggest a flat amount. I am not wed to any figure—I would welcome any comments on this—but perhaps we ought to limit the congressional rate to $50,000 and allow franked mailing privileges for the challenger as well as the incumbent for political purposes.

I put that out as purely a suggestion, a trial balloon, to see if anybody has any interest in this type of reform. The present bill which we have on the books, I believe, is ineffectual, costly to the taxpayers, and it basically proves nothing.

Mr. DANIELSON. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEYSER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DANIELSON. A moment ago the gentleman referred to filing some 400 pages of reports in his campaign during the course of his campaign. But does the gentleman have any opinion, or would he make any comment on the advisability of having one Federal campaign law preempt the State law so that we need not, after filing our rather voluminous Federal return, then sit down and agonize it all over again on the State return?

Mr. PEYSER. I would totally support that move without any question.

But I think also we should make a change in our present campaign spending law and still do exactly what you are saying. In other words, I think this multitude of reporting is an absolute waste, and whatever we end up with should take over instead of the State filing.

Mr. DANIELSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DEVINE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. Madam Speaker, I think the gentleman is doing a service to the House in bringing up this overall subject of election reform. I am afraid we may have gotten into the subject of reform for the sake of reform.

I happen to have been on the Committee on House Administration at the time the hearings were held on this, and I was a cosponsor of an election reform bill.

I think we can all attest to the fact, as the gentleman so well stated, that the reporting provisions themselves have become so burdensome that they have become almost meaningless. We are going to create a storage problem, if nothing else, in order to handle the multiplicity of election return expenditure forms that people do not have the time to look at let alone their having any particular effect on the outcome of elections.

Now, I recognize that John Gardner and his Common Cause look upon election reform as something that is a sacrosanct and something that you cannot touch or look at.

I had the audacity, however, to offer a perfectly harmless amendment in order to correct some inequities in it, and I was castigated by that outfit.

I might say that does not bother me too much. I happen to recognize the problems, and I offered a bill in the last session which would repeal this law and give us all an opportunity to go back and look at the previous one to see if we could not come to some conclusion that might be helpful on this matter.

I will say to the gentleman that I am not sure I agree with him that we should provide franking privileges to candidates for political offices. It opens up an entirely different and unique field which will have to be examined very closely before we get into that area.

Mr. PEYSER. Speaking of the franking privilege, the only thing I was trying to do through that—and as I said at the beginning, I am not wedded to any form at this time—is simply to give an opportunity to the challenger to utilize the mail. This would have to be a qualified challenger at that time. If that is presenting a problem, I can easily withdraw from that position. All I want to do is see a limit established and the elimination of this particular filing privilege.

At this time, if no one has anything else they want to put into the RECORD in the area of campaign spending, I would like to shift briefly to the second part of my request.

Mr. FRENZEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEYSER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRENZEL. I do not want to pry too deeply into this, because the elections of 1970 were not covered by the Campaign Disclosure Act of 1972, but I will wager that to get elected the first time the distinguished gentleman from New York spent more than $50,000. I will wager most Members of this body the first time they were elected spent considerably more than that. I simply raise the point that a flat limitation on campaign expenditures is a very nice protective gesture for all of us to keep ourselves from being defeated. Still, unless you allow candidates to spend more than that amount, we will all be here for a long time, which I submit is very comfortable and it is a very nice, warm thought for each of us. However, we ought to think occasionally that candidates ought to have a chance to present themselves and their candidacies to the public for a little more than that since most of us had that opportunity at some point.

Mr. PEYSER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

I think the reason we as challengers at that time ended up spending more money was simply because there were no limitations on what could be spent by either party. We were simply in effect doing whatever we could. It happens in my own race the first time I ran I spent less than half of the amount of money my challenger spent. In other words, he spent twice as much money as I did. I did spend more than $50,000 in my first campaign; I spent $68,000. Still, putting it frankly, if we followed the idea that I have suggested of $50,000 plus two franked mailings, it would have been very easily within that figure, because that franked mailing privilege is worth $10,000 each on a political basis.

Mr. DEVINE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEVINE. I would like to take exception to the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) about the first time candidates run. I have been around here for seven terms and was elected to the eighth term in November, and I recall the first election I ran in the State of Ohio the cost was less than $10,000. In each successive campaign—and I have unfortunately had an opponent each time—it has increased, not because of the desire of the candidates but because the costs of the media and the advertising agencies have gone up.

Now, in the most recent campaign I spent just about between $40,000 and $50,000, while my opponent spent over $100,000 just on committees. So those who holler the loudest about the high expenditures of campaigns are those who are usually the very beneficiaries of these funds that have been spent, and those are the television stations, the radio stations, the newspapers, the advertising agencies, and the novelty salesmen.

So let us get this thing into perspective.

I am not concerned about the reporting provisions because we have in Ohio a tough reporting provision, in fact, much tougher than even the present Federal election law, and everybody has to report every nickel received and every nickel spent, but let us let these people know who are the recipients and the beneficiaries of the funds.

Mr. PEYSER. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Another thing that was called to my attention in the campaign spending situation, and one that I would like to put into perspective, and this, once again, does not require a great deal of commonsense, or practically very little, is the practice of the establishment of committees. The reason that committees basically become established is to increase the amount of money for a candidate, and therefore, you establish a committee. In other words, suppose an individual is going to give $6,000 as a contribution in a campaign that cannot be given to one committee because no more than $3,000 can be given. What really happens is that they form two committees, and they give $3,000 to each committee. Now I am sure that does not fool anybody. Yet there is also the factor that one must file reports on these committees. If you establish a committee you file your reports, and then if you establish another committee then you have the same old filing process to go through in order to show what has been spent in the campaign.

Mr. HUNT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. I might say to the gentleman in the well that it is not necessary to explain that expenditure of $3,000, because you can have 150 committees with less than $1,000, and never have to report anything. So I believe that you have to view this from another angle because it is my opinion that the whole thing is just a can of worms. I believe it is unworkable, and it certainly needs a complete revision. I believe the present law that we have should be taken under consideration, and gone over by a competent committee, and I stress that, I mean a competent committee, and I mean someone who is not going to try to feather his own nest, or who is running for the Senate, but someone who is going to do an honest job on it. Because you can have all the committees you want, all the advisory committees you want, fishermen committees, firemen committees, housewives committees, and if they are under $1,000 there is no reporting.

So that is the loophole.

Mr. PEYSER. That is obviously a loophole that should not exist. And as far as I am concerned the device that is used to establish all of these committees is not anything more than a sham and a delusion on the public. And I think that it is something that we should address ourselves to, and that we should attempt to control in some way that makes good sense, and makes us honest.

Mr. HUNT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PEYSER. I will be glad to yield further to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. My people know every cent that I spend, because I publish this in the newspapers. And I told them when I spoke on this subject that this thing is something that is getting out of hand, and it was unworkable, and I said so when I first came on the floor. But now there is a great hullabaloo to get something done, and it is a problem that needs a commonsense approach. But as far as Mr. Gardiner is concerned I believe they had better work on something that they know part of. But now that we have gone

through this, now there is all this hollering and bellyaching. Let us get a new proposal, or get the old law revised, and produce something that is workable.

Mr. PEYSER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for making those comments. It is my hope that this subject can be expanded, particularly with the Members and with the leadership, so that something can come out of this of a very positive nature, and something that will address itself to this problem.

There is one other thing that I would like to talk about briefly, and I will very much welcome comments from the Members on this topic. This is dealing with the length of the term of office of a U.S. Congressman, which is currently set at 2 years. Since 1789 there have been 173 proposals made to lengthen the term of office in the House of Representatives; 171 of them have come since 1869, and since 1928 there have been 110 proposals made to lengthen the term of office of a Member of the House of Representatives to 4 years. Forty-seven proposals have been made since 1963. The most recent study on this subject came from President Johnson. The Johnson proposal advocated it, because the job had changed since the original Constitution was drawn up, and the 2-year term was initiated.

There is no question in my mind that there have been a lot of changes since the Founding Fathers drew up this Constitution. However, they had the wisdom and the foresight to say this Constitution can be changed for the situations which today are calling for a change. We can make reasonable changes. The safeguards are built into this, so that the changes will be carefully considered.

I should say one of the most common comments I get from people in my district, out on the streets, or at meetings, is: "How do you fellows do this running every 2 years? You must be wasting a lot of time when you should be legislating."

My experience in a very limited time here in Congress is that we do waste a lot of time running for office every 2 years. I also would say that the newer Members waste more time than the older Members who feel more secure in their seats. So the ones who are being cheated by this legislation as it now exists are the public; the very people that it was originally designed to protect are now being hurt by this 2-year term.

Originally, communication was a real problem and one of the real reasons for a 2-year term. It forced Congressmen in days of slow or no communication to go back to the people and tell them what they were doing, explaining everything, and having arguments back and forth. Today we do not have any problem of communication. If what we say this mornng is of some newsworthy value in the interpretation of someone, it will be in the papers this afternoon and will be all over the country. I think we no longer have this as a real problem.

What is a real problem is this business of trying to run our campaigns back in the districts, doing the things that as a campaigner we must do, and not doing the work here in Congress that we were elected to do. I think it is time that we again consider what will be, according to my figures, the 174th proposal of doing something about this length of time in office.

I think the most important thing I could say here is that the public is ready for this. The people are ready to see a change here. They no longer have the feeling that they want to be able to grab that Congressman every 2 years and tell him what it is all about. The reason I say this is that last year 96 percent of the incumbents who ran for office were reelected—96 percent of the incumbents who ran for office were reelected. It usually runs an average of around 80 percent, but last year it was up to 96, so evidently the public is generally satisfied with the incumbent, or is at least willing to give him 2 more years.

I think that we also should realize that in the 1970 congressional races we spent over $20 million nationwide. Over $20 million was spent in the 1970 congressional races. I have not seen the figures on this race, but I will certainly be willing to assume that it is going to be at least $5 to $10 million higher than it was 2 years ago, based on the early figures that have come in. I think that this is an absolute waste of money and of time and of commitment to this job to have a 2-year term.

Mr. DEVINE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. I do not wish to appear contentious with the gentleman in the well. I think again he is doing a great service to the Congress and to the country to bring up these controversial issues.

I recall a few years back when the late President Lyndon Johnson in one of his state of the Union messages pointed out that in his opinion the Members of the House should serve a 4-year rather than a 2-year term. We had a great deal of study about it, and we had a hearing by the Committee on the Judiciary on this subject, and nothing really happened because it did not emerge from the Committee on the Judiciary. But I was impressed by this particular argument.

The people have set up our branch of Government, the people's branch, and they kind of felt that perhaps the Member here would be more responsive to the wishes of the people back home if he were indeed required to go back to them every 2 years, to vote their convictions and to express their views, and if he were not doing the job he was sent here to do, they could send someone else.

A great many people stated to me that during the time I have been in the Congress, "Congressman, is it not inconvenient for you to have to run every 2 years?" The answer is "yes," it certainly is inconvenient, but we must keep this in mind. A 2-year term in the House was created for the convenience of the public and not for the convenience of the Congressman. I think the fact that the gentleman and I have to run every 2 years means we are looking to see what people are thinking. If we are to bear the title we do literally properly, as Representatives of the people in the Congress, if we are to really represent the people, we will be more responsive if we are required to answer to them each 2-year period.

Mr. PEYSER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. This has been one of the arguments, as the gentleman is aware, as to why the Congressman should be reelected every 2 years. It is that people should have the opportunity to vote their reaction to the Congressman.

What I am suggesting is: First, in the age of communications as we have today the public very well knows what we are doing all the time; and second, the public seems, based on history, to keep the incumbent in office. Certainly the incumbent almost always is reelected every 2 years. In the last election more than 10 percent of the seats in the House had no contest at all, and in over 40 percent of the seats in the House the incumbent won by more than 65 percent of the vote, and in some of the elections he won by more than 80 percent of the vote.

It seems to me if this is what is happening as a year after year after year situation now, it no longer quite holds up in the same way that the public wants to have that 2-year opportunity to get another crack at the candidate or at the incumbent. In addition, only 80 percent of the people who vote in presidential elections vote in off-year elections, so not all are concerned with the frequent chance to vote.

What I would suggest, and once again I am not introducing any bill or legislation on this point, is merely to get it open so if anyone has any comments on it we can get a feeling as to where we are. Perhaps we might have a 4-year term, and we could have half the House running every 2 years. In other words, whether it was the odd- or even-numbered districts, or however it may be decided, we could have half the House up in 2 years for a 4-year election and then in another 2 years have the other half up. In this way the public would still have an opportunity of expressing its will with the Members and the public would be getting its money's worth out of its Congressmen. I am not saying today the public is not getting its money's worth, but I am just saying they are not getting as much as they are entitled to because the system forces us to get out on the road, and then we cannot be working in Congress where I believe we ought to be working.

There are all sorts of statistics we have compiled that I am not going to run through at this time, showing the percentages in each of the elections, showing again how often the incumbent is returned and again showing the numbers who are not contested. I feel we ought to look at this and address ourselves to this question, and hopefully in the leadership there will come some ideas as to how we can at least have the opportunity as Members to vote on this issue on the floor and, I believe, give the public a break. I look on this as a reform and not a liberalization of the incumbent's rights.

Mr. DEVINE. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PEYSER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. Madam Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman happens to have any similar statistics as they relate to the other body whose Members are required to run only every 6 years, in a one-third splitoff.

Mr. PEYSER. I am sorry I do not have those statistics on the other body.

Mr. DEVINE. I would hope the Member possibly could provide them in his extension of remarks for this reason. I think it perhaps could be a factor that a number of incumbents have been elected and reelected to the House for the reason that they are required to go back and keep in touch with their constituents and have them decide what the incumbent's performance is. I think an examination in the other body might show a Member might be voting in different ways in the first 2 or 4 years of his term but in the last 2 years before he has to face the voters he might come back to what is closer to the views of his constituents.

I think this is a fact which should be included in these discussions.

Mr. PEYSER. I appreciate that remark. I do not know the statistics, but I will get them and will add them to my remarks on this issue. I think it is a point well taken.

My conviction is, though, that we should be serving a 4-year term. To summarize, as far as I am concerned, we should have campaign limitations on spending. We ought to have elimination of this vast reporting system that has been looked on as a reform, but has proved to be no reform. We ought to put a limit on the spending itself.

When we do those things, I think we will have gone a long way toward helping the public have a Congress which represents them and which can do its job without the encumberances with which we are now faced, in terms of the length of office and campaign spending.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

INTERIM REPORT BY THE JOINT STUDY COMMITTEE ON BUDGET CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ULLMAN. Madam Speaker, I take this time on behalf of our colleagues, JAMIE WHITTEN and HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, to talk for a few minutes about the joint study committee on budget control. Congressman WHITTEN is cochairman with me of this joint committee, which was established by legislation last year; Congressman SCHNEEBELI is a vice chairman and serves on the executive committee.

We have issued an interim report which I hope all the Members of the House will read. It has been printed and is a House document, No. 93–13, entitled "Improving Congressional Control of Budgetary Outlay and Receipt Totals—Interim Report by the Joint Study Committee on Budget Controls."

In that report, on page 2 we have a series of tentative recommendations which I think every Member of the House should consider seriously because they involve proposed procedures which would significantly change the fiscal posture of the Congress of the United States.

We are beginning public hearings on these proposals on March 6 in room 1114 Dirksen New Senate Office Building. We invite all the Members to participate in these hearings. This is important enough that it should involve input from all of the Members.

This series of hearings which begins on March 6 in my opinion should be one of the most important in more than a decade. At that time, the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control will consider ways of implementing the tentative recommendations contained in our interim report (H. Rept. No. 93–13).

The Joint Study Committee on Budget Control received a mandate from the Congress last fall—to put Congress budgetary procedures in order so that Congress may participate more fully than is possible under present procedures in the decisions that determine the priorities of this Nation—and it is essential that our final recommendations reflect the considered opinion and judgment of as many Members of Congress as possible.

As a cochairman of this committee, I believe it is necessary to get a clear idea of how Members want to proceed in changing our ways, and how they want to establish mechanisms that will allow us to determine national priorities on our own. We have done a lot of discussing about our prerogatives here in Congress, but unless we were prepared to put our House in order, all the shouting in the world will be wasted. And, the ideas and suggestions that our committee make will not get very far if our recommendations do not accurately reflect the ideas and the commitment of the Members of their body.

Let me very briefly read you from the report the first of a series of tentative recommendations.

1. There should be a mechanism for Congress to—

(a) determine the proper level of expenditures for the coming fiscal year after full consideration of the fiscal, economic, monetary and other factors involved—

That is something which we have never done—

(b) provide an overall ceiling on expenditures and on budget authority for each year.

Last year, when this amendment was adopted by the House, I think most Members and the public generally felt that this kind of procedure had been tried before and was totally out of our reach. Now, with this interim report, I think we must realize that it is within our reach. It is something that Congress should have done long ago, but now we can do it. I continue:

(c) determine the aggregate revenue and debt levels which appropriately should be associated with the expenditure and budget authority limits.

In other words, early in each session, to bring before the Congress a congressional budget which would involve expenditure limitations and revenue objectives.

The report continues:

The limitations referred to above should be provided only if Congress also makes provision for a system whereby it can make the decisions on budget priorities that will guide it as to where reductions are to be made in the event that this becomes necessary.

The committee favors provision for limitations on both expenditure and new obligational authority so an impact, to the extent possible, will be felt in the current year (as a result of the expenditure limitation) and also so that control will be obtained over future growth, (as a result of the budget authority limitation). At the same time however, it is essential that Congress develop ways of making its own decisions on budget priorities so that realistic control over the purse can be regained by the Congress, as intended by the Constitution. Any mechanism for establishing these limitations also needs to provide an opportunity to review and make recommendations as to overall tax and debt policies, since these also are an essential part of the Government's fiscal policy.

The report then goes on, in a series of further recommendations, as to procedures. Basically, it would involve a budget committee bringing to the Congress recommendations in the form of a joint resolution for total budget expenditures, new obligational authority and revenues together with how the expenditures would be allocated out to the major programs. Then the Congress would debate the resolution and establish the congressional policy on both spending and revenue. In this way we would have a mechanism for implementing that policy not only as to appropriated spending but also as to the expanding list of backdoor expenditures that have occurred here in the Congress.

The procedures would call both for revenue objectives to be carried out by the Ways and Means Committee and for the appropriation spending limitations to be implemented by the Appropriations Committee and other committees.

There are various devices that we would have to implement this, but one of them—and I think the most important—would be a wrap-up resolution at the end of the session that would call for the Budget Committee to revise, if necessary, its revenue and expenditure recommendations, and then for the Appropriations Committee to properly implement these in a wrapup appropriation bill that would add and subtract from all the various appropriation bills during the year, so that the total could fit within the ceilings established by the Congress.

I should like to yield now to my distinguished colleague from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, and I wish to say that without the help and cooperation and leadership of the Congressman from Mississippi we could not have obtained this kind of a report, which I consider one of the most meaningful reports in the area of budgeting that has ever been presented to the Congress.

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Oregon, and may I say it has been a pleasure to work with him and with the other members of the

committee. I appreciate those kind statements.

I do believe we have something to offer here that is a little surprising. We have a unanimous report from about 32 of the most experienced and most able Members of the Congress. At this point I think it only fitting to insert a list of the names of the members of this committee who have so much to be proud of:

CO-CHAIRMEN

Jamie L. Whitten, *House Appropriations.*
Al Ullman, *House Ways and Means.*

CO-VICE CHAIRMEN

John L. McClellan, *Senate Appropriations.*
Roman L. Hruska, *Senate Appropriations.*
Russell B. Long, *Senate Finance.*
Herman T. Schneebeli, *House Ways and Means.*

Senate Appropriations Committee: John C. Stennis, John O. Pastore, Alan Bible, Milton R. Young, Norris Cotton.

Senate Finance Committee: Herman E. Talmadge, Vance Hartke, J. W. Fulbright, Wallace F. Bennett, Carl T. Curtis, Paul J. Fannin.

At Large: William Proxmire, William V. Roth, Jr.

House Appropriations Committee: George H. Mahon, John J. Rooney, Robert L. F. Sikes, Alfred A. Cederberg, John J. Rhodes, Glenn R. Davis.

House Ways and Means Committee: James A. Burke, Martha W. Griffiths, Dan Rostenkowski, Harold R. Collier, Joel T. Broyhill.

At Large: Henry S. Reuss, James T. Broyhill.

To have such a report unanimous is very unusual.

This is an interim report. The recommendations are tentative pending an opportunity for further review and study of the problem. The document shows where we are and how we got that way. Like in a lawsuit, or with respect to any other problem, if one can get agreement on the facts one knows what the problem is. As we come to the Members today we know what the problem is.

If Members will read this report, they will find that some of the pertinent information points to the fact that a large portion of the budget is not subject to an annual coordinated review or control by Congress.

Only about 44 percent of the spending estimate in the 1974 budget, for instance, will channel through the annual review process of the Committee on Appropriations. The balance involves permanent appropriations, trust funds, and various backdoor or mandatory spending which bypasses the annual appropriation process.

I was one of those who voted last year against setting a fixed ceiling on expenditures. I did so because I felt it would be an invitation to the executive branch to pick and choose the projects and activities to be funded and those to be curtailed, eliminated, or canceled Time has shown this to be the situation.

I think we face a very serious problem, in view of the present status of the relationship existing between the people's branch of Government, the Congress, and the executive branch.

This very serious impoundment issue is an important part of our committee's assignment. We are examining it carefully and plan to consider it in our final report. I could speak all afternoon and cite various authorities and various arguments on both sides of the impoundment matter, but be that as it may, if the executive branch should take it upon itself and assume that it had the authority under the Constitution to impound any amount of money any place it wishes to, the fact is the original place of impoundment is the Congress itself, and Congress could in turn determine that it is going to impound the money and not make any appropriation to the executive branch.

Of course, you can see that if such a situation were to occur, it could lead to a complete breakdown in Government.

However, if we can develop an effective budgetary control mechanism and set our own priorities, I believe the impoundment issue should be largely solved. We need to establish ceilings at the beginning of each session and allocate them among the various program categories.

We need a procedure for a wrapup resolution near the end of the session as pointed out by my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Oregon, to make appropriate adjustments in the ceilings and the appropriations after full consideration of the various legislative actions affecting the budget.

I want to repeat that I believe your committee is doing a fine job of working together. They have developed a good report on the problem and proposed tentative recommendations. I am hopeful we can now proceed to develop a satisfactory, workable solution to the budgetary control problem.

I thank my colleague for letting me speak at this time, as I am in the middle of some hearings this afternoon in my subcommittee and I must return as soon as possible.

Mr. ULLMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Will the gentleman remain for just a few moments, because I think there is a question or two that needs to be directed to him.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me. I will be very brief.

I impose on my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, first of all to congratulate the committee on the very fine work that they have done. I am much impressed with the guidelines which are contained in the interim report. We all ought to be thankful that men of the caliber of Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. ULLMAN and others are willing to take the lead on this budget problem and to see that it receives the attention it deserves.

I am impressed by an argument of Mr. WHITTEN that the confrontation between the legislative and the executive branch adds a great note of urgency to this task of better budget management.

With that in mind, I am emboldened to raise a question. What has been proposed and considered by the joint committee so far would necessarily not take effect until next year. Yet we have this urgent need which exists today for better fiscal control. I ask the gentleman who is the second ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations if it would not be well for the Committee on Appropriations this year again to consider a single appropriation bill for the entire Federal Establishment? That was done some years ago. It was not an easy task, but it is one way in which the House can exercise better control of the appropriations process than is possible under the present procedure in which we deal with the budget requests on a piecemeal basis.

I wonder if the gentleman will respond to the suggestion that because of the serious confrontation we face with the executive on expenditure control that the House should seriously consider coming out with a single appropriation bill for the next fiscal year.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. As the gentleman pointed out, I am No. 2 on the Committee on Appropriations and not the chairman of it, so I only speak in that capacity.

I think the situation is sufficiently serious for the Appropriations Committee and its members to consider. I do not speak, of course, for Mr. MAHON. I have worked with him for a long time and am very fond of him, and I have the highest admiration for him, but the gentleman knows that I cannot speak for him. However, I know he recognizes the seriousness of the situation. All of us have been watching the developments, and in our various hearings which are underway we have been paying attention to it.

We all are devoting our individual time and attention to what we can do to stop the present standoff that we may have in connection with these bills this year. I for one can say only that it would be my hope that the committee will take a good look at this year's operations to see what we can do in this regard.

We need to do this for several reasons. Each man has his own opinions, but let me say that we are getting expenditures for frills mixed up with investments in our country. The Congress in the interest of protecting our land and soil and natural resources for future generations will have to step into this act in some way with the executive branch, which is making some unwise decisions.

This is just one man's opinion. Somebody else will have a different view. My individual thought is I will be doing what I can to meet the overall problem and to see where we can go from here.

Mr. FINDLEY. If I can make one further comment, it would not be necessary for the Committee on Appropriations to come forward with a single legislative package representing the entire appropriations for the Federal Government all at once.

It could be done piecemeal, but each step could be held in abeyance and the final approval of the appropriation bill could be held up until the process is completed. That would be an alternative way to go.

Mr. WHITTEN. That could be; however, I would call the attention of my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, and he is aware of it in the report, that the problem of control is much broader than just the appropriation bills. We would have to have the various legislative com-

mittees which mandate spending also hold up on final action.

As I mentioned earlier, only about 44 percent of the spending in the 1974 budget is associated with items pending before the Committee on Appropriations. The rest involve spending actions pending before other legislative committees or previously mandated in legislative bills, such as the revenue-sharing proposal last year. This provided a permanent appropriation of $30 billion for 5 years. There are also the various trust funds which are not a part of the annual appropriation process.

Mr. FINDLEY. It would only be a partial solution, but a step in the right direction, I would think.

Mr. WHITTEN. We certainly will consider all possible approaches to this year's problem, but we must keep in mind that we are dealing with only about 44 percent of all the budget.

Mr. FINDLEY. I was with the gentleman from Mississippi in opposing the Revenue Sharing Act, and that is one of the reasons that I did oppose it—because it bypasses the appropriation process.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. ULLMAN. I thank my colleagues for their contributions.

I want to add that I heartily endorse the views of my colleague from Mississippi. JAMIE and I have been close personal friends over the years and have worked together on many important matters. Yet, in my judgment, there has been no more significant project than what we are doing together as Cochairmen of the Joint Study Committee on Budget Control. We have been given a great responsibility, and we must succeed. To do so, we need the support of all our colleagues in both Houses. The decisions that the Congress makes on congressional control of expenditures will ultimately affect directy the effectiveness of each and every Member of Congress. If Congress is to be more than a debating society, then we must begin to view the budget process as more than a set of bulky documents which are tossed on our desks each January to be leafed through and pushed aside. We must begin to deal with the total expenditure and priority picture as the heart of our jobs. Congress must tackle the budget as a whole unit, considering the condition of the national economy and the needs of the people, and determine spending and revenue raising priorities. This must replace our present system of piecemeal consideration of programs without systematic regard for competing priorities, log-rolling one program on top of another.

The hearings that begin next Tuesday are most important for all of us, and I hope that we will find widespread interest on the part of all Members in our proceedings.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I am very happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is a vice chairman, a very important member of the Executive Committee, and one of the most faithful attenders that we have.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding to me. I would like to commend the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) while he is here, for his leadership, as well as that of the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN) who is a cochairman, because I believe they have done an outstanding job. I might say that I have been surprised by the comprehensive and the very effective accomplishments that have been borne to date by the committee, considering the fact that it is composed of 32 members, 16 from both sides, and especially considering the short time within which they have had to operate, and to prepare their first report by February 15. I believe it has been a very satisfying and effective report, and again I say that I have been surprised by the progress to date.

Certainly I believe that most of the Members of the House would want to encourage the furtherance of this program because I think that, granting that we have a lack of control over the budgetary process, I would certainly hate to be one of those Members who has to write home to their constituents and in addition be confronted by them, and say that they do not have any management over the budgetary processes of the Federal Government.

Certainly there has been a sympathetic attitude on the part of the whole group, even though some have been saying, "Well, we have been through this whole thing before, we have tried it before, and it did not work, and I doubt that it will work," and so on.

But I think that we have no alternative except to come up with something constructive, something positive. Frankly, I think that the recommendations that have been worked out to date have been excellent, and it will be the body on which we build the final structure, and I think it bodes well for I believe that we are doing a very good job.

I would also like to stress one other thing. As you know, the two chairmen are both from the other side of the aisle and, as a vice chairman from a different party, I would like to stress that the 32 Members in approving the report are truly working on a nonpartisan basis. This has been wholeheartedly evident from both sides.

It has been very encouraging to see the great attendance, the seriousness of the people, and the fine work which all the Members from both branches of the Congress and from both sides of the aisle have done. I think this is a compliment to our two leaders. They have both been completely unbiased and constructive, and I believe that through them we have done a good job to date in this short time. I think we will continue to do a good job. I think it is a highly important work, and I am sure that we will come up with a good final product.

Mr. ULLMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contributions. I think that the gentleman would agree with me that we should also pay our respects to the distinguished Members of our other body.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I certainly do, too, and I believe I said both branches of the Congress.

Mr. ULLMAN. That is correct. Because we have on this committee the ranking members of their Committees on Appropriation and Finance, plus the membership at large who have been exceedingly cooperative, not only in letting us assume the chairmanships over here, but in attending the meetings and giving their support to what we are doing.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I, too, believe that their cooperation has been the very most we could ask for.

Mr. ULLMAN. In addition, the meeting where we unanimously adopted the interim report was one of the most heartening meetings that I think I have attended since I have been in the Congress. It was well attended, virtually everybody was there. It was well discussed, and there was unanimous approval of the tentative recommendations which were probably the most significant that could be made as to reorganizing and revitalizing the Congress.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. I certainly think we are on the right track, and I am certain we are going to continue at this pace, and I think much will be accomplished.

Mr. ULLMAN. I again invite all the Members to participate and call their attention to the fact that hearings will begin on March 6. We invite the Members' participation. This has to be the Members' program. This is not a new committee coming over and taking over some new responsibility. This is providing a mechanism for a committee to come to the Congress so that the Congress can work its will on establishing a congressional budget on reordering our own priorities.

In the final analysis, the only way we can ever really face up to the impoundment issue is for the Congress itself to establish a priority mechanism, and that is what this committee is attempting to do. We invite the Members' participation in our effort.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ULLMAN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What is the gentleman's committee's statement in terms of how they are going to go about this establishment of priority? The gentleman did not explain that.

Mr. ULLMAN. As I have indicated, the Budget Committee's—and this is only an interim proposal—and my ideas are interwoven, but the interim proposal would lead us into a situation where there was a separate House and Senate Budget Committee, with adequate representation from the tax and appropriations committees, and members-at-large from the legislative committees, that would report early in each session to the Congress a budget, recommending expenditures and revenue objectives, and allowing Congress to work its will on those basic objectives.

The recommendations and the mechanism to maintain budgetary control must apply to all legislative actions which grant budget authority and mandate spending. This includes, for example, recapturing control over expenditure of funds in the pipeline which stem from obligational authority given the

President in past years. We must also assess the future impact of budget actions, projecting costs 3 to 5 years into the future. We must have a mechanism for establishing priorities and for projecting these priorities into the future. The problem is we now pass some vast new spending bills, with small initial costs, without being fully aware of the large, follow-on costs being committed for future years. If we do this in several areas, we find curselves on a rapidly diverging expenditure cycle where we have trapped ourselves into large spending commitments without having ever considered the total impact upon the economy or whether the economy cannot afford it. A new budgetary control procedure would put all of this back into perspective and allow the Congress itself, rather than the Office of Management and Budget downtown, to impose program priorities and set funding levels.

Mr. FINDLEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FINDLEY. What I want to reinforce, as I said earlier, is I believe the work of the Joint Committees on the Budget already completed represents a very great step forward for the Congress. I think it is very promising and that greater advancement will come out of it. I do congratulate the gentleman.

As I understand the idea he just voiced, there would be a Special Committee on the Budget in the House and then a separate Special Committee on the Budget in the Senate.

Mr. ULLMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FINDLEY. But the work of these two committees would be required to come together so that there would be agreement between the House and Senate on a budget resolution?

Mr. ULLMAN. That is right. That would happen in the normal processes of going to conference between the House and the Senate.

Mr. FINDLEY. And before the appropriation process could begin the budget resolution would have to be agreed upon. Am I correct on that? Is that the gentleman's thought?

Mr. ULLMAN. Yes, basically, although I believe procedures can be developed to expedite the process so as not to unduly delay the legislative schedule.

Mr. FINDLEY. I think that is an excellent proposal. The problem I see in it is the length of time that may be required in order to get the agreement of the other body on the budget resolution as well as on the other steps that may be involved in the latter stages of this process.

As the gentleman knows I have had a deep interest in this field. About a year ago I introduced a resolution on the subject and I reintroduced a resolution known as House Resolution 17 this year. In my examination I came to the conclusion it would probably be better not to try to involve the Senate in a budget discipline process but deal only with the institutions of the House and deal with the committee structure as it now exists. I came to that conclusion mainly out of concern that we might use up most of the fiscal year by trying to get agreement on the details with the Senate before we could begin the appropriations process.

I wonder if the gentleman in his work has looked into the timetable question and if he has any estimate as to how soon in the calendar year the Congress could be expected to be ready for the appropriation process.

Mr. ULLMAN. It seems to me budgetary control would not be meaningful unless we can include both branches in the process. Operating unilaterally we would immediately get into all kinds of jurisdictional conflicts with the other body. But it would seem to me the congressional budget debate may very well be the most meaningful debate we have during the year whereby we set forth a congressional budget. The other body would likewise then be faced with a problem in that they would be in the spotlight of the Nation. I think that alone would be enough to get action from them expeditiously, and I hope we can establish a procedure within 60 days which will resolve the issue. We hope that the resolution can be finally passed by about May 1 of each year.

Mr. FINDLEY. Did the gentleman get the feeling from the Senate Members of this joint commission that the Senate Members might be willing to apply a 60-day discipline upon themselves within which they would be required to make an agreement with the House on the budget?

Mr. ULLMAN. The committee has not discussed extensively the problem of timing, but certainly it is in our minds and it will be the subject of detailed discussion when we write the bill.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Madam Speaker, as a followup to the discussion about the legislation the gentleman from Illinois has proposed, is it contemplated by this joint committee that there clearly would be no appropriation bills completed until final action, by the proposed budget committee is taken by the Senate and the House? Would that discipline be in the legislation as it is now contemplated?

Mr. ULLMAN. Yes. Bear in mind that the fiscal year starts in July. There would obviously be supplemental bills for the current year conforming to prior years budgeting.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Yes.

Mr. ULLMAN. But it would seem to me and it would be my intention that no appropriation bills for the fiscal year involved be passed until the congressional budget is enacted by both bodies.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. As it is totally accepted by both Chambers of the Congress?

Mr. ULLMAN. Yes. It would not necessarily be a bill requiring the President's approval. It could very well be a concurrent resolution whereby we could bind ourselves. This would be a legislative budget and there would be no reason why, in my mind, it would have to be signed by the President. This would be our action. He would continue to prepare his budget but this would be our action in setting forth our budget and it would not require any approval from downtown.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for clarifying that point.

If the gentleman will yield further, the other thing I would ask is that there also be serious discussion about some method of stopping the continuing resolutions, or the supplemental appropriations which always come to the House even after substantial amounts have been appropriated, unless it is of an extreme emergency nature, if we are going to add some additional discipline into that process to make it more difficult to just add on in a piecemeal fashion.

Mr. ULLMAN. This is one of the problems we must deal with and it is one of the reasons we are having hearings. We hope to get the sentiment expressed on the part of Members so that we can finalize the procedures within the conference.

Certainly, there will be some rules of the House which will have to be amended in the process. This is where we are seeking the views and guidance from the Members.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I wish to thank the gentleman for taking his time today to try to create some additional discussion on the part of the whole House itself. The one thing that many of us have heard in the last year from many of our constituents and others is that they cannot understand how this House of Representatives and the Senate has not been more responsible in the way that it controls the budgetary process, since under the Constitution we are supposed to control the purse strings.

I thank the gentleman for taking this time today to stimulate some more discussion.

Mr. ULLMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I want to express my appreciation to the Chair for extending this time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ULLMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESS RIGHT TO KNOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Madam Speaker, back in the 79th Congress, the first Legislative Reorganization Act was passed effective January 1, 1947. That was 2 years before I gained the privilege of serving in this body. One of the key features of the law was the oversight responsibilities which were placed on each of the standing committees with respect to the department or agencies coming within their jurisdiction. In the case of the Vet-

erans' Administration that oversight responsibility was exclusively in the hands of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs until the recent creation of the Senate committee.

This oversight provision, in essence, means that the legislative committee should regularly inquire into, and be fully cognizant of, all operations of the department or agency under its jurisdiction. This can be done in many fashions—hearings, questionnaires and formal conferences, correspondence, and so forth. All of these plus many visits to field stations have been used by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I think it is only fair to say that this responsibility has been discharged very well and with considerable effectiveness. This too, has always been done without any partisan bias, but simply on the basis of discharging our responsibility and the Congress basic right to know what is going on in any programs which are appropriated for and legislated for by the respective Houses. Perhaps I should point out, with regard to partisanship, that partisanship as such has rarely existed in the House committee. I believe I can count on the fingers of one hand and have about three left over, the times in which there has been a partisan vote in the committee during the 20-plus years I have served in the House.

The provisions of title 38 which contain the basic provisions of law applicable to the Veterans' Administration were enacted in 1958 on the initiative of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, but only after attorneys and other representatives of the Veterans' Administration had spent long hours and days in working out final agreement. There was opposition in the agency to this concept, but it is now acclaimed as a basic tool.

Each month the Committee on Veterans' Affairs publishes a wealth of up-to-date statistics on the operations of the VA hospital and medical program. This was resisted by the VA at the outset. Now it is eagerly distributed to all of the field stations and used more or less as a monthly bible.

Beginning in the 83d Congress, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs developed a questionnaire on VA medical activities. These questionnaires were devised from our principal sources: First, from ideas from Members of the committee based on their own visits to VA hospitals and similar visits by members of the staff of the committee. Second, suggestions were solicited from people in the field who were knowledgeable, such as the operators of private hospitals who could give us some basis for comparison between a community operation and the VA. Third, the committee sought questions and suggestions from directors in the field and, lastly, but by no means least, from officials in the Central Office and the Department of Medicine and Surgery. This has been the process in each Congress. The questionnaire in each instance has been previewed and discussed thoroughly by D.M. & S. officials before being sent out. We have sought the independent, unbiased, unvarnished views of each station on a limited number of questions. Until recently, it has always been my impression that the Administrator and the Chief Medical Director welcomed these independent views and usually profited by them; and this is what makes so shocking the recent remarks of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Donald E. Johnson, at his conference for VA directors on January 31. At that time, Mr. Johnson said that he did not want to find any surprises on any of these forms—for instance, referring to the hospital questionnaire—and it is only fair to tell you that I do review them. He then added this ominous note at the end of the paragraph. "If you don't feel secure as to your interpretation of the questionnaires, call us through your area head."

Thus, Madam Speaker, you will note that there is to be only one answer and that is the answer which comes from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Based on recent—sad—experience, I fear that the Administrator's answer will come straight from the Office of Management and Budget. If this policy is to prevail questionnaires will be utterly futile and will be absolutely worthless insofar as enabling the Congress to pass legislation or to properly evaluate programs already in existence. In order that the record may be clear, I will insert at this point the text of the paragraph of Mr. Johnson's address on January 31 so that it may be clear to Members exactly what he said and what he intends to accomplish.

The paragraph follows:

In the legislative area, you have the same basic responsibility: to support the President's legislative proposals in every way open to you. As to the questionnaires you occasionally receive from the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I ask that you treat them seriously and responsively. Too many of our stations have not done so, and many of the returns have been carelessly, even sloppily, prepared. As Directors, you are responsible for the information returned. If the job hasn't been treated seriously, the entire results are of little value to the Committee or to us, and many dollars will have been wasted. At the same time, I will repeat what I have said before: I don't want to find any surprises on these forms—and it's only fair to tell you that I do review them. These questionnaires are not your opportunity to make an end run on Central Office, nor are they the proper vehicle for your "it would be nice to have list." Treat them seriously; they can be a very helpful management tool. If you don't feel secure as to your interpretation of the questions, call us, through your Area head.

The Administrator also made an oblique reference, without spelling out his intentions or desires, to "Ten Standard Federal Regions." There are now hospital regions and compensation and pension regions governing the 165 hospitals and 68 regional offices. Does the Administrator plan to merge the VA structure into this standard GSA Federal region?

Speaking at the same conference was the General Counsel of the Veterans' Administration who, following the leadership of the Administrator, devoted himself to quite a bit of explanation of the term "bootleg legislation" or perhaps we should say, "bootleg legislative proposals." I suppose that the General Counsel means that the Veterans' Administration is slipping legislative ideas to the legislative committees of the House and Senate and that these two committees are barren of any thought of their own. Such is not the case, Madam Speaker. It is nothing less than the truth to say that the initiative for most worthwhile legislative proposals have come from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the House and the converse of it is that practically all of the legislative proposals have been opposed over the years by the Veterans' Administration.

It comes with a considerable amount of poor taste on the part of the General Counsel to attack the legislative branch by remarks which can only be properly described as snide and irresponsible, when one considers two factors. When he was under consideration for appointment as General Counsel he actively sought and received the endorsement of members of his party in the Congress, including several on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Second, prior to being appointed as General Counsel he served for many years with one of the veterans' organizations and he spent a good portion of his time working on the Hill and fully utilizing the opportunities available to him. To use his expression as he describes it, he bootlegged or tried to bootleg many pieces of legislation in that regard and he has in the present job, not been adverse to giving his own private views to selected individuals in the Congress after he became General Counsel.

Pertinent excerpts from the General Counsel's remarks on January 31 follow:

One form of this activity may be described as the "bootleg legislative proposal." The presentation of such a proposal is accomplished by direct contact with someone outside of the agency. It could be a legislator, a friend on the staff of a legislator or on a committee's staff. It could be someone connected with a service organization or other interest group. The avenues of approach are numerous.

The presentation of a bootleg program is the height of irresponsibility. It is advocated by people who do not want to be on the team—who cannot take "no" for an answer—who place their judgment above the Administrator's and the President's—who subordinate the President's decision to their parochial interests. Such action is reprehensible. I urge you to impress this fact on your staff people.

The Administrator has emphasized his desire that contacts with Congress on legislative or potentially legislative matters be channeled through the General Counsel. When expedience demands direct contact between agency and congressional personnel, a report on such contact should be sent to the General Counsel, where it will be carefully reviewed and filed with related material for future reference.

The other way an employee may act on his own is to be called, or feel compelled, to appear before a congressional committee to present his individual views on a legislative matter relating to the business of the VA. This is a thorny problem, especially when the views of the individual are in conflict with those of the agency.

It seems clear that such an employee has a consitutional right to testify under the First Amendment. On the other hand, the courts have recognized that there can be an exception to this First Amendment right when public criticism of an employer is destructive of staff morale and serves to make working relationships with the agency impossible. In other words, it is recognized that

there may be situations in which disciplinary action might be warranted where an employee publicly criticizes an agency or agency policy. To do so, however, would require a careful and judicious balancing of the employee's rights, as opposed to the problems encountered by the agency. I believe that the circumstances would probably have to be extreme before we would venture into this type of action, unless, of course, there was a continuing pattern of disloyal activity by the employee. Nevertheless, I feel you should be aware of the possibilities.

It has been suggested to me that the remarks attributed to these officials are not their own but rather those dictated to them by some faceless, gutless, hidden wonder in the Office of Management and Budget. I do not know. I cannot believe that to be true, for it would mean that the Administrator and General Counsel of the Veterans' Administration have sacrificed their personal integrity to the holding of their high-paying jobs at the public's expense. If the comments by these two VA officials were really those of the OMB, perhaps the Congress will have to force OMB to backtrack as it did in the recent and infamous rating schedule episode.

I am sure I speak for the entire membership of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs when I say that we do insist on the Congress' right to know and we expect to obtain the necessary information to legislate intelligently, despite Mr. Johnson and his General Counsel and others in the Government who have like minded views.

FREE TRADE

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, there are still those who talk about the free trade doctrine as if it should guide us in our search for a trade policy. The notion that every country should devote its economic forces or capital investment to the production of the goods to which it is best adapted is, of course, uncontestable as an objective.

The trouble with the objective is that the world did not grow up economically in that manner and that production and trade have long followed other paths. The world having developed along different lines and having changed course from time for other reasons than obedience to the free-trade doctrine, the present state of equilibrium or disequilibrium in world trade will respond, not to free-trade mandates, but to the same practical considerations, including the political, that have ruled this field for centuries.

Too long it has been assumed that any American industry that cannot compete with imports is relatively inefficient. This is a mindless charge that cannot meet the test of reality. There are many American industries, indeed the majority of them, that cannot compete with imports today; but the reason is not lesser productive efficiency than that of their foreign counterparts.

The American producer, as an international competitor, has become the victim of developments that are far removed from his state of productive efficiency. If we look back a few years we will be able to trace the cause of his discomfiture.

We have to start with the notable fact that it was American economic pragmatism that tore our economy away from its immediate predecessor both here and abroad. Until well into this century the idea prevailed that the best way to achieve lower costs and prices was to keep wages at the lowest level. There was at that time little or no appreciation of the function of wages as the main constituent of consumer purchasing power.

This customary way of seeing wages or employee compensation independently of the market for goods and also as having no visible bearing on business activity was abetted in this country, albeit unwittingly, by the practice of our Census Bureau to classify as industries what were really only a relatively small part of the whole apparatus or productive effort that begins with mining and raw materials of many kinds, extracting or growing them, processing them, fabricating parts, modifying or reshaping them, combining and shipping them to central assembly plants for incorporation into finished goods. Usually it is only the assembling part of the total process that is called the industry.

An example is the automobile industry. By thus mistaking the tip of the iceberg for the whole industry the misconception that labor costs are only those incurred in the last step of manufacturing has been propagated. Thus it could be said that the labor cost in the automobile industry is only 15 to 20 percent of the whole sale value of the final product. This is, of course, very far from the facts. By considering the automobile assembly centers such as Detroit as the "automobile industry" the serious error about the share of the final product being paid out as employee compensation gained headway.

Actually the share that labor compensation represents of the total cost of production will be found, in the absence of monopoly, in the area of 80 percent in the American corporate productive operations.

Were this fact generally known, the part that employee compensation plays in the breadth and depth of the market for goods, would be more widely appreciated. Then it would be less difficult to grasp the difference between our economy as it persisted until well after World War II and other industrial economies as they were at that time.

General perception of this difference was slow in coming and also slow in its acceptance by business and the public. At issue was the persistent tug of war over the division of the product of industry between the owners and the workers. Wages were thought to be a subtraction from profits, and vice versa. It was the Great Depression that brought home the need of money in the hands of the vast majority of the people if the depression was to be turned around. We had abundant productive capacity but lacked effective consumer demand—not simply consumer demand. There was enough of the latter; but it was not backed sufficiently by the power to buy that resides in money in hand.

Cogitation over the difficulty posed by the Depression brought forward the idea that steps must be taken to "prime the pump" so that business could resume its forward motion. It was found that wages could be and were often used as a competitive weapon by employers who were willing to take advantage of the oversupply of labor in relation to demand. To prevent the use of wages for that purpose we first outlawed child labor. Then we established minimum wages with the purpose of preventing precisely that use of wages that was increasingly regarded as counterproductive. It became national policy that wages were to be withdrawn from use as a competitive weapon. We were seeking higher consumer income, not a shrinkage of it, such as wage-cutting would cause. To bolster the line against shrinkage of wages and therefore consumer purchasing power, collective bargaining was underwritten by statute and made obligatory in interstate commerce.

Thus did we bolster our system of mass production against the prospect of beholding our vast productive machine grinding to a halt for want of cash customers. We were faced with the prospect of retreating to the level of a subsistence economy such as existed and still exists in China, India, and elsewhere. Such a prospect had no vocal supporters or promoters here. Quite the contrary. We had tasted the abundance and comforts that our productive system could deliver if only we could get it back on its feet; and we did not look on a subsistence style of living with equanimity.

Whether the measures we adopted would in time have reversed the negative trends and restored prosperity was left undetermined by the outbreak of World War II. The war, however, did accomplish the turnaround. Shortly thereafter the Employment Act of 1946 was passed, by which we reasserted our belief in the importance of the fullest employment to the well-being of our economy. From time to time thereafter we have raised the statutory minimum wages in keeping with rising prices. Thus again did we recognize the link between mass production and an absorptive mass consumption.

Indeed our industrial wages rose substantially during the war years despite the establishment of wage controls, or from $0.66 in 1940 to $1.02 per hour in 1945, an increase of 55 percent. By 1950 the average hourly rate had risen to $1.46, representing another 43 percent increase. We were thus building a wider gap between our wage level and the foreign levels we might soon face in world trade. This unhappy prospect apparently occurred to no one since we pursued in full cry the objective of freeing international trade from tariffs and other barriers.

While it should have been clear that if child labor and sweated labor were countervailing to our economic objectives at home, foreign wages, which were already far below our levels, should pose a similar threat. Instead of recognizing

such a threat we enhanced its effects by reducing our tariff on imports. We cut it in time by some 80 percent, thus making it easier for foreign producers, utilizing low wages as a competitive weapon, to penetrate our market.

We, of course, could not legislate for the other countries and they were happy to have us open our market ever wider, as if they needed a wider competitive advantage than they already enjoyed.

We were told by those who pushed for the goal of free trade that we were so far ahead in productivity that our much higher wages would be no handicap. Then apparently they paid no further attention to what was developing.

The other countries had not found it desirable before World War II to adopt our system of production. It was the demonstration of our economic power during the war that so impressed the industrial countries of Europe and also Japan that, with the exception of the Communist countries, they decided to embrace our system themselves. We were happy to help them and did so with a sufficient vigor to convince them that their choice was right.

The rest is pretty much history. In the field of mechanization and automation they took hold and some of them came up very rapidly.

Whereas our output per employee rose 2.1 percent per year from 1950–60 that of West Germany rose by 6 percent, France by 5.4 percent, Italy by 4.5 percent and Japan by 6.7 percent.

From 1960–69 our productivity per employee rose 2.6 percent per year, that of West Germany 4.6 percent, France 5 percent, Italy 6.4 percent and that of Japan 9.5 percent.

From 1950–69 our rise was a total of 46 percent uncompounded, West Germany 106 percent, France 104 percent, Italy 112 percent, and Japan 166 percent, (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1972, table 1325, p. 811.)

In less than 20 years our industries began to feel the headwinds of the approaching competitive storm. As those countries replaced backward and worn-out machinery with bright modern installations their productivity per man-hour spurted rapidly upward and their exports began to loom as a veritable menace to many of our industries. The latter, sensing what lay in store, sent representatives abroad to test the investment climate. It was not long before a rising stream of dollar investments in foreign branches was flowing to Europe and elsewhere. Our industries were protecting themselves against the blighting competition by becoming identified with it.

We shipped billions of dollars of modern machinery abroad not only to equip our branch plants but also to native plants in the other countries. If our higher costs could no longer compete successfully in many of the foreign markets our capital could produce goods within those countries and supplement our exports by producing on the spot in foreign markets.

As foreign productivity rose so much more sharply than our own, because the foreign countries were building on a lower base, and as foreign wages remained far behind the rising foreign productivity, our foreign trade did an about-turn several years before 1970. The facts merely did not come to light because of our statistical practices in casting our trade balance. As if blinded by our enraptured adherence to liberal trade policies we treated as true exports all the billions of dollars in goods that we shipped under foreign aid programs. Thus was hidden the turn of the tide until it swelled beyond concealment. We also recorded our imports in a manner that made them appear about 10 percent less than they actually were. Instead of tabulating them on what they cost us we recorded them on their foreign value, point of shipment. Very few other countries deceived themselves in that manner. After a few years, however, the realities mounted to such a height that concealment could no longer hide our highly weakened competitive position in the world.

While wages did rise, and in recent years more rapidly than our own in percentage, the gap widened in dollars and cents. It will surely be many years before foreign wages will catch up with the rise in foreign productivity. Just so long we will be asked to provide an outlet for foreign goods that find an outlet in their home markets if the employers would emulate our early wage policy as well as they followed our production methods.

Meantime the combined wage-productivity gap is too wide to be bridged by what remains of our tariff. Resorting to currency revaluations will not do what is necessary to remove the overhanging threats of rising imports that cloud our investment climate at home. As a result we do not enjoy the industrial growth on which we depend for new jobs. Yet our labor force is constantly growing at a rapid pace and we are driven to deficit finance in order to prevent unemployment from swamping us. Unfortunately rising deficit financing results in higher production costs. This in turn reduces our competitive standing, thus creating pressure for further currency devaluation or upvaluation by our principal foreign competitors. At the same time it stimulates more foreign investment and less on the homefront.

Such a merry-go-round assures a disrupted foreign trade front that will require more effective therapy than modification of currency exchange rates. Foreign wages and productivity are not under our control. We cannot legislate higher rates for other countries, nor can we control the depletion of mineral resources. This fact explains what is called the energy crisis. Yet these elements affect our trade position more surely than exchange rates.

Therefore we need a form of control over imports that is more responsive, effective, and flexible than the tariff on exchange rates. * * * manipulation. Import quotas expressed in percentage of our domestic demand for particular products represent an instrumentality that has been condemned by a harsh prejudgment born of prejudice and emotion.

Import quotas have been described as deadly to trade expansion and repressive of competition. They need not be either. They represent the most flexible and sophisticated type of trade control among all the instrumentalities that have been relied on in the past. Import quotas can be tailormade to fit particular competitive situations as they exist with respect to particular products and particular areas of the world. They are not as unflexible as the tariff under the force of the most-favored-nation clause. This requires an equal tariff level against all countries, except the Communist-controlled areas of the world. Yet, nothing is more common than different competitive levels among the different countries that ship to us. A tariff that would be suitable for meeting competition from one or more countries might be either too high or too low with respect to other countries. There is no flexibility that overcomes this defect.

The same is true of currency rates of exchange. They are the same toward all countries and cannot be bent to meet the diverse competitive levels of other countries.

We could easily remove the tariff on any goods that might be placed under import quotas, so long as the quotas were in effect. Other countries would be assured a share in the growth of our market for particular products. Thus would the straitjacket effect of quotas be overcome. Moreover, upon showing of cause, quotas can be reopened for liberalization, as has been done in the importation of petroleum and sugar from time to time.

Madam Speaker, I think that we should forget the past prejudices against import quotas and endorse the import quota system as the best form of import control available in the modern world of rapid technological and productivity changes.

I am happy to join with my colleague from Pennsylvania in the introduction of a trade bill that if enacted would put imports into proper perspective. The bill recognizes the need for imports and would permit them to grow as our market for particular products expands. It would not, however, permit imports to perpetrate on us what unrestricted imports have done in the past and are still able to do; namely, penetrating our market without restraint and capturing increasing shares of it in a matter of a few years. We have seen imports come from less than 5 percent of our market in a number of instances and in a few years rise to 10 percent, 15 percent, 20 percent, 30 percent and even higher, bulldozing our employment out of the way as if imports had the right of eminent domain.

Such lack of control can no longer be tolerated. It contradicts our minimum wage system, our obligatory collective bargaining, our full-employment objective, and puts a damper on dollar investments at home in favor of foreign investment. We drive our dollars abroad, and the employment that would take place here takes place abroad. If we had a proper control of imports we would have a better investment climate at home, our industry would return to its earlier eager development of new products and home market expansion with-

out putting restraints on foreign investments.

The bill would protect our market for goods that enjoy American patent protection instead of laying them open to low-wage competition from abroad. Our patent holders would be assured that the market they might develop by dint of investment and extensive effort would be theirs so long as the patent lasted, and could not be spoiled for them by imports that would skim the cream and reap the bonanza, that formerly rewarded American industry when it invested heavily in new industry and new departures from established products.

This is the kind of legislation we need if we are to see our industry and employment bloom again, thus making it possible to employ the many new workers who are destined to come on our labor market year after year.

I urge other Members to study this legislation and to join in its support.

GRAND RIVER WATERSHED COUNCIL

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Madam Speaker, the State of Michigan and the Grand River Watershed Council, a regional governmental entity serving counties, cities, villages, and townships, has designated the month of April 1973 as Stream Appreciation Month in order to encourage the development of programs which create a better public understanding and appreciation for water resources.

The Michigan Grand River Watershed Council has undertaken a public action program, which they have entitled "Alpha 37," consisting of a promotional 225-mile canoe trip from Michigan Center to Grand Haven, Mich., to focus attention on the values and conditions of local water resources. Their name, "Alpha 37," is derived from the Grand River being Canoe Trail No. 37, as designated by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, and Alpha is the first letter of the Greek alphabet to correlate with the first 225-mile adventure.

Through their promotional effort, this organization hopes to encourage municipal and private groups to sponsor special activities, such as photography contests, boating trips, seminars, water quality and historical studies to encourage a similar awareness of water resources.

While this particular promotional activity is oriented towards a specific watershed in Michigan's Sixth District, the concern which they have so enthusiastically expresed is one affecting all of us, and I therefore want to share their plan for action with my colleagues. I know that Mr. John H. Kennaugh, executive secretary of the Michigan Grand River Watershed Council, 3322 West Michigan Avenue, Lansing, Mich., 48917, would be most happy to advise interested persons as to the operational details of "Alpha 37." I commend this innovative effort.

FEDERAL INSPECTION FOR RABBITS PROCESSED FOR HUMAN FOOD

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

Mr. SEBELIUS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss H.R. 4559, legislation to establish Federal inspection for rabbits processed for human food.

The basic objective of the meat and poultry inspection program is to protect the public from death or illness caused by unwholesome meat products. Consumers have responded to this quality guarantee by greatly increasing consumption of meat and meat products covered by the act.

When the first Wholesome Meat Act was passed, beef consumption was 71.3 pounds per capita and in 1909, the first year when poultry consumption figures were calculated, 14.7 pounds of chicken were consumed per person. In 1971, beef consumption reached 113.1 pounds per capita and chicken consumption was 41.3 pounds per capita.

I am hopeful that there will be a similar response by consumers to the wholesome guarantees provided for rabbit meat processing in this legislation.

This is of paramount importance in view of the nutritional quality of rabbit meat and the efficiency of rabbit production. The fact that rabbit meat is higher in protein and lower in cholesterol than other red meats underscores its dietary importance in our health-conscious society. Domestic rabbit is currently being recommended by physicians and is being served in hospitals and sanitariums all over the United States.

With growing concern over an adequate domestic meat supply, rabbit prolificacy and efficiency become important. In fact, three domestic rabbit does and one buck can produce more meat in 1 year than one cow—and at less cost per pound of meat gained. Rabbit production requires only a fraction of the investment and land area required for beef cattle production.

To date, however, the burdensome cost of Federal meat inspection has only curtailed development of the rabbit processing industry and has jeopardized the market for the rabbit producer. For example, Federal inspection costs in the Hill City, Kans., rabbit processing plant amount to about 4 to 4½ cents a pound. Monthly costs range from $1,200 to $2,000. Recently, the cost of production was 86 to 87 cents a pound. Frozen fryers were selling for 79 to 84 cents a pound, and fresh fryers were selling for 82 cents a pound.

In effect, part of the problem facing the rabbit meat industry is that rabbit meat lacks the consumer guarantees of wholesomeness afforded other meat products and the cost of inspected rabbit meat is inflated by the cost of inspection unlike the other meat inspection programs paid for by the State or Federal Government. This legislation will also tighten up the inspection standards for rabbit meat imports.

There has been some concern that mandatory Federal inspection will eliminate the small rabbit producers. This is simply not the case. Quite the contrary, this inspection program is for rabbit processing and does not affect the producer directly. It does, however, insure a more reliable market for rabbit products by establishing a sounder economic basis for rabbit processing and by adding stability to the rabbit processing industry.

There is more than adequate protection for the small processors through exemptions that are provided in the proposed legislation. There are two general categories for exemptions for small operators.

There is a blanket exemption for producer-processors handling less than 250 rabbits annually.

Those handling 250 to 5,000 annually are subject to review but not online inspection. Also, they are required to satisfy minimum sanitary and facility requirements, which are modified to reflect the size of the operation and the investment. This limited exemption includes rabbits processed for local distributon for meal preparation.

In addition, there are exemptions for custom slaughter and personal use and exemptions for requirements which violate specific religious dietary law. And, retailers who process rabbits are exempt as long as they process inspected rabbits.

The 1971 census data indicates that commercial rabbit production totaled 18.5 million pounds with a farm value of $4 million. This represents a primary source of income for many senior citizens, youth and minority groups, and a secondary source of income for small farmers and others with limited resources. In a recent survey of 1,100 rabbit producers for Kansas Food Products, Inc., 58 percent of the respondents had a net income of less than $5,000. Of the 231 who replied, 96 percent of the producers operated a farm business or lived in a rural area or town less than 10,000, and 64 percent raised rabbits for a main or supplemented income, the rest being hobby producers.

It is obvious that this legislation could lay the foundation for a very promising and profitable new industry which could be instrumental in saving the family farm concept and in revitalizing rural and small town America.

Domestic rabbit raising goes hand-in-hand with many other projects. These include such things as truck gardening, making houseplant potting soil, the raising of earthworms for fish bait and other economically feasible projects. In addition, the byproduct market is expanding, particularly in the area of pharmaceutical and biomedical research.

In summary, I feel that it is time to include rabbit processing under the mandatory inspection provisions of the Meat and Poultry Inspection Acts. This would stabilize the rabbit processing industry without forcing undue costs on the small processor who would be exempt. This act would open new doors of opportunity for our senior citizens, our youth, the handicapped, and others in search of gainful employment and economic well-being. This could offer our rural and smalltown areas a new growth industry.

At the same time, the consumer would be guaranteed an increasing supply of a most nutritious and healthful food which is high in protein and low in fat, promising much to a health-conscious society.

TIME MAGAZINE'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. McFALL. Madam Speaker, Time, Inc. is noting its 50th anniversary this winter, and it decided that some substantial labor, as well as celebration, should mark the occasion. The chosen focus of the 50th anniversary editorial project has been "The Role of Congress"—the relationship of the Congress and the executive branch in the years immediately ahead. The primary editorial question here is whether the men, women, minds, and experiences here in Congress have more potential than is now being realized. The editors emphasize that this inquiry is not an attack on the institution or the person of the Presidency, but is an attempt to determine whether the Congress is capable of an enlarged contribution to public policy.

Many assert that the legislative branch has been reduced to a twig, bending its collective will to that of the centralized executive. We cannot allow ourselves to be placed in the curious position of bargaining with the executive branch to be allowed to share with the President those powers inferred upon us by the Constitution.

In the 18th century, de Tocqueville noted the House as "remarkable for its vulgarity and its poverty of talent," at a time when it was dominant. Today, the caliber of individual Members is the highest it has ever been and we are fully capable of carrying out our obligations under the Constitution and we intend to do just that.

Time has done a great service by addressing the many issues involved in executive-congressional relations. Time has held four regional meetings in the past months at which scholars, civic leaders, and Members of both Houses of Congress discussed the difficulties of reasserting congressional authority and remedies. The symposia aimed to determine the extent of the crisis in the balance of power, discuss possible improvements to be made within the Congress, and explore avenues by which journalism might play a positive role in restoring the balance among the three branches of government. This has been an ambitious undertaking, and I am pleased to note the superior collection of essays, analyses and panel discussions that resulted.

Today I am inserting in the RECORD the preface to "The Role of Congress" of Time, Inc., and an essay by Neil MacNeil of the Time News Service, "To Redress the Balance":

PREFACE TO THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

(By Hedley Donovan)

This winter marks the 50th anniversary of the launching of Time magazine, and the founding of Time Inc. A half-century may be only a twinkle in history's eye, but these years do represent one-quarter of our national existence—momentous years of war, depression, social and political change, and an onrushing technology. For our company's anniversary we thought we should do some work as well as some celebrating, and as a special journalistic assignment we settled upon "The Role of Congress." Our interest is in the relationship of the Congress and the Executive Branch in 1973 and the years immediately ahead.

The essential point of such an inquiry is whether a democratic society, as originally conceived and successfully developed here over two centuries, still places high value on collective judgment as well as centralized, individual decision making. And in particular, whether the Congress can make a more meaningful and constructive contribution to public policy. Our concern is whether, as many believe, the legislative role is eroding, and, consequently, whether our system of government may be moving out of balance.

This inquiry is not in any way conceived as an attack upon the presidency as an institution or upon Presidents, past or present. Nor do we approach our inquiry as spectators at a contest between the Executive and Legislative branches, rooting for one side or the other and keeping a box score on who is momentarily ahead.

In each of the modern presidencies, no matter what the party line-up or the personal temperament of the President, a situation seems to come sooner or later in which the White House is isolated from congressional advice. We consistently find a feeling on the part of scholars, journalists and Congressmen themselves, that the national legislature is being insufficiently heeded. The voice of Congress may, in fact, be muted by its own institutional shortcomings. But our editorial question is whether the minds, talents and experiences that are assembled in Congress have more to contribute to the public well-being than is now realized. That is Time Inc.'s question, as journalists and citizens. That is our ax to grind.

TO REDRESS THE BALANCE

(By Neil MacNeil)

Time Inc.'s project to re-examine The Role of Congress comes at a moment when in many quarters there is serious question that Congress can continue to survive as a truly viable, independent institution. The federal structure is now undergoing basic change, new change piled on the structural changes of the past century, and this is taking place not only in the tenuous relationship between the Federal Government and the states, but also in the interplay between the President, the Congress, and the Judiciary. The presidency has reached such a stature of political power and personal prestige, largely at the expense of the Legislature, that it now seems impossible for Congress to contest the Executive Branch on equal terms over the management of the Government. Prospects for the future indicate that the President stands to gain even greater power than he now has, unless the 20th century trend can be altered or reversed. There are signs that the President and his branch of the Government may become so all-powerful in the immediate decades ahead that Congress consequently may become merely superfluous.

This is not the way the founding fathers envisioned the Government they designed at Philadelphia in 1787. That Government had Congress at its center and as its first branch. It was Congress that made the laws and set national policy; the President merely administered what Congress decreed. For the first half-century the President did not even dare to veto bills he personally opposed unless he believed that to sign them would violate his oath to uphold the Constitution. Through the 19th century we had what Woodrow Wilson aptly called "Congressional Government." Congress initiated legislation and formulated national policy, and the President approved it or vetoed it, wary of intruding on Congress's deliberations. Today the President initiates legislation and formulates national policy, and Congress modifies, approves or rejects his proposals. A historic reversal has taken place, and that reversal of legislative initiative and policy formulation is only part of the fundamental changes that have taken place in this century.

It is true that there were strong Presidents in the 19th Century. Jackson, Lincoln and Cleveland come immediately to mind, but they were, institutionally, sporadic oddities in the flow of federal power. Each was followed by weaker men in the White House. But in the 20th century came Teddy Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt, and each in turn enormously added to the President's powers, each building on the other's aggrandizements. (T.R.: "I took the canal zone and let the Congress debate.") By the time of Franklin Roosevelt's death, the President had taken full command of the federal establishment, in foreign and domestic affairs, and reduced even the once powerful leaders of Congress to mere presidential assistants. This is a role they continue to play.

The imperatives of the modern world, both at home and abroad, have made the Presidents who have followed F.D.R.—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon—more powerful, if less arbitrary, than any rulers in history. Today the President dominates national attention. The nation attends his every word and action. The once influential debates of Congress now seem little more than small men bickering. In this historic process, Congress has largely lost some of its greatest strengths: control of the nation's purse strings, control of the use of national force. Congress has been reduced so low that most Americans do not even know the surname of their Congressmen. (A Gallup poll has shown that 57% of Americans don't even know their Congressman's name; only 19% knew anything that their Congressman had done.

The evidence of Congress' figure appears on every hand, not only in its rivalry with the President for hegemony over the federal establishment, but in a somewhat different struggle, with the Supreme Court. It is no secret that Congress failed to deal with either the race question or legislative apportionment until the courts acted, and thereby they invited the Supreme Court into the legislative business. It is true that Congress does have areas of sophisticated competence, notably in such domestic fields as education and medical research, but the significant areas of its growing incompetence are frightening. What they add up to is an inability by Congress to allocate national resources or set national priorities. They take most tangible form in Congressional consideration of the national budget, of the sophisticated weapons systems, of the world power struggle, and of general foreign policy including the control of U.S. war-making.

On the budget, the concession by President Jefferson in 1801, to let Congress make specific appropriations was an enormous enhancement of Congressional power. Today, however, the budget has become so huge as to be incomprehensible, and Congress merely considers the add-ons, not the substance or even the direction of the budget. Congress tends to quibble over the details, the specifics—literally to the point of deciding how many patrolmen should be stationed in Washington's police stations—and does not use the budget as an instrument of directing national policy in a coherent manner. The President and his budget officers have substantively pre-empted the power of the purse from Congress. More than a century ago, Congress separated its consideration of

spending and taxation to support that spending, and this has now led to a considerable chaos in these interrelated fields.

On weaponry and the tools of space exploration, the members of Congress neither read nor write the language of commuter, and thus in appropriating the vast sums in these fields, they appear almost helpless before the Executive branch of the Government. Congress tends to vote billions into these operations on little more than the claims of some generals and admirals or the chauvinistic fustian from the incumbent Administration.

On foreign policy, Congress appears today even more impotent. For practical purposes, Presidents have moved away from the treaty-making processes, using Executive agreements and grants-in-aid in their place, and this has undercut the Senate's old dominion in this field. Perhaps more importantly, the Presidents for a half-century or more have taken it upon themselves to use the U.S. military forces as they see fit in the national interest. As early as the 1920s, protests were being made that the President had in fact totally usurped the power of Congress to declare and make war, and the Viet Nam War is but the latest example of these incursions on the powers of Congress. The Viet Nam War has been a momentous humiliation of Congress. The Pentagon papers demonstrated how Presidents manipulated Congress to their own secret purposes. This above all has been turning many American citizens as well as academics, politicians as well as journalists, to the question we are addressing: how to restore to Congress its constitutional functions. It is more than ironic to watch some academic advocates of the strong presidency now reverse field to try to shore up the flagging Congress.

It is not hard, by glancing at the Constitution and the political history of this country, to learn what Congress is supposed to do. It's not hard either to realize that Congress is not doing that well. (The way some of the doomsayers are now talking, including this one, it may be advisable soon to stuff a Congressman and stick him in the Smithsonian Institution among the other extinct species, so that future generations will know what a Congressman looked like.) The problem is to discover what Congress can now do and how it can be helped into doing that well.

Despite protests to the contrary, Congress is not a static place. It is always undergoing change, institutional and personal, for the law of life in Congress, as elsewhere, is change. The place today is not what it was in 1960, and it was not in 1960 what it was in 1950. The Senate filibuster is no longer a deadly weapon. The Southern anti-civil rights bloc and the Congressional farm bloc have been broken. The House Rules Committee has been tamed. Voting procedures and legislative practices have been substantively altered and improved. The question is not whether Congress can change, for it is changing, but whether it can change soon enough and substantively enough to save itself from practical obsolescence. The times and the imperatives of the times are changing swiftly, and Congress is changing slowly, the way the grass grows.

What is needed now is a set of imaginative and persuasive proposals to strengthen Congress institutionally. It would be hazardous to this purpose to chant the familiar and often hackneyed litany of Congressional reform. We need to seek ideas for strengthening the place institutionally in such a way as to attract the support of Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives. These ideas must aim to cure the real ills of Congress and not merely apply BandAids to the symptoms of those ills.

There are obvious areas and ideas to examine. One is the adequacy of the professional staffs of Congress. In institutional terms, it seems incredible, for example, that the House Ways and Means Committee actually has to borrow tax experts from the Treasury Department to write tax laws. One idea is to re-establish the Budget Bureau as a joint agency of the President and Congress. Another is to improve Congress' information-gathering facilities, notably through data processing. The Executive branch now has Congress totally outgunned in this field. A method should be found to deal with the growing tendency of Presidents simply to ignore congressional acts—like presidential efforts to impound billions in congressional appropriations. There have been suggestions of ways to strengthen the congressional committees and the leadership. One of these is to establish the committee chairmen as a policy-making cabinet of Congress, under the party leadership.

An area especially needing attention is the neglect by Congress of its responsibilities to oversee the Executive branch and its execution of congressional intent. Congress passes laws and votes appropriations and then leaves the rest to the Executive branch. Thus the will of Congress can be and is ignored and its actions vitiated. The General Accounting Office was established for this review purpose, but the GAO tends to do little more than hard-check the contract fulfillments of government subcontractors.

A critical area, of course, is the Congress' war powers. Constitutionally, it is conceded that the President has authority to use the American armed forces at his discretion to repel foreign invasion, but Presidents have used their discretion in a far wider manner than this. In a real sense, the President has come to answer to no one—except the electorate every four years—on how he exercises these powers he has assumed. It is not enough any more, even in Congress, to argue that the nation can only speak with one voice, that of the President, in times of overseas difficulties. The role of Congress in this area over the last several decades has been little more than acquiescence.

One has a sense that Congress is far too cluttered with trivial responsibilities to deal adequately with the great questions of national policy. Over the decades, Congress has delegated some of its responsibilities, when these responsibilities came to impede its other, more important work. Back in the 1850s, for example, Congress created the U.S. Court of Claims to take the burden of tens of thousands of claimants off its back. It has created the regulatory agencies for their varied legislative-judicial functions. It has established the Tariff Commission and got rid of the agonies of setting tariff schedules. The time has come to strip away some other impediments to Congress' acting more responsibly as a policy-making, priority-setting body. For example, Congress could abandon its function as city council for the District of Columbia.

An additional area also comes to mind, and that is the neglect of Congress by the press. This is no new thing, especially as regards the House of Representatives. The overall effect of media concentration of attention on the Presidency while largely ignoring Congress has been to encourage what has happened institutionally: the exaltation of the President and the denigration of Congress.

The time obviously has come for a long and hard look at the Congress, with the aim of bringing forward some specific steps that will help Congress help itself, and in so doing help restore the coequality for which the founding fathers aimed.

THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. REUSS. Madam Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, H.R. 4851, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1973. I hope it will break the current deadlock between the administration and the Congress on our housing and urban development programs.

As Members know, on January 5, the administration imposed a nearly complete moratorium on the Department of Housing and Urban Development programs of housing assistance to low- and moderate-income families and community development assistance to the Nation's cities and counties. According to the administration, housing subsidy programs will not be resumed pending an extensive reevaluation by the administration, which may take up to 18 months; and community development grants—principally for urban renewal, model cities, water and sewer facilities, and open space projects—will not be available until the Congress enacts the administration's proposal for special revenue sharing for community development. Even then, according to the budget, funds would not be available until fiscal year 1975.

If allowed to stand, the President's moratorium would be disastrous, both for the thousands of families who simply cannot afford decent housing without some subsidy, and for the hundreds of cities, large and small, which cannot eliminate or revive their blighted areas, or provide badly needed public improvements, without Federal grant assistance. It is inconceivable to me that the Congress would consent to the administration's heavy-handed approach in this area.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1973 would break this impasse by first, enacting—in slightly expanded form—the community development block grant proposal which was passed by the Senate in the ill-fated 1972 housing bill and reported favorably by the House Banking and Currency Committee; and, second, conditioning the effective date of the block grant proposal on the President's resumption of the HUD housing subsidy programs. Specifically, the new community development block grant program would take effect 60 days after the President certified to the Congress that all housing subsidy funds being impounded had been released and that the housing programs were being carried out.

Enactment of the bill would mean a speedier transition to the block grant approach to community development which both the Congress and the President agreed upon in 1972. It would not, however, mean an end to the administration's reevaluation of our housing programs. That reevaluation will, and should, proceed. In fact, the Congress is willing and eager to join that effort.

But we must recognize that a new approach to subsidized housing will not be agreed to by the administration and the Congress in a matter of a few months. In all likelihood, it will take 2 or 3 years. We simply cannot stop providing housing for needy families for that period of time.

The bill proposes that we continue our present housing efforts, but with important safeguards to avoid the major abuses brought to our attention during

the past 2 years. Title II of the bill prohibits assistance under the four housing subsidy programs—sections 235 and 236, rent supplements, and public housing—unless the community in which the housing is to be located—

First, specifically requests the housing units to be provided;

Second, certifies that the housing will be served by adequate public facilities—water and sewer systems, schools, transportation, and other supporting facilities—and

Third, certifies that the housing to be provided fully complies with local building codes and that local authorities have properly inspected the housing to assure compliance.

These provisions are designed to meet two of the most flagrant abuses found in our housing programs: First, the construction of new housing in remote areas not adequately served by transportation, schools, water and sewer, recreational, and necessary commercial facilities; and second, the sale, primarily in inner-city areas, of units which failed to meet even minimum building code standards. Placing responsibility on local elected officials to guard against these abuses will substantially improve the quality of federally subsidized housing and enable these programs to serve the housing needs of thousands of families.

I enclose for the RECORD a brief summary of H.R. 4851 provisions:

THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1973

TITLE I—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

This title authorizes a new Community Development Block Grant Program under which basic HUD physical development programs would be consolidated into a single block grant. The new program would have the following major features:

Authorization—$5.5 billion in contract authority, approved in an appropriation act, would be authorized for the first two years of the program, with limits on obligations of $2.5 billion in fiscal year 1974 and $3 billion in fiscal year 1975.

Distribution of funds—80 percent of the funds would be allocated to communities in metropolitan areas, 20 percent to communities in nonmetropolitan areas; funds would be allocated *among* metropolitan areas and *within* them to metropolitan cities (central cities and other cities over 50,000 in metropolitan areas) and urban counties (counties of over 200,000, excluding the populations of metropolitan cities and other cities which quality "hold harmless" treatment) on the basis of a 4-part formula (taking into account population, extent of poverty ((doubled), extent of housing overcrowding, and extent of program experience); a metropolitan city or urban county would receive the higher of its formula amount or a "hold harmless" amount (determined by adding its 5-year average of funds received under the consolidated programs to its average NDP grant).

"Hold harmless" provisions would apply to all other communities, both in and outside metropolitan areas, if the locality had undertaken at least one urban renewal or NDP project during the five fiscal years before enactment; if a city's or urban county's formula amount exceeds by at least 35 percent its 5-year "hold harmless" level, the Secretary would be authorized to "phase-in" the full formula amount over a 3-year period; the balance of funds remaining in each metropolitan area, and funds available outside metropolitan areas would be distributed by the Secretary to States, nonurban counties, and localities on a discretionary basis.

Activities for which funds may be used—all activities eligible for support under the existing urban renewal, section 312 rehabilitation loan, basic water and sewer facilities, public facility loan, comprehensive planning assistance, model cities, neighborhood facilities, advance acquisition of land, and open space-urban beautification-historic preservation programs could be financed under the new block grant program; additional activities would include the making of relocation payments, the provision of supporting social services, financing the local share of other Federal grant programs, and the coordination and monitoring of community development activities taking place within the locality.

Recipients of funds and local share—block grants would be made to State governments, counties, cities, and other units of general local government, which could designate special purpose agencies to carry out development activities; the block grant would cover the full cost of approved activities (including reasonable administrative expenses).

Application requirements—block grants may be made only where the applicant (1) identifies its community development needs, (2) describes its planned activities, costs, and locations, (3) formulates a program to provide housing for low- and moderate-income families, and (4) provides, prior to application, full information about the program to those likely to be affected, holds public hearings, and provides citizens an opportunity to participate in the development of the application; in addition, metropolitan cities and urban counties must set a 2-year schedule of activities and formulate comprehensive programs to eliminate or prevent slums and blight and develop properly planned community facilities and supporting social services.

TITLE II—HOUSING FOR LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME FAMILIES

Title II provides that the Community Development Block Grant Program authorized in title I shall not be effective so long as any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the section 235 homeownership program, the section 236 rental assistance program, the rent supplements program, or the low-rent public housing program are being impounded or otherwise withheld from use for their intended purpose. Such title shall only become effective 60 days after the President certifies and reports to the Congress that all such funds have been released and that the programs for which such funds were intended are being carried out to the full extent of the funds so appropriated.

Title II would also prohibit any housing assistance payments under these programs (except pursuant to contracts entered into prior to the effective date of the Community Development Block Grant Program authorized in title I) with respect to housing units situated in any locality, unless the governing body of such locality—

"(1) specifically requests that such assistance be provided with respect to such units or accommodations;

"(2) certifies that such units or accommodations will be served by adequate public or private community water and sewerage systems, adequate schools, adequate transportation systems, and such other supportive services and facilities as may be necessary to provide a suitable living environment; and

"(3) certifies that such units and accommodations will fully comply with all applicable local code requirements (both during and after construction), and will be properly inspected to assure such compliance by the appropriate local authorities at the time assistance is contracted for (and, in the case of new units or accommodations, at the time construction is completed)."

Request and certifications shall be made in such manner and form as the Secretary of HUD shall by regulation prescribe.

HOUSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. METCALFE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. METCALFE. Madame Speaker, recently President Nixon proposed one more cut from our rapidly diminishing program of social services. This new assault on the viability of our communities comes in the form of an 18-month moratorium on all new commitments for low- and moderate-income housing construction. The President has decreed that the Government rescind its traditional responsibility to help provide shelter for those unable to afford decent housing. As a representative from the South Side of Chicago I am all too painfully aware of what these cuts will mean to constituencies like mine around the country. Concerned citizens in Chicago have noted the trend of urban removal and the reclamation of choice land for expensive high-rise developments. In Chicago we have seen the demise of depressed neighborhoods in the name of urban renewal. We have looked with hope at the Federal Government's commitment in the area of housing. Now our hopes are dashed as one more vital lifeblood to our oppressed communities is strangled by Presidential edict.

We are told by the administration that the affected programs have been suspended pending review. While the administration reviews urban development programs, the current housing crisis will grow even more severe. Certainly periodic reevaluation of any Government program is essential to its continued effectiveness, but the termination of badly needed subsidies for a necessity like housing in the interim is callous disregard for the poor. The moratorium decreases the opportunities of the poor for decent shelter and increases their vulnerability to unscrupulous developers. The enormity of profits garnered by speculators from poor people has been well documented. We can only expect a rise in this kind of exploitation during the moratorium.

With good reason the poor question Mr. Nixon's concern for the rebuilding of the Nation's decaying cities. The inclusion of poor and minority peoples does not appear to be a part of the rebirth of the urban centers. As the latest in a line of domestic cuts the housing moratorium may well rekindle the fires of anguish that engulfed our cities in the late 1960's. What then will be the response of President Nixon to the cries of the oppressed?

Let me direct the attention of the Congress to a paper delivered before the United Mortgage Bankers of America by Mr. Dempsey Travis, president of that association. The paper, "Will the New Hudville Mean Mudville for the Central City," eloquently describes the effects and implications of the housing moratorium for blacks and poor people in this country. Mr. Travis attacks the "temporary hold" on subsidizing housing, citing its far-reaching economic impact for the black

community. Surely Mr. Nixon is alarmed by the moratorium's disastrous effects on the development of minority enterprise, one of his long-stated goals. As Mr. Travis has predicted, 90 percent of black mortgagemaking firms around the country will fold in the next 18 months of the moratorium; 50 percent of black architects will be forced out of business; and 80 percent of black construction companies will go bankrupt by the end of 1974. It is difficult to comprehend the logic of a policy which terminates an essential to review its effectiveness; which causes ruinous damage to a long-touted goal of the policymaker; which intensifies the suffering of long-suffering people.

I direct the attention of the Congress to the following address by Mr. Dempsey Travis:

THE BLACK COMMUNITY WITHOUT HUD

America's "Ethnic Cripples" for 300 years have just lost their last housing foot in the recent HUD moratorium. The agency freeze effectively eliminates the subsidies for low and moderate income families. In other words, the "Great Society" section of the 1968 Housing Bill has been junked.

Even with the aid of the subsidies, Blacks were more than 100 years behind in the housing race that for them started in 1870. In 1870, white home ownership was 48% of the population. In 1970, 100 years later Black ownership is only 41.5%.

The current 18 month HUD moratorium will add a 25-year deficit to the Black Housing Market. At the same time, the whites will go galloping along with their 2.4 million annual new housing starts, while the establishment is accelerating the housing abandonment crisis in the urban areas through excessive high taxes, poor schools, ineffective police protection—all combining to produce a high crime rate.

The need for a subsidy program is mandatory in a rising rent market where more than 72% of the Black families in America earn less than $10,000 per year. If we can afford to give a $200.00 tax deduction for every child that goes to a private school for families with incomes of $18,000 or under after taxes, how can we think of no subsidies for the poor? For the white community the "Great Society" subsidies in housing is the dessert, but for the Black community the subsidies constitute the whole meal.

For the first time since the 1930's, the United States does not have a plan to house the poor. The reason given for the moratorium explains everything but why the moratorium was applied only to the poor. Surely if "Excessive Dependence" on the Federal Government is "Weakening"—it is weakening to the affluent as well as to the poor.

Moreover, if a year-by-year patch work addition to the programs over three decades have produced an administrative monstrosity, all of the blame cannot be attached to the last few programs added. Surely, if we need an "integrated system of housing and social service at the local level", and we did not have it with housing programs for the poor, we will certainly not have it without housing programs.

None of the reasons given for eliminating subsidy programs are logical and many of the reasons are untrue. One of the assumptions is that if 98% of the buyers for new homes under the 235 program have not been swindled, then we must eliminate the program because 2% have been swindled. There is nothing I can think of that is 100 effective—including religion. (According to the latest figures, only 65% of the people in America have church affiliation and more than half of them belong for the wrong reasons, if we are to judge them by their inhuman behavior toward the Black and the poor.

The absence of the programs will leave the poor no choice but to be swindled again; however, this time, the figures will be inverted—98% will be swindled and 2% will be sophisticated enough to detect the flimflam. In effect, the Federal government has thrown the housing crisis for the Black and the poor back to the wolves.

You can make some logical cases for the moratorium if you give as your reasons a desire to keep low income people as a reservoir for old substandard housing. Then, it makes sense; all housing new and old becomes more valuable. Traditionally, the Black and the poor have provided the last profit in housing before it is torn down. Traditionally, that profit from the poor was greater than the original profit from the affluent for whom the housing was developed. Until the high real estate taxes of the last decade, developers of housing for whites were quite pleased to get a yield of 12% to 14% per annum; whereas, a speculator in old Black apartment housing felt he was being denied his God-given right if he did not get a yield between 22% and 30% per annum.

This type of contrived exploitation could only flourish in a dual system where more than 20 percent of the Black and the Spanish-speaking folk pay in excess of 25 per cent of their income for overcrowded shelter as compared to 9 per cent of the whites.

There has been a lot of comment about how this will hurt the housing industry. That is coated-can-sugar because this can be good business for a lot of people with vested interests. The market for old housing is beginning to slip. Now there will be no more of this trend of poor people moving into new housing. And old substandard housing has had its life extended because code enforcement has been rendered impotent in the budget cutback. Coupled with removal of price and rent controls, any one who has no scruples can make money in housing under the moratorium than he could before. There will be a period of adjustment and redirection and then—the sky's the limit! The "business as usual" philosophy will prevail. The "Black Tax" in housing will have been reimposed at the pre-Great Society levels.

The Experimental Housing Allowance to the tenant that is being supported by the National Association of Real Estate Boards is an establishment position to support absentee ownership in old ghetto apartment buildings. The realtors who were and still are the Architects of white housing covenants see big profits in fostering a dual market based on skin pigment and class.

One of the main reasons for the disruption and protest that occurred in 1966, 1967, and 1968 was housing exploitation and housing deficiencies. The programs that existed prior to 1966 weren't working and were creating as many problems as they cured. The new programs which are now being eliminated showed great signs of hope. This was a big factor in the "cooling of the cities" since 1969. The moratorium will restore the conditions for more exploitation and regression. It is not only UNFAIR, but in my opinion, very dangerous.

The moratorium has been given the appearance of an industry policing action. In other words, we are going to lay off the troops temporarily for a regrouping and a redesigning—But, housing is not a luxury like an automobile, it is a necessity—Not a choice to be produced or not produced—depending on whether the operation is profitable or not. But, there are many familiar facets of this Society which are in need of overhauling, modernizing, and redesigning: the postal service, the rail transportation system, and of course, public education, to name a few. The idea of closing down the post office for a lengthy period while rethinking the problem would cause a National Catastrophe. But, there is more than the misguided application of manufacturing practice to a vital activity of modern government in this. The moratorium has a racist impact and a classist impact that is unmistakable.

The question that has to be answered during the moratorium is not what do we do with the bricks and mortar; there is ample evidence in every major city and suburb that Americans are sophisticated builders. But, the real question that will have to be answered during the moratorium and could possibly be the prime reason for the moratorium is what do we do with Black people who have become dispensable and no longer productive in a computer oriented society. A halt on subsidies will absolutely guarantee that cities will not be rebuilt with their current Ethnix Mix—The Federal and the City fathers have finally concurred in the fact that a city with a 30% to 50% Black population is politically dangerous. The best way certain to stop this trend is to withdraw all the monies in the form of subsidies and all other ancillary services with the results being abandonment; the land is forfeited to the city for taxes to be subsequently sold to an establishment developer who will in turn build for all people who can pay $200.00 for an efficiency and from $400.00 to $600.00 for two and three bedroom apartments which is a 1973 way of saying "For Whites Only".

Black folk have been paying "White Subsidies" all of their lives in the form of land contracts at two and a half to four times the market value, higher food prices, higher insurance premiums, higher interest rates, and somebody is going to pay a higher funeral bill if they bury you in something other than a mass grave. All of these penalties come out of a Black family income that is two-thirds of the average white wage earner.

We might find peace in the Housing Freeze if being thrown to the wolves was an end in itself. But it is not, because we are gnawed, chewed, swallowed, and regurgitated in a time cycle from which no Black family has been able to escape.

EFFECT OF MR. NIXON'S BUDGET ON BOSTON

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. Madam Speaker, I am greatly concerned over the devastating effect Mr. Nixon's austere budget will have on my district. Boston metropolitan area will stand to lose an incredible $82 million if President Nixon's proposed cutbacks in housing, education, community programs, and health centers are allowed to stand.

Last year, Washington sent to Boston $200 million in Federal assistance to pay for such necessary and humanitarian programs like public safety, job training, education for the disadvantaged, and public employment.

Next year, Boston will lose more than half that money. And even the additional $18 million in general revenue sharing payments, as part of Boston's allotment from the revenue sharing program passed last year, will not compensate for the loss in moneys due to Nixon's cost-cutting budget for fiscal year 1974.

The impact on Boston is catastrophic: Nixon's 18-month freeze on Federal fi-

nancing of housing starts means 5,000 new housing units for the poor and middle-income families will not be built. And those housing starts would have provided jobs for 4,600 construction tradesmen.

The community action program, run all over the city by "Action for Boston Community Development," will expire July 1.

Model cities will exit within a year.

Approximately 5,000 disadvantaged Boston young people will not get jobs this summer under the Neighborhood Youth Corps program because there is not going to be a Youth Corps program any more.

The public employment program has ceased to exist. That means more than 2,400 city workers hired from the ranks of the unemployed and Vietnam veterans will be let go.

Psychiatric and mental health training and research programs at Harvard, Boston State Hospital, and the Episcopal Theological Seminary in Cambridge will be terminated because the money is no longer available through the National Institute of Mental Health.

Four hundred and sixty-three student nurses who receive financial aid, out of a total enrollment of 801, at the Boston University School of Nursing will be forced to find other financial assistance or drop out of school next year because Nixon has massively reduced or eliminated funds for traineeships for nurses.

The moneys which Mr. Nixon will send to Boston under special revenue-sharing bloc grants for job training, community development, law enforcement, education, will be less than the total now being spent on the individual programs they would replace. And it is a lot less than what the administration proposed for special revenue sharing 2 years ago.

Madam Speaker, I think my colleagues in the House will find a similar impact from Nixon's cost-cutting budget in their districts—and then they will be asking the same question I am: "Is this Nixon's panacea for domestic progress?"

At this point in the RECORD, Madam Speaker, I would like to insert an excellent article written on February 19, by Marty Nolan and Tom Oliphant, two fine reporters of the Boston Globe.

Mr. Nolan and Mr. Oliphant have proven themselves to be unusually perceptive and understanding reporters, and in this article they once again live up to the high standards of journalism that keep our citizens informed and aware.

The Boston Globe should be commended for bringing such an important issue to the fore and Marty Nolan and Tom Oliphant should be congratulated for a job well done.

The article follows:

REVENUE SHARING A FRAUD: NO "BONANZA" FOR CITIES AND STATES

(By Martin F. Nolan and Thomas Oliphant)

WASHINGTON.—Revenue sharing is a fraud.

An examination of the facts and figures available indicates that the program—now in its first few weeks of operation—is both a fiscal shell game and a philosophical swindle.

The Federal government's supposed bonanza for states and cities eventually will leave states and cities poorer than before.

President's Nixon's centerpiece of his "new federalism" not only raises doubts about the plan's execution, but calls into question the idea itself and the acclaim with which it has been escorted since its debut almost a decade ago.

Once governors and mayors start adding up their budgets, they may conclude that they have been both victims and perpetrators of a massive bunko enterprise, a conspiracy fueled by inertia and high-toned rhetoric.

With one hand, the Federal government is now sending a few billion stringless dollars to states and localities.

But with the other, the Nixon Administration is preparing to take back more than it gives by ending, cutting, phasing out, and emasculating the far larger collection of specific programs of Federal aid to state and local governments.

The results, which will gradually become visible and tangible over the next 18 months, will be a net reduction in overall Federal assistance, despite revenue sharing.

That is not what original proponents of the concept, from both ends of the party and ideological spectrum, had in mind when they advanced it in the mid-1960s.

Nor is it what President Nixon promised would be the case when he embraced revenue sharing in 1969, 1971, and as recently as last year.

Nor is it what the country's governors and mayors were promised when their vital support for the Administration's proposals was ardently solicited four years ago.

Two sets of numbers make the basic point. During the current government fiscal year, which ends June 30, $45 billion is the official estimate of the total amount of Federal aid of all sorts that will go to states and localities.

The following year, the total will dip to $44.8 billion, the first time this has happened in recent history. Just to keep up with inflation—in other words, just to stay at the same real level—one would have expected an increase in Federal aid next year to at least $46.5 billion.

Moreover, the total disbursements from the Treasury that take the form of loans to local governments and states will also drop, from an estimated $1.9 billion this year to $1.6 billion next year.

Meanwhile, regardless of how one feels about the specific forms of Federal aid that are about to go down the drain, the fact is that all the problems at which this aid was aimed continue to cry out for solutions, all of them expensive.

The major change under revenue sharing is that now there will be less money from all levels of government to help solve them.

The system called revenue sharing by the Nixon Administration has two parts.

The first is general revenue sharing. This is the simple disbursement of Federal money to cities, counties and states to do with essentially as they please.

As it works now, it is a five-year program that will have sent $30.2 billion to the hinterlands by mid-1977. Because this fiscal year's outlay is inflated by the inclusion of a retroactive payment going back to the beginning of 1972, next year's payment will drop to $6 billion from $6.8 billion this fiscal year.

After that, outlays will rise ever so slightly for two years—to $6.2 and then $6.3 billion—before falling off steeply to $4.9 billion in the final year.

That is not revenue sharing as first proposed by Walter Heller or even Richard Nixon.

For one thing, the payments don't expand each year with the economy's growth and the tax base's expansion; they shrink.

For another, what is involved is a five-year program, not the earmarking for all time of a fixed percentage of personal income tax revenues for revenue sharing.

That is what President Nixon claimed was essential back in August 1969, when he formally put revenue sharing at the top of his "must" list of domestic legislative proposals.

In his budget for the 1972 fiscal year, Mr. Nixon had proposed that 1.3 percent of the taxable personal income in the country go right to the cities and states. On this basis, the annual payment would have risen to around $10 billion by 1980.

What happened, as has been the case so often during Mr. Nixon's Presidency, was that he failed to win the approval of fiscal conservatives in Congress, and ended up settling for much less than half a loaf.

What's more, in the budget unveiled last month for the coming fiscal year, the President violated perhaps his most important promise regarding general revenue sharing.

As he put it on Feb. 4, 1971, "It would not require new taxes nor would it be transferred from existing programs."

However, his latest budget makes it painfully clear that general revenue-sharing dollars are indeed coming out of funds for existing programs.

For example, in a discussion of the end of grants for local community action agencies, the budget says:

"If constituencies of individual communities desire to continue providing financial support to local community action agencies, general and special revenue-sharing funds could be used."

Even more damning is this sentence in a document prepared by the huge Department of Health, Education and Welfare:

"With the increasing availability of general revenue-sharing funds, it is expected that states and localities will be able to continue the most promising projects and programs formerly supported by Federal categorical assistance programs."

Such statements, blithely ignoring the once sacred pledge, appear all through the latest budget documents.

The second part of the Nixon system, for now still in proposal form, is called special revenue-sharing.

As currently envisaged, this would involve lumping several specific Federal aid programs in a given field into one sum which the states and cities could spend within that field anyway they choose.

The latest Nixon budget proposes such an approach in four areas—education, law enforcement, manpower training, and urban community development.

As originally set forth two years ago, there would have been somewhat more money going to cities and states under special revenue sharing in each field than under the specific programs being replaced. In short, both more freedom and more money was being offered.

Now, however, the whole (special revenue sharing) has become less than the sum of its parts.

In its first full year of operation, the Administration would send $6.9 billion out of Washington under special revenue sharing. However, two years ago, for the same four areas of activity, the proposed total was $7.5 billion, and that was supposed to just cover the amount then being spent under the specific efforts.

Not only have inflation and an increase in the seriousness of the problems in these areas laid a case for greater, not less, spending at all levels of government than was proposed two years ago, but the Administration has also moved to "fold in" even more specific Federal aid programs to the special revenue-sharing pie, while terminating and cutting many others.

The result is an impossibly complex fiscal shell game, in which the Federal aid money has become hopelessly lost. The only thing known for sure about it is that it's shrinking.

Meanwhile, other forms of revenue sharing, under the general heading of fiscal

relief, have disappeared from Mr. Nixon's budget plans, or are about to.

One example is welfare reform, once gloriously described as a certain means of getting one exceptionally pernicious monkey off the backs of states and cities. Today, while the budget is silent, intellectuals argue over who killed the corpse.

Another example is the 18-month-old effort to pay states and localities almost all the cost of hiring and training the new employees they will need to perform all the tasks Mr. Nixon wants to shift out of Washington.

About $1 billion will go forth from this city this year for that purpose. Next year, however, Mr. Nixon wants to cut the total in half, and then kill the whole thing the following fiscal year on the specious and largely irrelevant pretext that unemployment in the economy's private sector will no longer be a serious problem.

Finally, there is the fact that the budget for the next fiscal year documents Mr. Nixon's determination to end or cut some $10 billion worth of Federal domestic spending both of the direct and local aid varieties.

Thus, states and cities are going to end up poorer, no matter how you slice up the budget;

The total amount of Federal aid to them will drop.

Special revenue sharing will mean less money than they are now getting under the specific, or categorical, programs.

Federal domestic spending generally will have its growth severely stunted.

And, perhaps most important of all, the costs of adequately dealing with crime, slums, lousy schools, and other by-products of poverty will go on jumping while general revenue-sharing payments drop.

Historically, the entire concept of revenue sharing has been bracketed by American involvement in the Vietnam war. Discussion of no-strings-attached block grants to states and municipalities began late in 1964, when Vietnam was on the periphery of American public concerns.

Now, Americans are just beginning to look at the peculiar procedure by which their representatives have decided to keep stitched the fabric of their Federal form of government. The man most responsible is Walter Wolfgang Heller.

In a memo to President Johnson in December 1964, Heller, then the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, suggested that an anticipated surplus in the next budget would create a fiscal "drag" upon the economy. The unprecented, high-Federal-spending, low unemployment economy could cough and sputter if idle dollars did not continue to prime the pump of the economy, Heller argued.

But the "surplus" Heller envisioned vanished in the jungles of Southeast Asia. This year's deficit, a continuing hangover from the war, and the Nixon recession, is $24.8 billion.

Even so, throughout 1967, optimism abounded in Washington, in state capitals, in city halls and in both political parties that revenue sharing would mark the beginning of a postwar bonanza of fiscal "dividends."

After leaving the Johnson Administration to return to the University of Minnesota, Heller spoke at the Godkin Lectures at Harvard's Memorial Hall in March 1966. His definition of revenue sharing carefully included the preservation of traditional grants-in-aid from Washington:

"The revenue-sharing plan would distribute a specified portion of the Federal individual income tax to the states each year on a per capita basis, with next-to-no-strings attached. This distribution would be over and above existing and future conditional grants. . . . Conditional grants for specific functions play an indispensable role in our Federalism. They unite Federal financing with state-local performance in a fiscal marriage of convenience, necessity and opportunity."

But in Congress, Republican leaders looked upon revenue-sharing as a convenient means of decimating the New Deal and wiping out the lumbering bureaucracy that had been the target of GOP rhetoric since the 1936 campaign of Alf Landon.

"We will continue to press vigorously for early enactment of a general revenue-sharing measure to replace the existing grant-in-aid programs," the chairman of the House Republican Conference said on the House floor in April 1967. Those prophetic words were spoken by Melvin R. Laird of Wisconsin, who five years later could see his vision emerge closer to reality as he left the job of Secretary of Defense in Richard Nixon's Cabinet.

Heller argued against cutting back on Federal aid programs, telling a joint economic subcommittee in 1967 that "putting the grants in conditional form enables the Federal government to apply national minimum standards, ensure financial participation at the state and local levels through matching requirements, and take both fiscal need and fiscal capacity into account."

This is precisely what revenue sharing does not do today and the Nixon Administration budget openly admits that the program it seeks to cancel—Model Cities, for instance, or community action and poverty programs—be funded with revenue-sharing money.

Heller had argued that states be rewarded for "their fiscal courage, their fiscal efforts." He told the Godkin Lecture crowd at Harvard that states deserve "an A-plus for their tax efforts."

"Since World War II, their quantitative role has been growing steadily. Indeed, they can lay claim to being the country's greatest growth industry," he said.

"Their expenditures have expanded more rapidly than those of any other major sector of the economy, public or private."

The Heller argument for the states was not new, not even at the podium of Sanders Theater in Harvard's Memorial Hall. In 1962, the Godkin lecturer was Nelson A. Rockefeller, governor of New York and his topic was "the future of federalism."

Rockefeller said:

"The striking fact in our domestic political experience since World War II has not been the growth of Federal government—but the far more rapid expansion of state and local government to meet growing social needs."

Both during and after his doomed presidential efforts in 1964 and 1968, the New York governor was the most indefatigable salesman for revenue sharing. Every fellow governor left every governors' conference at various spas burdened down with charts, graphs and fulsome Rockefeller rhetoric on the need for revenue sharing.

Well after being elected to an unprecedented fourth term in Albany, Rockefeller muscled his own congressional delegation as few governors have done on any issue. "It's astonishing," said Rep. Hugh Carey of Brooklyn, who felt the gubernatorial heat because he served on the Democratic side of the House Ways and Means Committee.

But throughout the late '60s, opinion was far from unanimous on revenue sharing. An AFL–CIO spokesman said in 1971:

President Nixon's revenue-sharing proposal is like the ballplayer in the old joke who can't hit, can't run, can't throw and can't field—but looks good in the dugout. The President's plan, too, looks OK in the dugout. It says to states and localities, most of which are hard-pressed for funds: 'Here's a bunch of money. Do something with it, anything.' But when it emerges from the dugout and you get a better look at it, the performance potential just isn't there."

But the labor movement was out-muscled by its former allies among intellectuals. Not only Heller, but such luminaries of the New Frontier as Richard N. Goodwin and Daniel P. Moynihan began writing odes to the nobility and frugality of local government in intellectual journals. Moynihan, of course, became a salesman for revenue sharing when he joined the Nixon White House in 1969.

A few intellectuals dissented. Christopher Jencks of the Harvard Graduate School of Education did so in a 1967 article in the New Republic, "Why bail out the states?"

Focusing on "simply increasing aggregate expenditures" as the fundamental basis of revenue sharing, Jencks wrote that such an increase is always "a prerequisite to improved service, but is by no means a sufficient condition for it."

"State legislatures are less concerned than the US Congress with the general welfare, and more amenable to various special interest groups, ranging from the bankers and the liquor interests to the state education association. The refusal of the legislatures to raise taxes is a symptom of this domination, and the Heller plan, while alleviating the symptom, will leave the basic pathology untouched."

The nation's press chorused editorial approval of revenue sharing, due in part to its eloquent spokesmen and because the clamor of mayors and governors hit close to home. A newspaper editor, no more than a politician, wants to go around urging a rise in taxes.

But the media-type symphony of praise for revenue sharing failed to take into account the shifting fiscal, philosophical and political picture. No better illustration of this laggard attitude could be found than in two different Walter Heller appearances on NBC–TV's "Meet the Press."

On Nov. 27, 1966, the Minnesota professor discussed revenue sharing as well as other economic issues. On February 11, 1973, Heller appeared on the same program and was not asked a single question about revenue sharing, not even on its obvious relationship with the drastically reduced Nixon budget.

On the 1966 program, Heller welcomed the interest of Republican congressional leaders, saying, "economics, like politics, makes strange bedfellows."

That may be the lesson of revenue sharing's first few months of operation. No such enterprise could have succeeded without the support of all branches of all governments at all levels. Ever since the Peloponnesian war, politicians have enjoyed passing the buck from one level of government to the other, as long as the buck belonged to a taxpayer.

The idea of revenue sharing, instead of being ignited by the energy of American government, may instead be a product of political fatigue. As Christopher Jencks argued in 1967:

"Third after four years of struggling with a recalcitrant Congress and an unwieldy Washington bureaucracy, intensely aware that their dreams of 1960–61 are far from fulfilled, many New Frontier graduates have begun to talk about the importance of local initiative and responsibility . . . the result is a bizarre alliance between the troglodytes who sermonize about states' rights and Federal wrongs, the special-interest groups who know it is easier to manipulate state legislatures than the national one, and the faint-hearted liberals. This united front may yet carry the day."

DEPARTMENT OF STATE: PROPOSAL FOR CONSOLIDATING HEMISPHERIC AFFAIRS FROM ARCTIC TO ANTARCTIC

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

Mr. FLOOD. Madam Speaker, over many years my major interests in the Congress have included the fostering of better relations between the United States and other countries of the Western Hemisphere through the adoption of policies based upon reasoned lines of thought. The unfortunate failure of the Department of State to consult with our hemispheric neighbors on the recent devaluation of the U.S. dollar, which will vitally affect all Latin American currencies, is but one example of the neglect of our true interests and emphasizes again the importance of hemispheric affairs in the conduct of the U.S. foreign policy.

In the Department of State, as listed in the Congressional Directory of 1972, there are two Under Secretaries of State, the Under Secretary of State and the Under Secretary for Political Affairs; and five Assistant Secretaries for African Affairs, East Asia, and Pacific Affairs, European Affairs, Inter-American Affairs, and Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs; and six for Congressional Relations, Administration, Economic Affairs, Educational and Cultural Affairs, International Organization Affairs, and Public Affairs.

Of the Assistant Secretaries of State all have only regional or administrative responsibilities except the Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs whose jurisdiction covers all of the Continent of South America and a large part of North America south of the United States. It is noted that Canadian relations come under the Assistant Secretary for European Affairs although Canada is not a part of Europe, and since the Statute of Westminster, 1931, has been independent.

With the current termination of the Vietnam war and the massive withdrawal of U.S. Armed Forces from Southeast Asia already accomplished and increasing demands for their withdrawal from Europe and Asia, the time is most opportune for a long-overdue demonstration of greater interest in the countries of the Western Hemisphere from the Arctic to the Antarctic. This will include the countries in the strategic Caribbean basin and the vital Central American isthmus.

As the first step in this direction, I would urge the statutory increase by the Congress of the rank of the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs to that of Under Secretary and the transfer of responsibility for Canadian relations from the Assistant Secretary for European Affairs to the proposed new office.

The forthcoming sessions of the United Nations Security Council during March 15 to 21, should dramatize the value of the indicated change in the State Department organization.

MASSACHUSETTS NEEDS EDA

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

Mr. DRINAN. Madam Speaker, today the House Public Works Committee is opening hearings on H.R. 2246, a bill to extend for 1 year the authorization for the Economic Development Act.

More than 100 Members of the House of Representatives have joined in sponsoring this important bill. In addition to the broad bipartisan support the bill enjoys, it is significant that this proposal has been cosponsored by every member of the House Public Works Committee, including Chairman JOHN BLATNIK and Ranking Minority Member WILLIAM HARSHA.

I am gratified to see such support demonstrated for the Economic Development Act, for as my colleagues know, the administration has threatened this important job-creating program with termination. For fiscal year 1974 the administration proposes only $20 million for EDA—just enough to cover the administrative expenses of closing down the program.

To end the EDA program now would be particularly unfortunate for Massachusetts and the Fourth Congressional District which I represent, where unemployment continues to be a severe problem. The most recent Department of Labor figures, covering the month of December 1972, show that an estimated 179,000 people are unemployed in Massachusetts. This shocking number translates to fully 6.7 percent of the work force—a figure well above the national average.

In the Boston labor area, which comprises 78 cities and towns, including the towns of Brookline, Newton, Waltham, and Framingham which are in my district, the unemployment rate is 5.6 percent, with 83,400 people out of work. The Fitchburg-Leonminster labor area, also in my district, is burdened with an unemployment rate of 8.8 percent, with 3,700 people out of work in the six cities and towns of this area.

These dismaying figures are compelling evidence that the need for programs like EDA has not diminished. These people need jobs, and I believe that the EDA program, which assists communities in attracting and retraining industrial employers, are of vital necessity in combating the unemployment problem.

Two communities in my district particularly hard-hit by unemployment are relying on the EDA for help. In Gardner, the city hopes to build an industrial park with EDA assistance to serve an area that has an unemployment rate in the vicinity of 8 percent for a long period of time. The community of Gardner has a very precarious tax base, and thus cannot come up with the necessary capital on its own. Its application for an $861,765 EDA grant was rated by the EDA as a top-priority project, but has not yet been funded due to insufficient funds.

The town of Fitchburg has applied for a $278,400 EDA grant as part of the west main trunk line sewer extension project, which would entail the construction of a forced trunkline sewer, connecting to solid waste facilities. EDA assistance in the construction of this pressurized sewer system will make it possible for two financially troubled industries, upon which hundreds of jobs depend, to comply with Federal water pollution control standards, and thus remain in Fitchburg.

Both of these programs present cases where economically depressed communities have legitimate needs for Government EDA funds. Communities in over 1,100 counties across the Nation designated for EDA assistance are in similar straits. As a result of current and proposed administration actions, they face the loss of Government funds that they need to escape the vicious cycle of unemployment.

The current administration effort to kill the EDA program is only the latest in a long series of actions taken to hamper the effectiveness of the program. Just last October the President vetoed H.R. 16071, the Public Works and Economic Development Act, which combined EDA authorizations with a massive accelerated public works program designed to further reduce unemployment. In addition, the administration has consistently asked for appropriations of only a fraction—between 25 and 30 percent—of the amounts authorized for EDA. For example, the EDA appropriation for fiscal year 1973 was $314.2 million, about one-fourth of the $1.2 billion authorized.

EDA funds have also been victimized by impoundment. The recent Office of Management and Budget report to Congress cited impoundments of $2.5 million for EDA planning and technical assistance and $8.89 million for EDA development facilities.

The bill now being considered by the House Public Works Committee essentially continues EDA authorizations at the $1.2 billion level through June 30, 1974. The bill would provide $800 million for EDA public works grants, supplementary grants, and support for the continuation of the accelerated public works impact program. $170 million would be authorized for public works and business development loans. Regional Economic Development Commission programs would be authorized $152.5 million, and authorizations of $50 million would be provided for EDA technical assistance and research programs with another $50 million authorized for EDA growth centers and for bonuses for economic development districts.

This bill would have particular impact upon areas with a large concentration of low-income persons, substantial and continued unemployment, or actual or threatened unemployment as a result of closing or curtailment of a major source of employment.

The unemployment statistics in Massachusetts and in other economically depressed areas of the country speak for themselves. The jobless people in these areas need more than rhetorical calls for "self-reliance." They need jobs.

Madam Speaker, I continue to believe that the best way to quickly reduce unemployment is to provide grants and loans for local government and business construction projects which create immediate construction jobs in areas of high unemployment, and thus, will have highly desirable side effects in creating new employment throughout such areas.

This is the intent of the Economic Development Administration and the

public works programs authorized by this bill. It is for this reason that I believe prompt and favorable action on H.R. 2246 is necessary.

I believe that the basic concept of the EDA program—helping communities help themselves—is sound. EDA may need improvement, but it does not need to be abruptly terminated, as the administration has proposed. I hope that my fellow colleagues will follow the leadership of Chairman BLATNIK, my distinguished colleague JOHN MCFALL, and the other members of the Public Works Committee in supporting this important bill.

U.S.S. "CAVALLA" SSN-684

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

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Madame Speaker, on February 9, 1973, the newest nuclear attack submarine in our fleet, the U.S.S. *Cavalla*, was commissioned at New London, Conn. The sponsor of the *Cavalla* is the charming wife of our beloved colleague from Illinois, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, the Honorable MELVIN PRICE.

The principal speaker at the comissioning ceremony was my dear friend and distinguished constituent, Rear Adm. Herman J. Kossler, commandant of the 6th Naval District, which is headquartered in my congressional district. Admiral Kossler had the privilege of commanding the first *Cavalla* during World War II.

In his remarks, Admiral Kossler points out that by using the seas in the past, we have kept wars away from our shores and through our trade with foreign countries, we have enhanced our prosperity and our economic growth. Unfortunately, there are too many people in our country today who take free use of the seas for granted and apparently believe this will continue whether we do anything about it or not. This is very dangerous thinking. For if we do not maintain an adequate and a modern Navy strong enough to keep the sealanes open, we will be unable to maintain our position as the leading country in the world.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to have Admiral Kossler as a friend, Charleston is pleased to have him as a resident. I urge my colleagues to read his thought-provoking remarks delivered at the commissioning of the *Cavalla*.

"CAVALLA" COMMISSIONING FEBRUARY 9, 1973, NEW LONDON, CONN.

Twenty-nine years ago today—I was here in New London—fitting out the first *Cavalla*—and getting her ready to be commissioned—later in the month.

The *Cavallo* was originally scheduled—to be commissioned about 15 March 1944. However in early January—representatives of my crew came to me—and said they thought it would be lucky—if the commissioning could be held on 29 February 1944—thereby making *Cavalla* a leap year boat.

So I wrote a letter to Washington requesting that the commissioning date be changed. And the only reason—I gave in my letter to them—for requesting this change—was that my crew thought it would be lucky—and so did I. To my surprise the request was approved—and *Cavalla* became the only naval ship—to my knowledge—to be commissioned in leap year on 29 February.

And becoming a leap year boat—did seem to make *Cavalla* lucky—just as my crew had predicted. Because less than four months after commissioning—*Cavalla* had not only sighted—and reported the position of a large Japanese fleet—but also had successfully attacked—and sank a Japanese aircraft carrier.

Many of our submarines went through World War II—without ever seeing a major Japanese warship. And here *Cavalla*—had the experience on her first war patrol—of seeing practically every type of warship the Japanese had.

And I might add that *Cavalla*—was on patrol off the coast of Japan—when the war ended—and was one of the 12 submarines—to enter Tokyo Bay for the surrender ceremony. And so *Cavalla's* good luck—had continued right to the end of the war.

I took *Cavalla* back to Philadelphia—and she went out of commission in early 1946—after almost two years of active service. And included in this service—was six war patrols.

I mentioned earlier—that I thought *Cavalla* was the only Navy ship—to be commissioned on 29 February. Likewise I may have been the only skipper—to both commission and decommission the same boat. Incidentally—the *Cavalla* is now on permanent display—at Sea Wolf Park in Galveston, Texas.

I might add that I wrote to Washington—well over a year ago—before the new *Cavalla* was launched—and recommended that the launching date be changed—from the middle to the end of February—in order to make the new *Cavalla*—a leap year boat also. However this time they didn't buy my lucky story—as they did in Washington—29 years ago.

The new *Cavalla* which you see here today—was made possible—only by the close cooperation of Navy men—and skilled members of the civilian shipbuilding industry. In other words it is a product—of the military industrial complex. All Americans should be proud—and should be grateful—that we have such a complex.

The *Cavalla* is a tangible manifestation—of the strength—that our Navy must maintain. I am sure that the officers and men—who will sail in her—will match that strength—with their own determination and courage.

By using the seas in the past—we have kept wars away from our shores—and through our trade with foreign countries—we have enhanced our prosperity—and our economic growth. Unfortunately there are too many people in our country today—who take free use of the seas for granted—and apparently believe this will continue—whether we do anything about it or not. This is very dangerous thinking. For if we don't maintain an adequate—and a modern Navy—strong enough to keep the sea lanes open—we will be unable to maintain our position—as the leading country in the world.

Today as *Cavalla* is commissioned—she becomes part of a great—and a proud tradition—in the maintenance—of the freedom of the seas—and in achieving peace for mankind. The opportunity—and the obligation—to prove herself worthy of this tradition—begins today.

Cavalla's success in meeting today's challenges—will ultimately rest—with the officers and men who man her. They have the responsibility—and the hard work—of preparing her—maintaining her—and ensuring that *Cavalla* is successful—in whatever mission she is assigned. I know they will live up to this trust—and instill in *Cavalla*—a reputation of honor—hard work—and quality—in service to the United States Navy.

Their courage—discipline—and devotion to duty—are qualities we will need as much—to build a peaceful future—as we have needed in the past—in time of war.

Those of us who love our country—are facing the challenge—to strengthen our love of country—love of God—loyalty to family and community—and the willingness to put service above self. At a time when a small minority—has tried to glorify the few—who have refused to serve—it is more important than ever—that we respect the millions—who have loyally stood by their country—when the challenge to freedom—called for service.

Some of the voices we hear today—calling for a weak America—and for an isolationist America—are repeats of past mistakes. The same thinking—that they proclaim today—led an unprepared America—into two world wars—during this century—because it encouraged others to believe—that their aggression would go unpunished.

I believe that our domestic problems—need our very serious attention. However, it is because our armed forces—have been properly equipped—and properly manned over the years—that Americans have been permitted—to live in freedom—and to count their blessings—and their freedom—in hundreds of years. Therefore we can go too far—in diverting military money—to take care of domestic problems.

War has always been—the final result of weakness. And history has proven—that it is much cheaper to remain strong—than it is to have to pay the price—for being weak. Strength commands respect—weakness breeds contempt. And someone once said—that we can't prevent fires—by hating the fire department. Nor can we prevent war—by despising the military.

I don't know what has happened—to our pride in our country—and to our patriotism. Many Americans today—seem to want something for nothing—including their freedom. We must never forget—that when patriotism becomes a dirty word—a nation is ready to be taken to the cleaners.

I've had four different tours of duty—here in the New London area—and it's good to be back again.

My first visit here was 36 years ago—as a student at the submarine school—from January to June 1937. Then I was back to put two submarines in commission—the *Guardfish* in 1942—and the *Cavalla* in 1944. And my last assignment to duty here—which was also my last tour of duty in submarines—was commander of submarine squadron 2 in 1957—16 years ago.

In less than four months I will be retiring—after 43 years in uniform. I have many pleasant memories—of my naval career—but like all naval officers—my first command—is my most cherished memory. *Cavalla* indeed was a fine ship—and a lucky ship. The new *Cavalla*—will also be a fine ship—and a lucky ship.

Thanks for inviting me here today—and permitting me to reminisce—and to recall such pleasant memories.

I would like to close by quoting a part of the letter I received—from Secretary of the Navy Warner—concerning this ceremony today—and I quote:

"Over a quarter of a century has passed—since you commanded the first U.S.S. *Cavalla* (SS-244). Much has changed since then—in the world—and the Navy as well. But the need for dedicated men—to serve in our ships, still remains. This need was met—by those who sailed in the first *Cavalla*—and will continue to be met—by those who will sail in her namesake."

And so—to the officers and men of *Cavalla*—good luck—and may God bless you all.

WHILE CONGRESS SLEEPS, FOREIGN-MADE CRANES SWING OVER CAPITOL HILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Madam Speaker, it is tragically ironic that on a day when the House of Representatives votes to curb the flow of American dollars overseas, foreign-made construction cranes are swinging over Capitol Hill.

On the site of the $90 million Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building, several tower cranes are being erected, the component parts of which are made in France.

While we deplore our mounting balance-of-payments deficit, the United States literally subsidizes foreign manufacturers to build our public buildings right under our very noses.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, last Saturday, February 24, was a day most dear to Estonian people the world over. On that day, 55 years ago, the Republic of Estonia was instituted and the Estonian people reestablished their independence from czarist Russia.

This event was no small occasion, Madam Speaker. The shackles of oppression had long been worn by the Estonian people and when their statement of independence was pronounced, another blow was struck to the brow of tyranny. This joyous feeling was only experienced for two short decades, however. A new imperialist Prussian regime swallowed this brave new nation, attempting to choke the democratic principles of freedom and self-determination, which the Estonian people had come to love. It is a great testimonial to the fortitude of the Estonian people, Madam Speaker, that this conquest has not succeeded and will not ever succeed. The democratic ideals we so cherish in the United States still live strongly in the minds of Estonians everywhere.

We remember Estonian Independence Day each year to reaffirm our friendship and support for Estonians everywhere in their struggle for freedom. Estonian-Americans have contributed much to American life. We thank them for this today and also look to the future, hoping that one day soon, the sun of freedom will shine again in Estonia.

THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Madam Speaker, there was no mention of funds available for the Neighborhood Youth Corps—NYC—for next year in the President's 1974 budget.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is a 5-year-old inner-city youth employment and training program that has been administered by the Manpower Division of the Department of Labor since 1968. To date, this program has provided jobs for hundreds of thousands of underprivileged young men and women. These young people have been employed, primarily, during the summer months and after school hours, to enable them to earn money to continue their education and to supply them with additional training for their future careers. Without the Neighborhood Youth Corps most of these teenagers would be forced to drop out of high school. It is estimated that 75 percent would be welfare recipients within a year after their leaving school.

I cannot emphasize strongly enough, Madam Speaker, the importance of the NYC for the underprivileged youth of my city of Chicago and every major city in the United States. As an urban-oriented program, the Neighborhood Youth Corps is by far one of the most successful nation-wide youth programs ever to be instituted by the Federal Government.

This year alone, 31,617 young people are participating in the NYC program in Chicago. And 740,222 young people participated nationally. It is estimated that the demand for next year will increase nationwide by 278,769.

If it is the administration's intention to eliminate the Neighborhood Youth Corps or to group it with those programs supposedly covered under "special revenue sharing," I believe that nearly 1 million young Americans will be cruelly cheated out of the chance to build a future for themselves.

THE METRIC CONVERSION ACT OF 1973

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

Mr. FRASER. Madam Speaker, I am introducing today—with 22 bipartisan cosponsors—a bill to establish the international system of weights and measures—the metric system—as the sole system of measurements in the United States.

Almost 200 years ago Thomas Jefferson suggested adoption of the metric system. The United States is the only industrialized Nation in the world still using the "English system" of weights and measures—which the English have already abandoned.

Last year the Senate passed legislation to establish a board to develop a plan for conversion. Since the Constitution states—

> The Congress shall have the power to . . . fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.

This board seems unnecessary. My bill simply directs the Secretary of Commerce to develop and implement a plan. I believe it important that the plan be the direct result of congressional initiative. We keep creating boards and commissions and directives for the President rather than directing the executive branch ourselves.

We are already moving toward a fully metric economy. My intent is to move a little faster, and with a definite plan in mind. The benefits of complete conversion are already acknowledged by business—we will not need dual inventories, we will not need conversion tables, American products will be on a more equal footing in overseas markets.

I hope the House will hold hearings on the adoption of the metric system this year. I hope that both Houses pass a bill which will be sent to the President for his signature. But I also hope we will have the sense not to create something else to conduct the business of the Congress.

I include the text of the bill at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 4779

A bill to provide for the conversion of the United States to the metric system

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Metric Conversion Act of 1973."

SEC. 2. The International System of Units (hereinafter referred to as the "metric system") as established by the General Conference of Weights and Measures in 1960 and interpreted or modified for the United States by the Secretary of Commerce is fixed as the sole system of weights and measures in the United States, effective ten years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. The President shall take such actions as are necessary to assure that the executive departments and agencies of the United States shall convert to the metric system as soon as possible after the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall use the metric system exclusively in all official transactions no later than ten years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. The Commissioner of Education, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall develop and carry out a program of public education through the printed, broadcast, and other media—

(1) to inform the public of the conversion of the United States to the metric system as the sole system of weights and measures, and

(2) to assist the public in learning to utilize the metric system in accordance with that conversion.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized, under such reasonable terms and conditions as he shall prescribe, to make grants to individuals to defray otherwise nonreimbursable expenses which must be incurred by them for the purpose of acquiring tools or instruments which are necessary to their continued employment in a trade or business (including farming) and which are required as a result of the conversion to the metric system of the United States under this Act. Grants made under this subsection shall not exceed a total of $2,000 in the case of each individual.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to consult with, advise, and encourage each sector of the nation, including business and trade, labor, education, and consumers, in the process of a smooth and efficient conversion to the metric system.

BRITISH OPPOSITION TO GREEK JUNTA

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Madam Speaker, people from many lands who love Greece and who remember with gratitude the sacrifices made by the Greeks in their struggles against Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany have witnessed with despair the support given the present military government of Greece by

the Government of the United States, France, the German Federal Republic, and England.

Fortunately in each country there is strong opposition to each government's bizarre support of the oppressive, totalitarian, and cruel Greek junta. This opposition does not advocate interference in Greek affairs to overthrow the military junta, but it opposes vigorously and indignantly its own government's wooing of the colonels.

In Britain, support for freedom and democracy in Greece is centered in the League for Democracy in Greece, and the following describes the current work of their excellent organization:

BRITAIN AND GREECE

The opposition to the Colonels in Britain is very much centered around the League for Democracy in Greece, formed in London in 1945, shortly after the regrettable actions of the British Government toward the end of the war which led to the assumption of power in Greece of a very right wing Government and to the restoration of the Monarchy. Thereby, thousands of those who had shared in the magnificent resistance put up by the Greek guerillas against the Nazi invaders were thrown to the wolves or, worse, into the gaols of Greece as political prisoners.

During over 27 years of unremitting work for the restoration of the democracy that was then so cruelly denied to the Greek people, the League for Democracy in Greece has had the warm support of the British Trade Union and Labour movement, representing millions of workers, of the Co-operatives and Trades Councils and of thousands of individual supporters from among British workers, writers, artists, musicians, members of the academic world—in a word, from the liberal minded British public.

British governments have from time to time prodded the Greek regime about its political prisoners and lack of democracy, but only very gently—a reaction rather to the strong opposition of the British people to the Greek junta.

But in Government and official circles of late there has been an insidious but nevertheless observable change of attitude towards the Greek regime. Relations have gone beyond the mere exchange of diplomatic courtesies. Criticisms have quietened and the embarrassment of the empty Greek seat at the Council of Europe (the regime resigned to avoid the indignity of expulsion) is overlooked.

These closer relations with the junta have been recently enhanced by the holiday taken by our Minister of State for Defence, Lord Carrington in the Aegean which concluded with the so called unofficial visit to Athens and discussions with the Greek Prime Minister, Papadopoulos, and other members of his Government. The League for Democracy in Greece cabled Lord Carrington in Athens hoping that, whilst there, he would raise the question of the political prisoners and, as subsequently reported in the press, he did so and referred to what the Times described as the strong feelings in Britain on this subject. No doubt any embarrassment caused to our Minister of State for Defence in raising the topic was soon dispelled when discussions followed on the sale of arms by Britain to Greece, to which Lord Carrington agreed in principle—a surprising outcome, one might think, to a holiday trip in Greek waters and unofficial courtesy talks in Athens. With almost indecent haste Lord Carrington was followed back to Britain by a high ranking Greek emissary seeking to buy frigates etc. Arms deals are no doubt now well in hand.

David Tonge, who of late has been reporting especially informatively from Athens for the Guardian has pointed out, 12th October, 1972, that the last Minister of National Economy is on record as having said that "The road to his Ministry passes through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs—a dark reference to the regime's insistence that countries which wish to do business here should not expect to criticise the regime."

So, Lord Carrington having made peace with the junta, Lord Limerick from the Board of Trade, is now in Greece—on an official visit this time—and no doubt lucrative deals will be concluded with some of the Colonel's strongest supporters, who are to be found among the wealthy Greek shipowners, bankers, and industrialists, all closely allied with their American opposite numbers.

It is for the League for Democracy in Greece and its supporters to ensure that such deals are not concluded at the price of continued human suffering and torture—now rated very cheaply in far too many quarters. As has been reported by the British press, Congressman Hall protested that McGovern's policy of "cessation of US support for the repressive Government in Greece" will mean a loss of 130 million dollars for the McDonnell-Douglas Aircraft Corporation in Missouri."

It is regrettable to see some Churchmen in Britain joining in the good fellowship now being fostered with a regime which, not only tortures, imprisons and exiles its political prisoners, but constantly denies committing these atrocities despite the irrefutable evidence to the contrary from many sources including, very recently, Mr. Niall MacDermott, Q.C., Secretary-General of the International Commission of Jurists. Archbishop Athmagoras, head of the Greek Orthodox Church in Britain, entertained a few days ago the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Heenan and others at Grosvenor House to a £7 a head banquet a "Divine Way to spend an evening a la Grecque" as the Guardian aptly described it, 27.10.72. Only a few days earlier, Mr. Niall MacDermott had reported that Greek opponents to the regime banished to remote villages (which include Professor John Pesnazoglou, formerly Deputy Governor of the Bank of Greece and Professor of Political Economy in the University of Athens, and Mr. Anastasios Piparis, a former Director General of the Greek Broadcasting Corporation) were allowed the equivalent of 30p a day with which to maintain themselves! Mr. MacDermott also pointed out that such banishments without trial were a violation of Article 10 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Unhappily it is well known that the higher dignatories of the Greek Church are firm supporters of the Colonels. But within the Church there are such honourable exceptions as Father Petros Gavales, twice imprisoned and subjected to torture, on one occasion for removing from his Church a picture of the Prime Minister put there by the Police. Father George Pirounakis has been constantly hindered and harassed in his work, and has complained to his bishop about the Church's apparent acceptance of military police involvement in ecclesiastical matters. Last August he complained to Ieronymous, Archbishop of Athens and all Greece and the Holy Synod about their lack of support. One wonders if Dr. Ramsey, who was the official guest and speaker at the Grosvenor House banquet and who accepted a decoration from his host, is as fully aware of the true situation of the Church in Greece as he should be.

The British Government are not alone in their increasing co-operation with the Greek regime. The US Government, which has always been a main support, is now transferring thousands of American families to Greece having adopted Piraeus as the home port for their 6th Fleet. This action removes any doubt which might have lingered in some people's minds that the US Administration, still less the Pentagon, had any serious concern about democracy in Greece and the political prisoners there.

The Guardian, 28.9.72, reported that Bonn and Athens were "mending fences". No doubt this is to ensure that the German Federal Republic, too, gets an economic and political foothold in Greece. West German military aid was also discussed.

As the date for Britain joining the EEC draws close our Government is likely to be more susceptible to Greek pressure the British support for their membership of the EEC and the Council of Europe. This means that the new West European bloc, especially in the light of some strong neo-fascist tendencies within it and of NATO pressures because of Greece's strategic position, will be the more ready to forget the political prisoners and the democratic freedom of the Greek people.

But within Britain there is a great warmth and friendship for the people of Greece, with roots deep in history, and a real sense of gratitude for the sacrifices made by the Greeks in their struggles against fascist Italy and Nazi Germany. This explains the breadth of feeling and concern among all sections of people in Britain at the present fate of the proud Greek nation. We have seen striking reminders of this in the anxious questions in the House of Lords, in the letter published in the columns of the Times from British academics, in the concerns of so eminent a jurist as Lord Gardiner (Lord Chancellor in the Labour Government) and by the many eminent signatories, from so many walks of life, to the Amnesty appeal this year on behalf of the political prisoners and exiles. It also explains the frequent articles in the press, the numerous books published about the Greek situation and the readiness of people to help, like the distinguished Prof. D. F. N. Harrison, who went to Greece and gave his medical service to a gravely sick political prisoner.

Our Trade Union movement has over many years supported the Greek people in their struggle for democratic and trade union rights. Three times within recent months there have been fine examples of solidarity with Greek workers by our trade unions. Concerted action by the National Union of Seamen, The Transport and General Workers' Union, the International Transport Workers' Federation and Mr. Anthony Wedgewood Benn, MP, prevented the "Elikon", a Cypriot registered but, in reality, Greek owned vessel, from leaving Avonmouth Dock until arrears of wages had been met and the ship's crew brought up to strength.

The National Union of Seamen and the International Transport Workers' Federation supported a group of African seamen who left a Greek ship at Avonmouth this month because they were being grossly underpaid. On the 24th of October the officers and crew of the "Gulf Coast" threatened to desert at Avonmouth because of wages and conditions. This ship flew the Cypriot flag of convenience. Its Third Engineer, Andrew Bankhead, a Scot, told the local paper "We have chosen this port to make our stand because of help given here to crews". He claimed that the crew were treated like slaves. They were refused contracts, given poor food and forced to work long hours.

Mr. Alan Sapper, General Secretary of the Association of Cinematograph and Television Technicians was once offered a free holiday in Greece by the junta's emissaries, with every allurement at the Colonels' command. His Union exercised and still does a boycott against its members working on films, other than news films, in Greece—a splendid example of disinterested trade union action. This boycott has been wonderfully effective, and more and more locations for British produced films are being sought in countries other than Greece because of the boycott. Needless to say, Mr. Sapper declined the junta's visit and the Colonels are perhaps now wiser than to offer such entertainment to leading British trade unionists and confine their hospitality to members

of the Government, business tycoons and a few of our higher Church dignatories.

The work of the League continues above all to revolve around an amnesty for all the political prisoners and exiles but, in the meantime we press for the release, if only temporary, of sick prisoners, the release of aged prisoners, the betterment of prison conditions and the abandonment of torture and trials by Court martial. Whenever possible we try to arrange for observers to attend trials—this encourages the accused and their lawyers, brings publicity to Greek methods of justice, exposes the junta and undoubtedly results in reduced sentences.

We have organised and shall continue to organise amnesty appeals in this country and in this have been supported, to the chagrin of the Greek authorities, by many eminent people.

We are always alert to the importance of focusing the light of publicity on the junta's activities and have found recently a splendid response from the public media. Also our activities are often brought to the notice of the Greek public by the BBC Greek Service—an invaluable medium of news to Greeks about what is really happening in their own country and of events throughout the world which affect them.

We send delegates to international conferences which deal directly or indirectly with problems created by the junta. We regard it as important to bring to the notice of such international gatherings the implications, for World peace and European security and democracy, of the fascist military dictatorship in Greece.

Through its individual membership and affiliated organisations the League is able to maintain a consistent campaign in support of Greek democracy, in addition to taking special action as developments occur.

We also work to ensure support for the Greek Relief Fund (26, Goodge Street, London WIP IFG) through which financial aid is sent to political prisoners and their families. The continued aid to these Greek democrats is yet another proof of the British people's sympathy for the Greek people.

We regard solidarity with Greek democrats as our prime concern at the same time believing it to be in the best traditions and true interests of our own people and country. The violation of democracy in Greece is an injury to us all and the military build-up in that country is a matter of concern to all who want justice and peace.

NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION THANKED BY GREEK STUDENT PRISONERS

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Madam Speaker, last summer Congressman BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL brought to our attention the resolution passed by the 25th Congress of the National Student Association expressing their opposition to continued American support for the military dictatorship which is now in power in Greece and mandating their resolve to continue to speak out, study, and take action in support of Greek students engaged in resistance to the junta.

In response, I would like to include the following letter addressed to the Student Union of the United States:

FRIENDS: During the Christmas and New Year holidays we send you our sincere greetings.

We send these greetings as a small gesture of appreciation for the effort and struggle which you have exerted to assist our student youth and the people of our country during the difficult days which they are experiencing under the military fascist dictatorship.

We were especially touched by the resolution which you passed at your last Congress of your association requesting the release of all political prisoners.

Your protest and assistance have, for us, special depth and meaning because it shows that there isn't just an America of the military-industrial complex, the America of Nixon who with money, weapons and every other kind of aid, backs up the dictatorship in our country. There is also another America. The America of the toilers and thinkers who believe in the democratic principles of Lincoln and Jefferson.

Dear friends, we request that you transmit our warm wishes and our fighting greetings to all the democratic American students.

With warm greetings,

THE STUDENT POLITICAL PRISONERS OF THE KORYDALLOS AND AEGINA PRISONS.

STATEMENT UPON INTRODUCTION OF VIETNAM VETERANS DAY RESOLUTION

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I am introducing today, along with several of my colleagues, a resolution authorizing President Nixon to proclaim a Vietnam Veterans Day, honoring those men who have served and returned to their homes, those men missing in action, and those men who have made the supreme sacrifice of giving their lives for their country.

The necessity of such a day is self-evident. This was an unpopular war, a war which incurred a great deal of suffering, not only on the battlefields, but also, in the hearts of many Americans.

Madam Speaker, this war in Vietnam, unlike any past war in our history, did not leave any heroic glory in its wake. Instead, this war belittled and discredited many of our brave, heroic soldiers who were steadfastly loyal to our Nation.

Throughout our involvement in Southeast Asia, we have criticized and we have been criticized. Now that our negotiations have successfully terminated our involvement, let our internal strife also be terminated by a genuine thanksgiving among the American people. Let there be a Vietnam Veterans Day as a day of remembrance for those valiant young souls who gave their lives in their commitment to their country; let this Vietnam Veterans Day be a day of thanksgiving for those prisoners of war reuniting with their families and friends; and let this Vietnam Veterans Day be a day of blessing, honoring those soldiers who have fought and returned to their homes.

Madam Speaker, before we consider the issue of amnesty for those who refused to fight, let us clearly set forth our priorities. Let us pay tribute to our unsung heroes whose conscience directed them to bear arms in defense of liberty and freedom for the people of South Vietnam.

I ask my colleagues here and in the Senate to join in support of this Vietnam Veterans Day resolution. Do not let our soldiers feel their sacrifices have been in vain. Let us seal the rift this war has caused in so many hearts, by joining together to honor the veterans of our Vietnam war.

The cosponsors of this resolution are: Mr. FISH, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. Speaker, I have attached a copy of my proposed joint resolution authorizing President Nixon to proclaim Vietnam Veterans Day. I include this resolution in the RECORD:

H.J. RES. 381

Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim a "Vietnam Veterans Day"

Whereas a negotiated peace ended hostilities in South East Asia; and

Whereas arrangements for the fullest possible accounting of Prisoners of War and men missing in action are currently underway; and

Whereas the veterans of the Vietnam conflict have made valiant sacrifices to foster American ideals; and

Whereas we can take great strength, renewed faith and courage from the outstanding service of our veterans; and

Whereas the sacrifices of our servicemen in Vietnam encourage our rededication to the precepts that have made America such a tower of strength among the nations of the world; and

Whereas the thousands of servicemen who have now returned from the Vietnam conflict are deserving of due recognition for their courage and service on behalf of our nation:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating a "Vietnam Veterans Day", honoring those men who have served and returned to their homes, those men missing in action and those men who have made the supreme sacrifice of giving their lives for their country, and to invite and encourage the citizens of the United States, especially veteran's groups, churches, and their affiliated organizations, to observe this day with the appropriate ceremonies and activities.

PROTECTING THE HOME OF OUR FIRST PRESIDENT—GEORGE WASHINGTON

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Madam Speaker, over the years, the Congress has, appropriately, honored our first President with deeds as well as words.

Twelve years ago, the Congress enacted Public Law 87-362, designed to preserve the view from Washington's beautiful home at Mount Vernon. Washington prized that view from the porch of Mount Vernon; I assume that everyone in this Chamber has made the pilgrimage to Mount Vernon at one time or another, so you too are aware of the inner peace and tranquillity which comes from surveying the historic countryside surrounding Washington's home.

Following the action of Congress to protect the view, over 180 landowners have donated scenic easements on their land to the National Park Service. They too have come to appreciate the uniqueness—to the history of our country—of the areas having a direct esthetic impact on the Mount Vernon area. Two foundations, one led by our former col-

league, the Honorable Frances Bolton of Ohio, have donated over half the 6 miles of waterfront lands. The donations made possible substantial completion of Piscataway Park, the newest of the National Parks in the National Capital area.

On three separate occasions since the original act, the Congress has acted to preserve, protect, and expand the area which surrounds and/or, in an esthetic sense, is an integral part of the George Washington homesite.

Three years hence, we celebrate the bicentennial. Mount Vernon will, of course, be highlighted as one of the principal preserved landmarks of the revolutionary period. Its unique historical setting on the Potomac River, which is to be a model for the Nation, makes it mandatory for the Congress to complete the task of preservation.

The Congress had to act hastily to prevent the monumental insult of a sewage plant directly opposite Mount Vernon. And, as the Congress is aware, encroachments on both Marshall Hall on one flank of the park and the marina at Fort Washington on the other flank of the park, were allowed to remain. These modern day monstrosities have disrupted and degraded the character of the park and Mount Vernon itself for years.

I believe it is proper to mention at this point, and publicly thank, the American Horticultural Society, for its recent purchase of George Washington's historic river front farm south of Mount Vernon. Although my information is sketchy, I understand the sale is to be completed tomorrow, and that the Society intends to open the estate to the public. It is also in order at this point to commend again our colleague JOEL T. BROYHILL, who represents the 10th Congressional District of Virginia, for his efforts to preserve that particular property from the clutches of a foreign power some years ago.

In order that Piscataway National Park may be completed for the bicentennial celebration, I am proposing today what I believe is the last legislation needed. This bill will bring the potential encroachments on the park under the full control of the U.S. National Park Service of the Department of the Interior. At the same time, the bill will provide access to the river via the only State road in the area. It will, in this way, provide accessible space for picnicking, biking, and camping, and similar public uses in keeping with the original intent of the Congress. It is my hope that the bill will receive speedy approval of our colleagues in both Houses.

It is fitting and proper that Congress make its own Washington birthday's gift to the Nation by 1976. The legislation introduced today will achieve that goal.

F–14 BEST IN EVERY WAY

(Mr. GROVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROVER. Madam Speaker, the recent publicity given the contractual dispute between the U.S. Navy and the Grumman Aerospace Corp over financing of the F–14 aircraft has many people confused.

I should like my congressional colleagues to note three conclusions I have drawn in the matter.

First. The company's estimates were off target in great part because of Government error in projection of inflation increases.

Second. The F–14 is an outstanding weapons system which the Navy wants desperately and our national security demands.

Third. An equitable compromise should be reached immediately.

There is little better endorsement of this great aircraft that can be found than the one given by one of our colleagues, Hon. OTIS G. PIKE, of New York.

The following newspaper articles detail his observations:

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Daily News, Feb. 10, 1973]

PIKE TAKES A FLIGHT IN F–14—HE CALLS IT "VASTLY SUPERIOR PLANE"

(By Michael Hanrahan)

A swing-wing Navy fighter jet took off from Calverton, L.I., yesterday afternoon and before it traveled a distance of 5,000 feet it was 8,000 feet high and had reversed directions.

One hour later, Otis Pike (D.-Riverhead), climbed down from the cockpit to the Grumman test runway and announced that the F–14 was a "vastly superior plane" to the F–4, the fighter plane now in use by the Navy.

Pike, a former Marine fighter pilot and a ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, flew as navigator in a demonstration flight by Grumman's chief test pilot, Chuck Seweel.

"Grumman has built an obviously very solid, honest, smooth machine," said Pike.

"We flew against the F–4 in tighter turns and quicker rolls," he said. "The F–14 can clearly turn inside the F–4, can clearly run away from the F–4, can clearly outclimb the F–4, and makes split S maneuvers far superior to the F–4."

The Grumman Aerospace Corp., Long Island's largest industrial plant, is in a running feud with the Navy on escalating costs of producing the F–14. Grumman, which says it wants to continue building the plane, says it cannot do so at the contracted price. To do so says a Grumman spokesman, "would put us out of business."

Negotiations in an attempt to reach a compromise are being conducted between the Secretary of the Navy and the company. Congress, will be asked to pass on appropriations for the plane. And the Senate is conducting an investigation into the Grumman claim that it is unable to live up to a contract which was first drawn in 1968.

To date, 22 planes have been delivered to the Navy, with 64 more to be delivered by mid-1974. Grumman contends the order will result in a $65 million loss. The company said it would absorb that amount but is declining to build an additional 48 planes under contract as part of a fifth lot order.

WANT $2.2 MILLION MORE

Company cost experts claim that the Navy will have to pay an additional $2.2 million per airplane on the fifth lot order. The current cost of the F–14 is $16.7 million per craft.

Pike said in an interview yesterday, "I don't think the difference in cost should be the deciding factor in whether or not the Navy gets the F–14. The fact of the matter is the Navy certainly needs it. It is unquestionably the best plane available."

Pike contended that it is impossible for Congress to determine whether the plane is actually worth any particular cost in the terms of dollars and cents. "That matter is up to the Secretary of the Navy and the airplane manufacturing company," he said.

Yesterday's flight was instituted at the request of Pike, who said he never had any doubt as to the performance capabilities of the aircraft.

The last government official to fly in the F–14 was Sen. Barry Goldwater (R.-Ariz.), a brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve. Goldwater flew in the plane on Nov. 29, 1972.

Pike said yesterday that the last time he actually piloted a plane was in 1945, when as a Marine night fighter pilot he flew an F–6FN out of Peking, China.

Pike contended yesterday that the dispute over the F–14, a long-range interceptor jet, will have no bearing on the development of the AX–10, a much smaller close air support for ground troop plane being developed by Fairchild Industries.

[From the Long Island (N.Y.) Press, Feb. 10, 1973]

UP, UP, AWAY, PIKE SAYS F–14 BEST IN "EVERY WAY"

(By Karl Grossman)

The F–14 jet fighter with Rep. Otis G. Pike in the back seat went straight up . . . and up . . . and up . . . like a rocket into the skies over Long Island yesterday.

Its pilot later explained: "We were at 8,000 feet just halfway down the runway."

Then, high in the sky, the airplane made a sharp turn and winged to a patch of ocean south of Long Island for a simulated dog fight.

The F–14 was put up against an F–4, and Pike said later: "It outflew it in every way."

Then the plane headed east, toward Block Island. "I could see Nantucket, and up north the snow on the Catskills," Pike recalled.

After a total of an hour in the sky, the plane landed back at Calverton with a thoroughly impressed but somewhat bloodied congressman-passenger.

"I'm getting a little too old for this stuff," said Pike, 52, a former Marine fighter pilot, as he hopped out. The enormous changes in pressure had left him with "a bloody toothache," he complained. Still, he said, "it was fun."

Fun, obviously, wasn't the object of Pike's ride in the sleek, supersonic Grumman jet plane.

In the wake of months of debate in Washington over the F–14, Pike said he wanted to learn for himself how much the plane is worth in the air.

"It's better than looking at pictures," he said.

And, said Pike after his ride: "Grumman has built an obviously solid, honest, smooth machine."

The craft, he said, "can clearly turn inside the F–4, can clearly fly away from the F–4, can clearly outclimb the F–4." And this was important to know, said Pike, because in Washington "they've been saying it (the F–14) can't do anything the F–4 can do."

And after his ride, said Pike, he was committed "more than ever" to the $16.8 million F–14.

"I'm impressed as hell," said Pike, a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Grumman and the Navy have been arguing over Grumman's insistence that it be paid an additional $105 million for a batch of 48 F–14's ordered by the Navy.

Pike said yesterday he feels that the Bethpage firm should get at least some of what it wants extra.

Pike said the last time he flew a Grumman aircraft was in Peking, China in 1945.

"It was a Grumman F6FN then," said Pike, an ancient propeller-driven plane compared to the F–14.

Peking, he explained, was his last stop with the F6FN after piloting the craft on 120 combat missions in the Pacific Theatre during World War II.

Even for a former flyer, the F–14 take-off, said Pike, "was just incredible."

"I think they were trying to see if the old man was going to throw up," said the Riverhead congressman.

Grumman's chief test pilot, Chuck Sewell, denied this—with a wide smile. Sewell said he was demonstrating how the F–14 has the attributes of a Short Take-Off-and Landing (STOL) craft, and needs little room to take off and land.

The plane is designed for aircraft carrier work with the Navy, and so this is important, he stressed.

The plane landed at the Grumman-Navy Airfield in Calverton in just 1500 feet.

TEXAS VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER TALKS ON FREEDOM

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam Speaker, the freedom provided all of us as citizens of the United States of America is our most priceless possession. Throughout our history, Americans have fought and died to preserve this freedom, and we look to the youth of our Nation to preserve it for generations yet unborn.

I am not worried about the future, because I know there are young people like Barbara Ann Massey of Plano, Tex., who appreciates the freedom we enjoy and who realize the responsibilities that go with it.

Barbara is the Texas State winner in this year's Voice of Democracy Contest, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Jimmie D. King of 1812 Fairfield Drive, Plano, Tex., and is a senior at Plano High School.

This outstanding young lady was one of 500,000 students from over 7,000 secondary schools participating in this year's contest. As the winner in State competition, she will now compete with the winners from other States for five national scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes.

Her award-winning broadcast script addresses itself to the theme, "My Responsibility to Freedom," and it is an excellent speech. I am today inserting Barbara Ann Massey's remarks into the RECORD, so that my colleagues may have the opportunity to read this most timely and interesting speech. I am proud to have Barbara as my constituent.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Barbara Ann Massey)

I prosper where men strive for justice. I am deeply embedded in the minds of all mankind, no matter how subconsciously hidden. My companions are courage and truth. I represent the struggles of all the centuries, of all the nations. I have many symbols. I am present in spirit in the cracked bell of Liberty. I am present in the welcoming statue in New York Harbor. My birth certificate is the constitution and my degree of achievement is the Bill of Rights. I am the basis upon which the greatest nation the earth has ever known is built. My nickname is liberty. My true name is freedom; my twin brother is democracy, and I am alive and living in the hearts of all mankind, Freedom. It's more than just flag-waving, and firecrackers on the Fourth of July and the way you feel when the Star Spangled Banner is played.

"Give me your tired, your poor, your hungry, your homeless . . ." Freedom. It offers so much and yet it demands respect and it demands responsibility.

A high school yearbook once had this legend under a picture of a group of smiling, happy people, "Friendship is not an opportunity, but a sweet responsibility." The same comparison can be drawn between friendship and freedom. Many are born into freedom. Few realize that with this opportunity comes the responsibility to live and practice freedom. It is the duty of all free people to spread freedom, share freedom, live freedom. In a nation of growing apathy, freedom seems to be a part of a breed of dying words. And yet freedom is more than just a once a year celebration of a few minutes tribute at a ball game. Who can forget the immortal words of President John F. Kennedy? "Ask not what your country can do for you, but rather, ask what you can do for your country."

Is not freedom a part of our country, a part of our heritage? Our country has always been extremely freedom oriented. This country was formed because of the desire for freedom. Our courts of justice and our laws are based on freedom. Our government is based on freedom, even our whole social structure is based on the idea of freedom. This country was conceived in freedom and has prospered on freedom. This is where we come in. It is our responsibility to see that this freedom is continued. Not a stilted, false freedom but the kind of freedom that has made this nation the United States of America. Freedom still reigns supreme in this nation. It is our responsibility and our privilege to carry out freedom. Freedom does not live by itself; it lives through man, and through it—man lives. From every mountainside truly let freedom ring.

THE PRESS: NOT A DIVINE ESTATE

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Madam Speaker, there have been numerous shrill cries lately on the subject of the journalist's alleged privilege or right to refuse in any and all cases to reveal the source of a story.

A great deal of this breast-beating is to the effect that newsmen are, somehow, a special breed not subject to the laws that govern their fellow citizens.

In years gone by I spent a considerable part of my life as a reporter, editor, and news broadcaster and in my opinion it is about time to put an end to the claim that those in the news business have some sort of divine right not available to mortal men.

Few journalists of our time have been so honored as Clark Mollenhoff, the Washington bureau chief of the Des Moines, Iowa Register. This Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter who, incidentally, is a lawyer, has written a telling argument in opposition to those who would, by legislative fiat, give journalists blanket immunity from revealing their sources.

This article appeared in the February 24, 1973, edition of Human Events and I include it at this point in the RECORD.

LET'S TAKE A CLOSER LOOK AT "SHIELD LAWS"

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

I am reluctant to support any legislation to change, modify or clarify the 1st Amendment protection of the United States Constitution with regard to freedom of the press.

In the first place, it is impossible to define or limit those covered by the "freedom . . . of the press" clause without doing serious violence to the full meaning of the Constitution. It is not for the protection of the big newspapers and magazines and broadcasting only, but must include the weakest, poorest-financed pamphleteer regardless of beliefs.

This leads to the second point which nearly everyone mentions in proposing "shield" laws. How can it be written so it covers only "newsmen" entitled to protect their "confidential sources" and eliminates the possibility of its use by extremist groups or gangsters as a cover for illegal operations? It should be obvious that any restriction in coverage would be likely to eliminate the pamphleteer, who probably needs protection more than any of the better-financed groups. The underworld would have no problem in financing a newspaper that could meet any standards set in a shield law.

Thirdly, if reporters and editors are only reasonably competent, responsible and understanding of their job, they do not need shield laws to be effective in exposing government corruption and mismanagement or repressive measures.

I have been working as an investigative reporter for more than 30 years and that experience has involved a broad and varied use of "confidential sources." It has involved exposure of scandals from the Polk County, Iowa, courthouse to the White House and essentially every type of city, county, state or federal agency.

I have always protected my "confidential sources," and in only a few instances have been even faced with a choice of whether to reveal the source or risk contempt. The crisis never did materialize.

It is seldom that the crisis does materialize for the thinking reporters and editors who use some sense of responsibility in entering into "confidential" relationships with their sources and the manner in which the information is used.

My experience indicates that it is seldom that responsible editors and reporters need a shield law, and it could hardly be argued that the irresponsible press needs further encouragement. It is the irresponsibility of a few that makes the press vulnerable to the criticism that destroys public confidence.

There is a great deal of sympathy for public officials who are subjected to provably false attacks by other politicians or by the press. The public reactions against "smears" by the political critics or by the press is a proper reaction, and the last thing we need today is a law that could be a further invitation to irresponsibility.

It is a serious business to charge political figures with corruption, mismanagement or to otherwise reflect upon their integrity or competence. Certainly, it is also a serious business to consider clothing the press with a near total immunity that is comparable only to the immunity that members of the House and Senate enjoy in connection with remarks made in Congress.

Hardly a year goes by that we do not see some examples of what for the last 20 years has become known as "McCarthyism" by some member of the Senate or House. We have seen and we have probably deplored the abuse of the constitutional provision that no member of the House or Senate shall be "questioned in any other place" for "any speech or debate in either house."

To pass some of the broader shield laws suggested would in fact clothe all publishers, editors, reporters, columnists and commentators with the same immunity that

senators and representatives enjoy to fire charges at public officials on the basis of anonymous "confidential informants."

We should ask ourselves if we really believe that all publishers, editors, reporters and commentators are that much better in their motivations and that much more responsible than the members of the Senate and House we have criticized for "McCarthyism."

We should ask ourselves if an invitation to more irresponsibility is the medicine the press needs in addition to the United States Supreme Court decision in the case of *New York Times vs. Sullivan* that frees us from libel responsibility in all except those instances involving provable malice.

This decision certainly gives all the protection the press needs to cover its unintentional errors and even sloppiness associated with meeting daily deadlines. And the United States Supreme Court is speaking on the Pentagon Papers case gave an added dimension to the news media's right to publish the contents of government papers carrying the highest national security classifications.

The prosecution of Daniel Ellsberg for "leaking" the Pentagon Papers is another problem since he identified himself as the source, and the government through other evidence had pretty well established his identity even before he made the admissions.

It is an irresponsible reporter who writes a story on the uncorroborated statements of a so-called "confidential source," and it is an irresponsible editor who does not insist upon such corroboration as a test of the truth or falsity of the confidential information.

A few unrelated arrests of reporters for failing to reveal "confidential sources" have resulted in a near hysterical atmosphere in which it is quite likely that legislators may be pressured into passing unwise laws.

I say unwise laws because I fear that in the long run shield laws could become the instrumentality for a government control of the press.

That danger comes in the demands of a large number of legislators for a definition of "legitimate newsmen" and "legitimate news media" to be shielded from disclosure of confidential sources. Once the definition is drawn some person or group of persons will have to be empowered to determine who are "legitimate newsmen" and what are "legitimate news media."

Obviously that power must vest in some entity selected by the press, the public or the government. Certainly a public election of those with this power has innumerable hazards, and who in the press would or should be trusted with this authority over his colleagues.

Any government role in naming or selecting the men to make the decision as to who are "legitimate newsmen" has the major drawback of permitting government to have "a little control" over the press.

The Standing Committee of Correspondents is the group that would come closest to being an objective committee, and present standards this group uses certainly would bring complaints from the extremist pamphleteers and propagandists who would undoubtedly be excluded from the definition of "legitimate newsmen."

The broadcasting industry is rightfully concerned that the so-called "fairness doctrine" will be used by this Administration or some later Administration as a vehicle for exerting a government control of radio and television licenses. The speech by Dr. Clay Whitehead gives some concept of the attitude of the Nixon Administration and how it might seek to use the "fairness doctrine" lever against those in the broadcasting industry who displease the Administration.

It is not wise to underestimate the ability of government lawyers to twist and distort almost any law into authority for withholding documents that the executive branch wants to keep secret.

We have seen the Nixon Administration's recent expansion of the claims of "executive privilege" to the point it is blocking Congress, the press, the public and even the General Accounting Office (GAO) auditors from important information on government operations and on the expenditures of tax money.

We have seen how the bureaucrats, often with White House approval, have even twisted the exceptions to the Freedom of Information Act to justify withholding documents from the press and the public. The Freedom of Information Act was passed only a little more than six years ago for the specific purpose of assuring a maximum free access to government information. The exceptions to the act have been expanded and distorted by misinterpretation by government lawyers into a law to suppress information.

It went to the ludicrous extreme where the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and the AID agency refused to reveal such basic biographical information on employes as place of birth, schools attended, and prior places of employment. The refusal was justified by government lawyers on grounds that the Freedom of Information Act authorizes the withholding of personnel records as confidential.

Those of us who were active in amending the so-called "housekeeping statute" (5 U.S.C. 22) recognize the great capacity of the bureaucrats for interpreting any law to provide a justification for nondisclosure of information.

In that case, a law that was written to provide for the custody and preservation of government records had through a series of interpretations by the various attorneys general been turned into the most widely quoted grounds for withholding documents.

How are we to assure that a shield law that is written for the protection of the "confidential sources" of legitimate newsmen will not be turned around and used as an instrument of government control?

As I set out the reasons the press should be wary about a shield law, I do not wish to give the impression that I am downgrading the value of "confidential sources." As one one who has availed myself of information from such "confidential sources," I know such informants are indispensable in our efforts to expose and correct the dishonesty and unfair practices that creep into every government agency from time to time.

My coolness to a shield law is based upon my belief that skillful use of information from confidential sources will usually leave no hint that the original tips came from confidential sources. The full protection of the confidential sources requires that the reporter and his editors handle the information in such a manner that there is no direct or indirect clue as to the source.

Deadlines and the need for a "scoop" are never justifications for failing to check out the information that comes from a confidential source. If the reporter has a true confidential relationship with his source the responsibility is not merely to not use his name, but to in every way possible avoid giving any indication of the identity of the source.

If a thorough job is done of corroborating the informant's story, the story itself need not indicate that it came from a confidential informant.

Over the centuries the only universally recognized confidential relationships have been those of doctor and patient, lawyer and client, husband and wife, and priest and confesser. In each of these four relationships the confidentiality is required for the benefit of the person making the disclosure—the patient, the client, and the confesser and, in theory at least, for the mutual benefit of husband and wife.

In each of those confidential relationships the area of confidentiality protected is carefully circumscribed, and specifically exempted are some statements made in the presence of other parties or information that is to be passed on to third persons.

The major beneficiaires of a newspaper informant's statement that is confidential are the reporter and his newspaper, not the informant.

The question that puts the whole thing in perspective involves the question of what the newspaper would do if a story from a confidential source resulted in a substantial libel suit against the newspaper. Would the newspaper, with its economic base threatened, permit its reporter to remain silent on a confidential source who might be the key to whether the newspaper had acted responsibly or irresponsibly?

It would be difficult to justify using a shield law to protect a reporter's confidential source in a criminal contempt action while refusing to permit the same reporter to protect those sources in a civil libel action against his newspaper, its publisher, or editors.

Finally, it is my deep belief that this is, and must be, a nation guided by laws and not a nation guided by the whims of any man who is temporarily in charge of government or any group of men who are in a position to control public opinion. All men have a responsibility under our laws and our Constitution to give testimony in civil and criminal proceedings and to produce relevant records.

Prof. James Wigmore in his celebrated treatise on evidence declared that "the public . . . has a right to every man's evidence," including that of "a person occupying at the moment the office of chief executive."

"His temporary duties as an official cannot override his permanent and fundamental duty as a citizen and as a debtor to justice," Prof. Wigmore wrote.

Chief Justice John Marshall in *United States vs. Burr* held that "a subpoena may issue to the President" and that the "accused is entitled to it of course . . . whatever difference may exist with respect to the power to compel the same obedience to the process."

In a letter responding to the subpoena, President Jefferson acknowledged the obligation of the chief executive to give testimony, but said he could not journey to Richmond for the Burr trial. However, it was noted that he would be available in Washington for the taking of a deposition.

The press properly criticizes the President for his expansion of the claim of "executive privilege" in a manner that makes his entire White House staff unaccountable to the Congress and to the courts.

It is illogical for the press to assail President Nixon for the power grabs inherent in his expansion of the claim of "executive privilege" at the same time that some segments are asking the Congress for a near total immunity from the process of grand juries, the courts and Congress.

I believe that law enforcement officials should be restrained in the use of subpoenas to compel newsmen to testify or produce records, and should not do it if there is any other alternative. There is a danger of its being used as a tool of harassment against an aggressive press, but the facts will usually speak for themselves in such cases.

The 1st Amendment guarantees of freedom of speech, freedom of press and freedom of assembly have served us well. Our Supreme Court has wisely ruled that radio and television are equally protected by the 1st Amendment, but has rejected expansion to protect reporters' "confidential sources" up to this point.

I have no doubt that the Supreme Court will come up with a protection for "confidential sources" when the fact situation makes it apparent that prosecutors and law enforcement officials are using their power of subpoena to harass and intimidate the press.

In the meantime, the press would do well

to be more discriminating and more thoughtful about the cases it pushes in court and the principles that those cases represent. It is well to remember the legal maxim that "bad cases make bad law."

We have shield laws on the books in a number of states providing us laboratories for continuous study of the problems encountered in their administration and enforcement. We should ask ourselves if we are interested in practical solutions, or are we interested in flashy stunting in front of a grandstand.

If we criticize an administration for sloganeering that we characterize as superficial, slick and deceptive gimmickry from the advertising world, we have a greater obligation not to be caught up with equally superficial efforts to make the cry of "freedom of the press" cover all of our sins. The need for a "scoop" is never a justification for rushing to press and failing to corroborate a confidential informant.

While I always feel a degree of sympathy for men who are jailed, I have always found it a good idea to examine the facts in each case before suggesting sweeping changes in the laws.

The banker who is imprisoned for embezzling funds may have been only engaging in the pursuit of his profession of making money in a manner that he regarded as more efficient. I am sure that there is a great deal of sympathy for the imprisoned bankers within the banking community. Yet few would argue that the laws on embezzlement should be changed to encourage the free enterprise system.

Every profession has its renegades. There are doctors, lawyers, bankers and even journalists who deserve to be in jail. Every journalist who shouts "confidential source" and "freedom of the press" is not a John Peter Zenger or Elijah Parish Lovejoy. I am sure that there have been occasions when a so-called "confidential source" was a non-source, and there have been some journalists who have been little more than arms of the underworld.

These are just a few of the things one should keep in mind in determining whether we really need a shield law, and whether it would promote the responsible journalism that is our greatest need today.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF HUNGARY'S GREATEST POET, ALEXANDER PETÖFI

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Madam Speaker, recently, Hungarians and Americans of Hungarian extraction marked the 150th anniversary of the birth of Hungary's greatest poet. The American Hungarian Federation and all other Hungarian organizations in the United States and Canada have declared 1973 the year of commemoration for this poet, Alexander Petöfi, and have been conducting memorial programs in his honor. The Washington program took place January 13–14 at Trinity College. My distinguished colleague from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) was the main speaker.

Petöfi occupies a unique place in world literature. His style was like that of Shelley and Burns, yet simple and of an immediacy which is seldom found in other poets. As a man, he had an ardent love of freedom and was one of the early protagonists of democracy in Hungary. He was a true patriot who sacrificed his life in battle during the Hungarian War of Independence in 1848–49. Petöfi fell at the hands of the invading armies of the Russian Czar, whose troops were called in by the Austrian Emperor when he was unable to defeat the Hungarians led by Louis Kossuth.

Petöfi was a writer of many moods. He was an admirer of nature, of the Hungarian Plains. He was a descriptive writer of the rural life in Hungary, yet also a romantic writer. He was a visionary who foretold the manner of his own death, his future fame, and also the remarriage of his wife. He was a patriot who declared his undying and undivided love for his nation.

Only where freedom and democracy are considered the highest virtues can Petöfi really be understood and appreciated. Only in hearts truly devoted to freedom does his message come through clearly. A beautiful example of Petöfi faith and commitment was provided by Hungarian youth on October 23, 1956, when their demonstration before the statue of Petöfi sparked the glorious, but tragic, Hungarian Revolution.

In this 150th anniversary year of the birth of Petöfi, we pay homage to the poet and patriot, and hope that Hungary may soon live in accordance with the principles he espoused with his life and poetry alike.

PROTECT SENIOR CITIZENS' SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASE

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing new legislation to guarantee that recipients of social security will not lose any eligibility or entitlement to veterans' pensions, Federal retirement and disability benefits, medicaid, public housing, food stamps, aid to the aged, blind, and disabled, or aid to dependent children as a result of increases in social security benefits.

Under present law, many social security beneficiaries find themselves losing out on payments and assistance which they were receiving as a matter of course prior to the 20 percent social security benefit increase of 1972. This situation is occurring because State and Federal agencies have determined that the social security benefit increase has made many recipients so "prosperous" that they are now either ineligible for valuable programs ranging from public housing to food stamps, or else eligible only for drastically reduced assistance entitlements. Unless the entire social security increase of 1972 is completely "passed-through" to its recipients, that benefit raise threatens to turn into a nightmare for thousands of persons around the country. Senior citizens are being particularly hard hit by this situation.

I first introduced comprehensive pass-through legislation in the 92d Congress, before the 1972 social security benefit increase went into effect. Tragically, only a very limited form of pass-through was enacted into law.

The pass-through provisions enacted by last year's H.R. 1 provide first, that $4 of the social security monthly benefit increases shall be disregarded for the purposes of determining payments made under federally assisted State programs of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled, and second, that no person eligible for medicaid and for aid to the aged, blind, and disabled would become ineligible for medicaid solely because of the 1972 social security benefit increase. This left unprotected those medicaid recipients who were not covered by aid to the aged, blind, and disabled. Even those weak and inadequate pass-through provisions will expire this year, the former in December and the latter in October.

As a result of the inadequacy of current pass-through provisions, thousands of persons across the country are confronted with the fact that they will now receive less total assistance after the 1972 social security increase than they did before it. To permit such a situation to continue would be a cruel hoax upon the citizens of this country, particularly the senior citizens, who are relying on social security and other forms of federally funded benefits to maintain even a minimal standard of living.

The legislation which I am introducing would provide a comprehensive remedy to this disgraceful situation.

State and Federal agencies would be directed to disregard the 1972 social security benefit increase, all cost-of-living increases, and any future benefit increase legislated by Congress, in determining the eligibility and entitlement of social security recipients for all federally assisted programs, including medicaid, public housing, food stamps, aid to the aged, blind, and disabled, and aid to dependent children, as well as veterans' pensions and other Federal retirement benefits. The increased benefits which Congress legislates for the Nation's social security beneficiaries should reach their intended targets without cutting a single dollar from the other forms of public assistance and pensions which the beneficiaries are receiving.

The need for this legislation is becoming critical. In New York City alone, over 10,000 elderly social security beneficiaries have received notices telling them that because they were not receiving aid to the aged, blind, and disabled at the time that H.R. 1 was enacted in the 92d Congress, they are about to lose their eligibility for medicaid, since their increased income from social security puts them over the medicaid eligibility ceiling. They are understandably so upset that many are willing to turn back to the Social Security Administration their hard-fought 1972 benefit increases rather than lose out on the advantages of medicaid.

I am attaching to this statement an article from the New York Post which describes graphically the story of a disabled man and wife in New York City for whom the 20 percent social security increase represents disaster because it has made them ineligible for further medicaid benefits. The article describes them as "growing bitter toward a government which . . . does not care for the welfare of its citizens." Their attitude toward Government policy is far more generous than the treatment which this couple will receive from the Government. When their medicaid benefits are cut off

and they are forced to live on $150 a month.

The United States is supposedly the wealthiest nation in the world. Nevertheless, this country has a shocking history of disregarding the needs of the aged, the infirm, the poor, and the hungry. Time and again this Nation expends vast sums on Asian wars or on ventures into outer space, but when the plea is made to improve the lives of the neediest members of our society, many of whom have spent long years in productive work to make America strong, a deaf ear is turned to that request. The administration is lavish in its handouts to our military for ill-advised foreign conflicts and wasteful defense procurement programs, but it does not hesitate to play the miser when the needs of senior citizens, disabled persons, pensioners, and children are involved. It is the responsibility of Congress to bring this distortion of national priorities to an end.

In the hope that the social security increase which we voted for last year will reach its intended recipients in full and without any loss of other forms of public assistance and Federal pensions, I am introducing this legislation.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 amends the Social Security Act to provide that State agencies shall disregard the 1972 social security benefit increase, all cost-of-living benefit increases, and any future general benefit increase in determining eligibility of social security recipients for federally aided State public assistance programs.

Section 2 amends title 38 of the U.S. Code to provide that the 1972 social security benefit increase, all cost-of-living benefit increases, and any future general benefit increase shall be disregarded by the Veterans' Administration in determining eligibility for veterans pensions and pensions paid to surviving dependents of deceased veterans.

Section 3 states that increased social security benefits shall be disregarded for the purpose of determining a person's eligibility for food stamps, surplus agricultural commodities, low-rent public housing, and any other Federal program or federally assisted program. It also specifies that all social security benefit increases shall be disregarded for the purpose of determining the payments to which a person is entitled under any Federal retirement or disability program.

Section 4 provides that all social security benefit increases shall be disregarded by the Federal Government in determining eligibility and payments to be made under the federally administered program of assistance to the aged, blind, and disabled.

Section 5 establishes the effective date of section 1 as March 1, 1973, of section 2 as January 1, 1974, of section 3 as March 1, 1973, and section 4 as January 1, 1974.

[From the New York Post]

NO BREATHING ROOM IN MEDICAID-SS BIND

(By Stephen Gayle)

Although breathing is the easiest thing in the world for most people to do, next month it may cost 58-year-old Dave Towski his life.

A chronic sufferer of emphysema, asthma, bronchitis and heart failure, Towski must have daily dosages of oxygen to keep breathing. But he has learned that as of March 1 it will be his responsibility and not Medicaid's to pay for it. Because his life will depend on money that he does not have, Dave Towski is afraid.

"How can they do this to us, tell me, how?" he asks again and again.

Ironically, Towski's life is being threatened by something the federal government considers a boon to the permanently disabled—a 20 per cent increase in Social Security.

He and his wife Betty, who has already had one breast removed because of cancer and has just undergone an operation for a benign tumor on the other, are no longer eligible for health care under Medicaid because the increase has made their yearly income a few hundred dollars too high.

Together, the Towski receive $330 a month from their disability pensions. "We pay $128 a month for rent," he explains, "and now the oxygen service will cost $53 a month. That only leaves us the magnificient sum of $150 to supply ourselves with food, telephone service, medicine and other things. There isn't even an extra dime left over to go to the movies once a month."

Towski, who lives at 5935 Shore Pkwy. in Brooklyn, was an elevator operator before he was disabled five years ago. Now he is growing bitter toward a government which he feels does not care for the welfare of its citizens.

Because he says the 20 per cent increase will end up costing him 40 per cent more a year. Towski is seeking help from all sources, including his congressman, for himself "and all other people in the same stew."

"Before I had the heart attack in 1965 I worked," he says. "I didn't make much, but I didn't complain either. Luckily I had my teeth and my glasses made before so I don't need those things now. But what I want is the meat instead of the bone the government is throwing me."

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct the Voice of Democracy Scholarship program in our Nation's secondary schools during the fall term. It is a national broadcast scriptwriting program which provides an opportunity for 10th, 11th, and 12th grade students in our public, private, and parochial schools to think, write, and speak for freedom and democracy.

This year the theme of the program is "My Responsibility to Freedom." This theme focuses the attention of our youth on the principle that freedom is a responsibility and not a license. It calls upon the youth of America to make a personal evaluation of their responsibility in preserving our heritage of freedom.

Students prepare and transcribe a 3- to 5-minute broadcast script addressing their remarks to this theme. Participants are judged on the school, community, district, State, and national levels. This year over 500,000 students in over 7,000 schools participated in this program. State winners are brought to Washington for the final judging as guests of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

This year the winner from North Carolina is Alan Drum Pike of Sherrills Ford. Alan is an 11th grade student at Bandy's High School and has been active in student government. Alan has served as president of the student council, vice president of his freshman and sophomore classes, and a reporter for the school newspaper.

Alan's remarks serve as a reminder to us all of the need for a personal commitment to the basic values upon which our Nation was founded. Alan reminds us of:

Our responsibility to restore faith in the ability of our Democratic system to satisfy the needs of all people, and to restore faith in the sincerity of the American dedication to humanistic ideals.

I insert Alan's winning script at this time for your review.

MY RESPONSIBILITY TO FREEDOM

(By Alan D. Pike)

It has been said . . . there are three ways in which a nation can die.

A nation can die of internal strife, of indifference, and of an inability to adjust to change.

A nation can die from internal strife, tearing itself apart—At New York University, members of the "SDS" slip into an auditorium where the Ambassador from South Vietnam is scheduled to speak. They storm the stage, manhandle the Ambassador and flee the hall. The young agitators then proceed to another room, batter down the doors and forcibly prevent columnist James Reston from delivering his speech. —At Tougaloo College in Mississippi students attend a closed-door "defense workshop" to discuss the elimination of mayors and police chiefs, the kidnapping of college authorities, and the instruction of ghetto residents in the use of firearms.

These recent incidents, by no means isolated, are graphic illustrations of a new breed of revolutionary violence that is gravely threatening America . . . the nation that stands for freedom.

A nation can die of indifference, of an unwillingness to face its problems—Every day that passes, increases the potential of our foreign enemies, yet we are neglecting necessary measures needed to keep pace with the growing menace. At the same time internal violence threatens our freedom, yet, no greater threat to freedom exists than in the apathy of millions of Americans, who either don't know or don't care about the problems of this country.

Finally and quite simply, a nation can die of old age—a waning of energy, an inability to learn new ways and adjust to change, which, little by little, causes a nation to lose grip on its future. It is evident today that during the past ten years in many ways our nation has regressed, or at least, not made enough headway against the problems endangering American freedom. There is much discussion about why Rome fell, with the consistent conclusion that it fell because it veered away from old established patterns of citizenship and responsibility. The problem faced by Rome, now faces America: How to hold on to the basic values upon which our nation was founded while adjusting to the change which we cannot escape.

Today, as then, the solution is not to find better values, but to be faithful to those we profess. Then it is my responsibility to uphold the values of my forefathers, values embodied in our freedom, values that we, as Americans cherish—The American Dream . . . justice, liberty, equality of opportunity, the worth and dignity of the individual, brotherhood, and individual responsibility.

The responsibility of all Americans is to restore faith in the ability of our Democratic

system to satisfy the needs of all its people, and, to restore faith in the sincerity of the American dedication to humanistic ideals. It is my personal responsibility as an American citizen to meet these challenges constructively, rather than through violence and dissention. It is my responsibility to speak out, I must take advantage of every opportunity to express my opinions about the goals and ideals I believe this nation should pursue, and the actions I feel are necessary to achieve them. I must let my voice be heard, my opinions understood, for it is only through the testing of ideas that we can hope to find immediate and appropriate solutions to the problems confronting us.

Finally, I must examine and evaluate the present performance of our governmental machinery and institutions in light of their responsiveness to the needs of all the people. I must analyze and so recommend those changes in government and institutions which will make them more adaptive to the problems of our rapidly changing society, so that freedom is preserved for my posterity.

I believe, by executing these ideas, that I am fulfilling my responsibility to myself, my country, and most importantly . . . to freedom.

As the late Robert F. Kennedy stated . . .

Some men see things as they are and say, why.

I dream things that never were and say, why not.

THE EROSION OF CONGRESSIONAL POWER

(Mr. KASTENMEIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Madam Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an historical analysis by the codirector of the Institute for Policy Studies, Mr. Marcus Raskin, brilliant political theoretician, of the critical events of the past several decades generating the present debate about the erosion of congressional power by the executive branch. Mr. Raskin uses the Indochina war as the vehicle for his analysis of this power struggle which now appears to be extending to almost every area of public concern.

THE EROSION OF CONGRESSIONAL POWER

(By Marc Raskin)

America's war in Indochina has brought into focus, the momentous events which led its government into an imperial pattern of behavior. As the United States became the dominant world power in the twentieth century, the American ruling elite found itself legitimizing military incursions while routinizing and rationalizing the Executive's usurped powers of war-making. It whittled down the constitutional authority of Congress and systematically excluded the people from the process of making fundamental decisions on war and peace.

This series of events, which led to the militarization of the American government and a fundamental reliance on force in its relations abroad (and later at home) ran counter to a very different trend in American statecraft which developed after World War I—a trend toward viewing war itself and the making and planning of aggressive war as a *crime*. Such American statesmen as Secretary of State Frank Kellogg signed the Pact of Paris (Kellogg-Briand Pact) on outlawing war. By World War II, American officials, including Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, were denouncing the German and Japanese leaders as war criminals for having made war. A major charge leveled against them was that they had militarized their societies. American leaders proclaimed that the primary peace aims of the United States were the development of the rule of law, the demilitarization of Germany and Japan, and the holding to account of war criminals. Indeed, government officials even said that American citizens in *future* times would be able to hold leaders personally accountable for their actions. To this end the United States proposed resolutions in the United Nations General Assembly and signed and initiated charters on war crimes, treaties (as yet unratified) on genocide, and stern measures against militarism and ultranationalism.

But the Cold War intruded and American leaders began justifying their militarism in the name of defending the "free world" against "aggression"—a process that culminated in the massive and tragic adventure in Indochina. Now that the dead end of such political behavior has become plain, people are beginning to rediscover the other impulse in American statecraft: that of holding leaders accountable to the people and the law for their plans and actions. This may be the major hope of avoiding the terrifying degeneration of American society and its governing processes. The rules and laws fashioned over several generations as the alternative to international terror politics, brushfire wars, preemptive aggressive wars, and nuclear war are laws of personal responsibility which must be incorporated into the domestic law of nations. The irony of American history is that these two trends, that of imperial rule and that of holding leaders to personal account for war-making, principles applied in the flush of victory in 1945, must now stand in direct conflict with each other. The lesson of Vietnam could have been learned at Nuremberg, not Munich. The concept of rules of personal responsibility in public office or among "professionals" is not new. It poses a threat only to those who believe that power should remain untrammeled and that the populace should be held hostage to the wielders of such power. As Karl Jaspers has said, "For wherever power does not limit itself, there exists violence and terror, and in the end the destruction of life and soul." [1]

THE POWER TO WAGE WAR

Members of the Constitutional Convention understood that the power to declare and make war was not an abstraction. It meant the power to impress the young and destroy community, family, and commerce. For precisely these reasons the authority for undertaking war was not placed in the hands of the Executive. Alexander Hamilton, who on other matters favored wide latitude for the Executive, noted that the power to "embark" on war was something which the Constiutional Convention reserved for the Congress:

In direct contrast to the power of the British sovereign to initiate war on his own prerogative, the clause was the result of a deliberate decision by the farmers to vest the power to embark on war in the body most broadly representative of the people.[2]

Thomas Jefferson wrote to James Madison in 1789:

We have already given in one 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.[3]

From its beginnings, the American form of government generated a built-in area of conflict. If the President had the power to determine foreign policy, suppose the foreign policy which he pursued should end in war, which fell within the power of Congress? In this debate the Hamiltonian view prevailed over the Madisonian: The day-to-day business of foreign policy was left in the hands of the President. However, the limits imposed on Presidential power in this regard were evident in the conduct of the early Presidents. As one recent Senate document has said, "The early Presidents carefully respected Congress's authority to initiate war." The Supreme Court, in an 1801 case, concluded that the "whole powers of war" were "vested in Congress." Historians have pointed out that Presidents Adams and Jefferson declined to act against France despite their conviction that France was invading and destroying American shipping. Hamilton told Adams in an official opinion, "In so delicate a case, in one which involves so important a consequence as that of war, my opinion is that no *doubtful* authority ought to be exercised by the President." [4]

Yet, according to Alexander Hamilton, the President, on his own authority, had the power to "repel sudden attacks." But what was a sudden attack? And on what? The question has never been fully resolved. Hornbook learning in constitutional law supported the idea that the President had the power to respond to a "sudden attack" without prior Congressional sanction. This power was broadened in the famous Prize cases during the American civil war when the Supreme Court ruled in a five-to-four decision that the President had the unlimited power to wage war when another nation waged war directly upon the United States:

If a war be made by invasion of a foreign nation, the President is not only authorized but bound to resist force by force. He does not initiate the war, but is bound to accept the challenge without waiting for any special legislative authority.[5]

More pertinent than the instance when the United States was under attack was the reverse. When could the United States do the attacking, and, consequently, when was the United States at war? The United States has been involved in military actions every few years since its beginning. Such actions have not been recognized by the Congress as "war," perhaps because Congress is abjured by the Constitution from making aggressive war. When the House of Representatives voted its appreciation of General Taylor at the end of the Mexican War, it declared that the United States had won "a war unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States." [6]

The Supreme Court interpreted the war power as one granted to Congress only for the purpose of national defense. The war power was not granted, according to this view, for aggressive purposes. In effect, Congress's war-making power was limited to defensive wars only. In *Fleming v. Page*,[7] Chief Justice Taney, speaking for the Supreme Court, argued that American wars cannot:

. . . be presumed to be waged for the purpose of conquest or the acquisition of territory . . . [but] the genius and character of our institutions are peaceful, and the power to declare war was not conferred upon Congress for the purpose of aggression or aggrandizement, but to enable the general government to vindicate by arms, if it should become necessary, its own rights and the rights of its citizens.[8]

If the Congress and the people were reluctant to exercise the power to make war, this was hardly the case with the Executive, which saw the use of the military, and the engagement of the military in hostilities, as essential components of foreign policy. Since the Administration of President Washington, the United States has used military force on 150 separate occasions outside the continental United States.[9] However, it was not until the twentieth century that the Executive used the military as a major and, ultimately, predominant tool of foreign policy.

The Congressional war-making power had significantly eroded by the end of the nine-

Footnotes at end of article.

teenth century, and finally washed away with the bully actions of President Theodore Roosevelt in Panama in 1903,[10] when U.S. armed forces went beyond the traditional goals of protecting the status quo or punishing insurgents who might endanger American interests. Military force was used purely on Executive authority to establish a government that would serve American economic and military interests. The U.S. intervention in Panama did not pass through the legitimating procedures of Congress.

It was during Theodore Roosevelt's Presidency that the Navy fleet was sent around the world to show that the U.S. was ready for any "eventualities." The fleet was sent over the objections of Congress and in derogation of Congressional power under Article 1, Section 8.

President Roosevelt also gave a broad new interpretation to the Monroe Doctrine.[11] During his administration, various European powers attempted to assert economic claims against Santo Domingo. Roosevelt objected, saying that the Europeans had no right to come to Latin America to collect debts. A popular concept at the time was that disputed debts should be submitted to arbitration before an international tribunal; indeed, in other situations arbitration had been proposed by the United States. But Roosevelt decreed that if Latin American countries could not keep order and pay debts, it fell to the United States to keep order and secure from the debtor nation resources to pay its creditors.

As the list of military interventions suggests, the United States did not shrink from such actions. Indeed, it would appear they were welcomed as a means of showing American interest and interests in the lands of others. No doubt all of them fell within the bounds of imperial propriety, since other nations aspiring to "greatness" carried on in simliar ways. The conflict within China at the time of the Boxer Rebellion, and then later after the nationalist rebellion in 1912, involved the United States in a military intervention that spanned a generation. When in the 1950's, the Republicans charged that the United States had "lost" China, they had in mind the halcyon days of the American military constabulary in China which protected roads to the sea, missionaries, and trading companies.

The guard at Peking and along the route to the sea was maintained until 1941. In 1927, the United States had 5,670 troops ashore in China and forty-four vessels in its waters. In 1933 we had 3,027 armed men ashore. All this protective action was in general terms based on treaties with China ranging from 1858 to 1901.[12]

STRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATION FOR IMPERIAL PURPOSES

To cavort in the world in a grand way required a structural transformation of America's internal governing apparatus. It was during the Wilson Administration that major changes in structure were put into effect. In 1916 Woodrow Wilson proposed that Congress authorize the arming of American merchant vessels against possible attacks from German submarines. The "little band of willful men," led by Senators La Follette and Borah, succeeded in defeating the President's request through a filibuster, but this did not deter Wilson from pursuing his noble ideals. He ordered the ships armed and instructed them to fire on sight at any German submarines. In overriding Congressional recalcitrance, Wilson did not hesitate to point out that he knew he was courting war with Germany.

Wilson's ability to move *against* Congress was bolstered by three separate but related developments. First, his demand for "security" arrangements drew support because he was already carrying on an undeclared war with Mexico. Second, institutional preparations for war had been made with leaders of the major corporate groupings; once it was clear the corporate class was ready to make war, Congress became a mere appendage. To legitimize his actions, Wilson used the Army Appropriations Act of 1916, which provided for the creation of an advisory body to coordinate industries and resources for the "national security and welfare." The Council of National Defense was told by Wilson at the time of its appointment (but before the Congress had declared war) to unite the forces of the country "for the victories of peace as well as those of war." [13] By 1917, the purpose of this committee was to set up the means for purchasing munitions, to rationalize the supply of war materials, and to control prices.

Finally, under the Overman Act, the President was given "more freedom than any of his predecessors had in disposing the Executive establishment to suit himself." [14] In this process, Wilson gave up any pretense of reform or control over the industrial class, since it was held that the cooperation of industry was crucial to the State's effort to make the world safe for a democratic America.

Wilson himself, surrounded by an array of Executive agencies of unprecedented scope, was finally at the center of an organism no man, however vigorous, could in any real sense direct. It was during this period that the limitations of a one-man Presidency began to appear so serious as to call in question the whole institution.[15]

Wilson's "reformism" was felt in the armed forces. Before 1916 the President had been limited in his ability to use the militia. It was Congress which had the power to call up the militia (now the Army and Air National Guard). Both branches were constrained by the Constitution, which limited use of the militia to executing "the laws of the Union, to suppress insurrections and to repel invasions." [16]

According to one Attorney General, George Wickersham, such constitutional language meant that the militia could not be sent into a foreign country. To circumvent this limitation, Wilson developed the idea that the President should have the power to incorporate the National Guard into the Army. The power was granted by the National Defense Act of 1916, which greatly increased the Executive's ability to make war on its own. In the late winter of 1916, Wilson incorporated the National Guard into the regular Army for use against Mexico.

After World War I, American, French, and British interests turned to the question of containing and destroying the Bolshevik revolution. This required Allied intervention, which United States armed forces joined. It did not seem appropriate to think that the United States was at war, or that significant constitutional precepts had been breached. No internal ideological or political forces were organized to stop the American intervention; on the contrary, the Palmer raids against "anarchist," "communist," and socialist dissidents within the United States made the intervention in Russia even more credible. And vice versa. The Democratic intervention in Russia set up the repression at home which saw 10,000 people arrested and deported over one weekend.

But it was Franklin Roosevelt who sealed the casket on Congressional power. Before American entrance into World War II, Roosevelt expanded American interest by taking ninety-nine-year leasing rights from the British in bases at Newfoundland, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, St. Lucia, Trinidad, Antigua, and British Guiana, in trade for fifty old U.S. destroyers. Roosevelt *informed* the Congress of this transfer of American vessels and the extension of American imperial power. There was no treaty and hardly an explanation. Edward Corwin has noted that Roosevelt's action violated two statues "and represented an exercise by the President of a power which by the Constitution is specifically assigned to Congress." [17]

Presidential power was greatly enhanced by 1941 when, through lend-lease authorization, the Selective Service Act of September 1940, and the Priorities Statute of May 1941, the President could direct the manufacture of weapons for war and "sell, transfer title to, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of" [18] materials to any country in the world which met his terms. Further, he could bring industry under Presidential control—or so it was thought. Roosevelt believed that the war effort would facilitate the implementation of his plans for agriculture. In 1942, when it appeared that Congress would not support his proposed price controls for farm products, he made it clear that he thought parliamentary bodies were of limited usefulness in the twentieth century.

I ask the Congress to take this action by the first of October. Inaction on your part by that date will leave me with an inescapable responsibility to the people of this country to see to it that the war effort is no longer imperiled by the threat of economic chaos. In the event that the Congress shall fail to act, and act adequately, I shall accept the responsibility, and I will act. . . . The American people can also be sure that I will . . . accomplish the defeat of our enemies in any part of the world where our own safety demands such defeat. When the war is won, the powers under which I act automatically revert to the people—to whom they belong.[19]

There are profound ironies in this message. The "war" never stopped, although it was interrupted, until 1950, and the powers have never returned to the Congress, let alone to the people. There was an attempt to uphold some of the implicit power of Congress.[20] But by 1947, in *Fleming v. Mohawk*, the Supreme Court held that when Congress appropriated funds for Executive agencies which the President consolidated on his own authority, such action was considered as "confirmation and ratification of the action of the Chief Executive." [21]

The Supreme Court has not helped to preserve Congressional prerogatives against Executive power. Under the *Pink* case [22] and *Missouri v. Holland*,[23] executive agreements have the same force of law as treaties which have gone through the advice and consent of the Senate. Needless to say, there is little bureaucratic incentive to have "agreements" sent to the Senate for ratification when there is no operational effect on their binding meaning.

The final blow against Congressional power came with the passage of the National Security Act of 1947. Its purpose was similar to that of the legislation Wilson had recommended to Congress when America was going *into* war, not supposedly coming out of it. The preamble to the 1947 Act told the story: It was to "provide an integrated program for the future society of the United States to provide for the establishment of integrated policies and procedures relating to the national security." [25] James Forrestal, who was to become the first Secretary of Defense under the new law, told Congress at the time that legislation provided for the integration of foreign policy with national policy, "of our civilian economy with military requirements." [26]

Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who had promised in 1949 that no troops were to be sent to Europe as part of the NATO treaty (a direct lie), also told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the time of the Korean intervention in 1950 that the President had the authority to use armed forces as he saw fit in carrying out American foreign policy and "this authority may not be interfered with by Congress." [27] The Acheson

Footnotes at end of article.

view coincided with his interpretation of the Truman Doctrine which, as he explained to Congress, was an extension of the Monroe Doctrine; wherever "freedom" was threatened, the military had a right to go on Executive initiative. In 1950 Congress also passed the Central Intelligence Act, which empowered the CIA to keep its budget hidden and to distribute it through other agencies of government. This caused the transformation and pollution of civilian programs, because the legislature could no longer tell whether funds which it voted for particular departments of the government were, in fact, for those departments or for covert CIA or paramilitary operations.

Congress thus found that it was no longer in a position to protect itself from the onslaught of Executive authority and illegal activity. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has lamented that the Executive now has power of life and death over every living American, to say nothing of millions of other people in the world. It is true, of course, that Congressional power did not erode without Congressional complicity. The Senate had tried to protect its prerogatives with a concurrent resolution on April 4, 1951, which stated that it was unconstitutional to send troops abroad without Congressional approval. But the Executive Office of the President has pointed out that the Congress is responsible for its own abdication of power when it passes legislation requested by the President to create a national emergency. National emergencies allow the President "to take action which would have been possible only under a declaration of war." [28]

Such proclamations were signed by Presidents Truman,[29] Eisenhower,[30] Kennedy,[31] and Johnson.[32] One must remember that Johnson invariably pointed to the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and to various appropriations bills as proof that Congress had supported and indeed encouraged the actions of the Executive. War, however, is made by those who have operational and political control over armed forces and their supplies. The fact that Congress appropriated funds did not mean that it exercised control over the war or the Executive's power to make war. The Senate's National Commitments Resolution meant that the Senate was a petitioner to the President. The Cambodian invasion of April 1970 meant that the President knew resolutions hardly affected war policies of the Executive and the bureaucracy. And the Department of State's comment on the proposed commitments resolution on March 10, 1969, made clear that it was too late to talk about constitutional controls. The Department stated its opinion to the Senate in these terms:

As Commander-in-Chief, the President has the sole authority to command our Armed Forces, whether they are within or outside the United States. And although reasonable men may differ as to the circumstances in which he should do so, the President has the constitutional power to send U.S. military forces abroad without specific Congressional approval.[33]

This view not only eroded the explicit constitutional power of war declaration which was reserved to Congress by the Constitution, but it went one step further: It also meant that Congress no longer had the power under the Constitution "To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval forces." [34] The idea, so simple and so profound, that there is a distinction between diplomatic and military policy could not be maintained once the national security state saw all forms of diplomacy as a variant of military threat, intimidation, and the actual use of force.

But what about the President? There was an irony to Executive usurpation. While Congress had lost its governing status by the end of World War II, the President also found that his surfeit of newly acquired power had to be delegated to others. The result was creation of a huge bureaucratic apparatus. It took a considerable act of Presidential will to find out what was going on and what sorts of commitments, criminal and otherwise, had been made by the Executive agencies of which the President was nominally in charge. The President and his immediate entourage became, in effect, the brokers for the illegitimate power wielded by such agencies as the CIA.[35] Ad hoc committees threaded the lines of legitimacy and illegitimacy, legality and illegality, in an almost seamless web.[36]

President Kennedy set up the 303 Committee, which reviewed the covert operations that were developed and carried out by the CIA and military in the field, in an attempt to create within the Executive a system of control—*a common law of illegal activities*, as it were—on the basis of "broader" purposes and objectives than the acts themselves. The President's purpose was to control and rationalize the illegal activities which seemed to be bureaucratically rather than Presidentially controlled. Yet the dialectical result of this activity was to force a legitimation of the illegitimate. Furthermore, as the President grasped power for his own survival, it matured into a leaderhip system that was authoritarian in its purpose and operation. Citizens did not learn of such activities or structural change except through accident, blunder, stealth, or the need of one particular group within the national security apparatus to obtain support from the "outside" for its battles at the bargaining table of power; this occurred, for example, when reports were leaked to the press in 1967 about internal debates regarding a new round of military escalation in Vietnam. The Executive branch is ensnared when it must invent rules and "commitments" to protect various parts of the bureaucracy and institutional elements who insist on their view of interest. The President must obtain funds from the Congress by manufacturing arguments and transforming error into para-law and state necessity.

CONGRESSIONAL APPROPRIATIONS AND THE DELIBERATIVE PROCESS

The power of Congress is greatest when the government is small. As the government grows, the role of Congress decreases. There is a separation between administrative and legislative authority. Legislative authority invariably transfers power of administration to the Executive. When a nation decides that it must have social welfare and military programs, the legislative branch, by voting money for such programs, invariably subsidizes huge social systems and classes that depend directly on the managers of the state machinery. Hence, the more money Congress allocates to spend, the less power it wields, since those who spend the money decide how and where it is to be spent. (It is true, however, that the Congressional seniority system permits some members—those who have attained committee chairmanships—to share in the power and direction of resources. Under the present committee and seniority system, members of both houses of Congress act like permanent undersecretaries in the British bureaucracy. In Washington after-hours places, it is said that Presidents come and go, but committee heads stay on forever.)

In the last sixty years, the power of Congress over the appropriations process has been severely curtailed. Prior to enactment of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, Congress seemed to have had the power to dictate the shape of the federal budget and the amounts needed by each department. This power, of course, had been conferred in the Constitution. Congress was able to raise and levy taxes, and "all bills of raising revenues" were to "originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills." [37]

The reality of Congressional control has long since evaporated. The Executive now clearly believes it can wage war even in the absence of Congressional appropriations. But the myth of Congressional power proved durable—at least in Congress. In 1967, during one of the many recent Senate debates on resolutions to limit the power of the Executive, Senator George Aiken of Vermont told his colleagues:

I do not think we can excuse Congress from the situation which exists today. . . . We have reached the point now that if we are interested in retaining our form of government of which we boast so freely and fluently, *we have to do something*; . . . I do not blame the executive branch so much for doing this. I blame them for some of their recent mistakes in the last few years, but nevertheless, Congress has to share the guilt with them because we have been too negligent and too tolerant. (emphasis added) [38]

Aiken insisted that senior members of Congress were at least complicit, and that some had a far more direct responsibility. There was, he suggested, no way to vote funds for the war or advise on it without assuming responsibility for its consequences. By June 11, 1968, however, Congressmen were denying that their vote for appropriations to the military and for the prosecution of the Indochina war meant that they supported the war. Because of that doubt, the Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, George Mahon of Texas, declared on the House floor that a vote for a supplemental appropriations amendment in support of soldiers who were hurled into battle "does not involve a test as to one's basic views with respect to the war in Vietnam. The question here is that they are entitled to our support as long as they are there, regardless of our views otherwise." [39] A senior Republican member of the House, Paul Findley of Illinois, echoed this view:

Mr. Chairman, I hope no one reading the *Congressional Record* on this last amendment will jump to the conclusion that the division vote denotes enthusiastic endorsement of present policies in Viet Nam. There is ample evidence not only within the conversation of Members on the floor here today but also in the newspapers of the utter bankruptcy of what is presently being attempted in Vietnam.[40]

Such reticence was hardly new. It can be found in each of the appropriations debates during the years from 1964 to 1971. It was annoying to the Executive, but hardly a crucial problem. There was, however, a political need to keep complaints within bounds, since the Executive was not prepared to open up its policy of continuing military and covert intervention—and the governing structure supporting that policy—to Congressional hectoring and control.

Executive strategy was to present Congress with a *fait accompli* so that it had no choice but to support actions in which American troops had already been committed.[41] Each time Congress accepted this result, its power was reduced even further. Nevertheless, most members of Congress cannot be absolved of complicity. They voted for the construction of bases in Vietnam, conforming to the intentions of the American bureaucratic and military leaders. And, of course, they voted for the weaponry which was used.

The leading members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees toiled long hours to increase the American military commitment in Indochina. They were not reluctant to prod the Executive apparatus forward, joining with the Joint Chiefs of Staff from time to time in such encouragement. The Special Subcommittee on National Defense Posture of the House Armed Services Committee had long proposed that bombing restrictions on North Vietnam be removed

Footnotes at end of article.

and that Haiphong be destroyed. The House and Senate Armed Services Committees favored the use of greater force more quickly and constantly spoke out against "gradualism," hoping that a knockout blow could be struck against the "enemy" in Southeast Asia.[42]

The costs of the Indochina war made it necessary for President Johnson to obtain Vietnam supplemental appropriations. This was the legislative means that the Congress used to express its dissent or assent to the war. There was no way that Congress could regard the money authorized, appropriated, and spent except as funds for building bases which serve as weapons and manpower centers for American supplies. Yet there was colossal naiveté and dazzling ignorance in Congress. Few members comprehended that the activity of the national security bureaucracy was criminal. Blinded by imperium, the Cold War, and the assumption that all governing processes are legitimate, members were oblivious to legal standards which did exist and which could have been enforced. And because those standards were not enforced, there was a presumption of legality to the illegal. There was the acceptance of idealistic pretension in which the citizen and the Congress clothed the national security apparatus, masking the obvious from themselves.

CONGRESS AND PARA-LEGAL PRINCIPLES

As we have seen, the Constitution does not endow Congress with the right to sign over the war power to the Executive, nor does it indicate that appropriation of funds in fact ratifies any action of the Executive. To overcome these obstacles, the bureaucracy developed the language, color, and appearance of legality and ratification as substitutes for constitutional legality and ratification. The language of complicity and ambiguity allows men of power to fool or coopt those who have legitimate authority to say "yes" or "no" but who, in fact, lack the power to do so. To wage aggressive war it became necessary to cloak it in legality that would prove acceptable to Congress and the people.

The national security apparatus (including the President) bombarded Congress and the people with the para-legal idea that the United States had a solemn commitment in Vietnam. Who made that commitment? Was it the CIA or AID?[43] Did it come through solemn treaty?[44] Did it originate in a letter?[45] Was it an afterthought of the Joint Chiefs of Staff? Was this a commitment which flowed from the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution,[46] which seemed to give the President power to respond to attack from the North Vietnamese?

According to the Undersecretary of State, Nicholas Katzenbach, the resolution was the "functional equivalent" of a Congressional declaration of war, even though the floor debate in the Senate and the House made clear that the resolution itself was not "an advance declaration of war." Indeed, the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Thomas Morgan, said the Committee had been "assured by the Secretary of State that the constitutional power of Congress in this respect will continue to be scrupulously observed." [47]

By 1967, after some 600,000 troops were in Indochina, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee sought to define the meaning of the word "commitment," [48] which the Executive now felt could only be met through a great war in Asia. Just as the U.S. delegation to the United Nations refused to define the word "aggression" for more than a decade in the International Law Committee, Katzenbach argued that the meaning of "commitment" should be left vague. Because of the kinds of international involvement which might be deemed necessary by the Executive, he said, it was better to leave formal actions of the United States in the hands of the Executive. Congress would be informed on a continuous basis of the arrangements that had been made. Any policy problems that might arise with regard to fulfilling American "commitments" abroad would be worked out on an ad hoc basis among the senior members of Congress and the Executive departments. They would be settled "by the instinct of the nation and its leaders for political responsibility." [49]

"This "sweetheart" arrangement hardly comported with the struggles between Congress and the Executive with regard to the use of troops abroad. By the time the United States took military charge of the Indochina war, "creative tensions" could no longer be resolved by telephone calls between the leaders of the several branches of government. Irritations became policy differences. And policy differences uncovered realities that only such conservatives as Senators Bricker and Taft had been prepared to face fifteen years earlier, at the time of the Korean intervention and the decision to send American troops to Europe.

The struggle in Indochinna pointed up structural defects in the American governing apparatus which developed from twentieth-century imperial pretensions. It exposed the dirty little secret which had been hidden by bipartisan foreign policy and the phrase that "politics stops at the water's edge." [50] By 1967, Congress was forced to acknowledge that its power with regard to issues of war and peace was ornamental. The most influential legislators, whose military loyalties were unquestionable and who *seemed* to exercise control over the appropriations of the national security bureaucracy, agreed that the United States had no interest in war on mainland Asia. They advised against it. Senators Stennis of Mississippi and Russell of Georgia—as well as Ellender of Louisiana—followed the position of Senator Robert Taft, who advised Presidents against military engagement in Asia.[51] Yet, during Kennedy's administration, once the President ratified the conclusions and operations of the national security apparatus, virtually no Senators, save Gruening and Morse, were prepared to exercise their vote to stop American-initiated war in Vietnam. The powerful, impeccable hawks opposed to the adventure were prepared to override their own sentiments and constitutional responsibilities.

This should not come as a surprise. In the twentieth century the natural inclination of any legislative body dealing with foreign and national security policy is to go along lest it be attacked as unpatriotic. Its major interest is to maintain privilege for its members and acts as a broker between constituents and the bureaucracy. Senators and representatives are prepared to barter power for information, service to constituents, and the security of feeling that they are part of the "ruling club." Legislators must also contend with the narcotic attraction of imperial action for its own sake—a craving which is even stronger among Executive leaders. Once such interests predominated, it was not likely that legislators would challenge Executive national security power with the vigor necessary to defeat Executive usurpation.

As a result, the President was able to fashion or, as bureaucrats say, "orchestrate," the Congress as an instrument ready to accept his national security policies. Except as a debating point against opponents who might stir up the citizenry, The Executive no longer needed to rely on Congressional resolutions for authority to act. If Congress disagreed, the Executive was free to act on its own initiative. For example, Eisenhower, while he sought and received a Middle East resolution from Congress at the time of the American intervention in Lebanon in 1958, did not count on that action as anything but support for an *independent* exercise of power taken on his own initiative.[52] The same was true of Kennedy in the Cuban missile crisis, though a resolution was passed by Congress.[53] The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was used by Johnson as legitimizing language for actions which came after 1964, although the substance of the resolution had been drafted months before the "provocative incident," and the incident itself was manufactured.[54] Presidential advisers such as McGeorge Bundy wanted a Congressional resolution to legitimate their plan of widescale escalation. The bureaucrats waited for an opportune, and *manufactured*, moment to obtain their resolution. By 1967 there was much grumbling in the Senate that the resolution was otbained fraudulently. And the Fulbright hearings, dealing with the Gulf of Tonkin incident, would seem to bear out that contention. In any case, President Johnson saw the resolution as a way of getting people into line. Had Congress voted no, the President would still have gone ahead. Indeed, the State Department has argued that repeal of the resolution did not change the legal power of the military and the Executive to engage in war.

As long ago as 1951, the State Department enunciated the doctrine that whenever the President determines it is necessary to send troops around the world, he may do so even if that action should involve the United States in war:

> As this discussion of the respective powers of the President and the Congress in this field has made clear, constitutional doctrine has been largely molded by practical necessities. *Use of the Congressional power to declare war, for example, has fallen into abeyance, because wars are no longer declared in advance.* (emphasis added) [55]

These, however, are formal considerations. During the Cold War period, as one Senate Foreign Relations report pointed out, the people and the Senate accepted the notion "that the President has the authority to commit the country to war but that the consent of Congress is desirable and convenient." [56] Political considerations impose still further constraints on legislative objections.

Even when declarations of war are sought from an assembly, they seem to constitute mere technicalities. "Before such a declaration can take place, the country will have been brought to the very brink of war by the foreign policy of the Executive." [57] Once the war declaration is demanded, the managers of the State have already deceived the people and the legislators. If the Congress were to deny the Executive and his bureaucracy a requested declaration of war, once it was requested the Executive would be in the position of a band of thieves who up to that point had engaged in a criminal enterprise. They would have to be stopped, but who would stop them? And where would the alternate source of legitimacy and power to the Executive government be found? If the answer is "the people," then the nation and society are set immediately on a revolutionary course. For its purposes the Executive merely requests complicity from Congress, not agreement. Members of Congress will comply rather than risk internal revolution to stop a war abroad. As a result of Congressional compliance the Executive is able to transform its private war into the *Zeitgeist* of the State and is justified in shedding the people's blood.

Such complicity has made progressives and populists doubt whether Congress can be anything but a collaborator in war-making activity. From time to time (as in 1924 and 1937) they have argued that even Congress should not have the war power: that the war power should reside with the people. The idea that a people should vote to go to war, as a people, as a body, becomes an intimidating concept because it assumes personal responsibility and active citizen-

Footnotes at end of article.

ship. In such a framework the personal act of voting means the de-mystification State power and the end of docile acquiescence to that power. The State becomes identical to the people. The more refined classes are reluctant to offer the less refined a choice on questions of mystic communion, such as war by frolic, mistake, or design, offering them instead a choice of different brands of toothpaste.

But if the people do not have the power to declare war and the power of Congress to declare war is dubious, the question of *how* the war-making power is exercised by the Executive has remained one which can be drawn for reexamination by critics and nags at a moment's notice, as a rhetorical lance against the warriors or the Executive. A legal or moral defect is ascribed to the Executive bureaucratic adventure by Congressional critics and popular shirkers when the war is going badly, when too many are informed about it, and when dissidents attempt to capture all legitimate symbols to discredit the war-makers. The dissidents are successful when the war actively poisons the everyday concerns of people. It is then that notions of principle, definition, responsibility, guilt, and punishment become central to the debate of citizens—when they begin to wonder about the political principles which govern their state.

We may note another example of how the para-legal[58] approach distorts perception and undermines democratic principles. On May 4, 1965, the President sent Congress a message asking for a supplementary appropriation. He outlined the actions he had already taken—increasing the armed forces in Vietnam to 35,000, sending supplies and helicopters, increasing the bombings to 1,500 sorties a month, even sending medical supplies to the Vietnamese people. He asked Congress for "prompt support of our basic course . . . resistance to aggression, moderation in the use of power and a constant search for peace. Nothing will do more to strengthen your country in the world than the proof of national unity which an overwhelming vote for the appropriation will clearly show. To deny and delay this means to deny and delay the fullest support of the American people and the American Congress to those brave men who are risking their lives for freedom in Vietnam." But he began this attempt at ratification by saying, "I do not ask complete approval for every phase and action of your Government." In effect, he asked the Congress to vote $700 million retroactively for equipment and forces, and his request was granted through a joint resolution of Congress which authorized the President to transfer $700 million of unappropriated funds to any existing military account. As Francis Wormuth has pointed out, the President asked for a vote of confidence. But there is no such thing as a vote of confidence in an Executive form of government, since there is no way, save impeachment, to give *no* vote of confidence. Furthermore, there is no way that a member of Congress can do more than support a general direction, especially when the direction is described in words that are nonspecific, nonreferential, and imprecise. Can it be legally possible for Congressmen to underwrite a course that does not exist except in the minds of war-makers?

The para-legal method gives the appearance of participation to Congress without reaching the basic questions of law and reality. The military and the national security bureaucracy can report on the success of the war (filling their formal obligations with para-legal language) to the Congressional committees and to the people by using statistical analyses of body counts, number of bombs dropped, number of people moved from one area to another, and so forth. It did not dawn on anyone within the governing apparatus or the Congress (until 1970) that such modes of behavior were, by their nature, criminal enterprises.

Treatment of "refugees" is instructive in this regard. While occassional Congressional committees pointed up the dreadful refugee situation caused by American policy, no one bothered to suggest that the policy was criminal in nature. (And where the policy was not criminal in nature, it had elements of criminal negligence which were undeniable.) By May of 1968, the Senate Judiciary Committee estimated the number of refugees generated by the war at close to four million. Three years later the number was closer to six million. The U.S. budget for fiscal 1968 for care of refugees was approximately $43 million.[59] A Judiciary subcommittee asked the General Accounting Office to conduct a spot check of conditions in the camps in 1967, picking them at random. Less than one percent had sanitation facilities. Less than 45 percent had housing facilities. As the GAO report said, "In large sections of Saigon there are hundreds of thousands of people living in squalor, in subhuman conditions. They sleep in the alleys and in the streets, in courtyards and halls, even in graveyards and mausoleums where bodies have been removed to allow more room."

The question is: Who is responsible? Once Congress learns of such matters, do its members have a positive obligation to correct them and to stop supporting policies which generate such conditions? And if Congress does not assume its responsibilities, does it become complicit? If the power of Congress is not merely an ornamental one, it is not relieved of responsibility. Congress has the right to call Executive officials to testify, under oath, about their activities.

In democratic theory, election absolves the individual official of personal responsibility where he is acting in the name of the state or in an official capacity. In theory he is acting in behalf of the people and their interests. When they discover he is acting against them, they are able to turn him out of office. But this theory does not go to the question of criminal behavior. From time to time, Congress has been graced with criminals or scoundrels, and it has been held that they can be tried under the criminal laws of the United States. It has been held that the Congress may decide the basis of membership in its body, developing and applying any rules that it deems consistent with its constitutional prerogatives. Congress is, therefore, on notice that laws of the land will apply to criminal behavior, and that elected members are not exempt from those laws. It has the power to set its standards of membership. It has developed a code of ethics to which others within the government are expected to adhere. It is able to develop a series of self-limiting actions and laws which will purge it of being drawn into such criminal enterprises as the Indochina war.

The present situation within American society is such that Congress could reassert its constitutional authority to protect the people against the Executive penchant to wage war. There are specific considerations relating to Congress which the public may wish to take into account as it ponders means of controlling and curbing the governing elite's potential for war-making. I will explore these in the context of the impulse for personal responsibility and antimilitarism which emreged in American law and policy at the end of World War II.

It is well, however, to close this chapter on reaffirming Congress's *limited* power to make war. It would seem that even if Congress assented to the Vietnam war, there is nothing in the Constitution to suggest that Congress has unlimited power to vote funds and commit *lives* to military adventures for the purpose of ideological or bureaucratic vindication. As Chief Justice Taney pointed out, it is the genius of American government to be peaceful and not wage war for aggression. The people, then, retain those residual rights to resist usurped power on the part of the Executive or Congressional acquiescence to frolics of war and militarism.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *The Question of German Guilt* (Dial Press, 1947), p. 34.

[2] *Harvard Law Review*, June 1968, p. 1768.

[3] *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, 15 ed. Julian Boyd (Princeton University Press, 1955), p. 397.

[4] In *The Viet Nam War: The President Versus the Constitution* in Francis Wormuth, quoting a letter from Hamilton to James McHenry, Secretary of War, May 17, 1798.

[5] 67 U.S. (92 Boack) 635 (1863).

[6] *Documents Related to the War Power of Congress*, Committee on Foreign Relations, July 1970, GPO, p. 76.

[7] Section 50 U.S. 602 (1850).

[8] While there is much evidence that American military actions were undertaken in Vietnam for the purpose of vindicating a clique in the American government who through their decisions and programs involved the United States more and more deeply, it can hardly be said that the rights of American citizens or of the general government of the United States were under attack by North Vietnam or the NLF.

[9] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 1st Session, June 23, 1969, vol. 115, pt. 13, pp. 76840–16843.

[10] I do not mean to overlook President Polk who, in his war with Mexico, usurped Congressional power. Abraham Lincoln, then a member of Congress, wrote to his law partner that Polk was setting a precedent for making war at the President's pleasure. The war-making power, according to Lincoln, was given to Congress because "Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no men should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us." (Feb. 15, 1848—Lincoln to Herndon—S10495, July 31, 1957.)

[11] Even the Monroe Doctrine was limited in its application. According to a response by John Quincy Adams to an inquiry from Colombia as to the "manner" in which the United States would resist interference of the Holy Alliance, Adams replied that "the ultimate decision of the question belongs to the *Legislative* department of the Government."

[12] This is to be found in the House Foreign Affairs Committee document put out by the Library of Congress. It is listed in the Appendix to this book.

[13] Rexford Guy Tugwell, *The Enlargement of the Presidency* (Doubleday, 1961), pp. 363–367.

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] Edward Corwin, *President: Office and Powers*, 3rd ed. (New York University Press, 1961), p. 289.

[18] Tugwell, *op. cit.*, p. 452.

[19] *Papers of Franklin Roosevelt, 1942*, pp. 364–365. Cf. Tugwell, *op cit.*, p. 454.

[20] In *Ex Parte Endo*, a majority of the Supreme Court held that the fact that Congress approprated funds for detention camps for American-Japanese citizens did *not* mean that Congress was ratifying every administrative policy of the detention camp program. According to Justice Douglas, who wrote the majority opinion, support of appropriations by Congress does not ratify all the activities which the Executive might pay for with appropriated funds. Ratification can only occur where there is "precise authority" for a particular purpose. (323 U.S. 283–1944)

[21] 331 U.S. 111, 118 (1947).

[22] 315 U.S. 203 (1942).

[23] 252 U.S. 416 (1920).

[24] [Missing.]

[25] National Security Act of 1947:61 Stat. 495.

[26] The reader should note that the clause is not reversed. The policy of the leaders at that time was that peacetime military requirements were more important than the economy. This view had the effect of transferring power from Congress and the corporate elites to a military and national security bureaucracy. Those on Wall Street and in the corporations who intended to exercise power for their class would have to do so within the national security machinery. But that machinery had purposes, interests, and goals which in many instances were anticapitalist and irrational as related to a traditional definition of corporate capitalism.

[27] Hearings, National Military Establishment, 80th Congress, 2nd Session, p. 28. Also note "The Making of the National Security State", by Robert Borotage, in *The Pentagon Watchers* (Doubleday, 1970), pp. 1–61.

[28] "Background Information on the Use of United States Armed Forces in Foreign Countries," GPO, 1970. Report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, prepared by George L. Millikan and Sheldon Kaplan.

[29] No. 2914 on December 16, 1950, and reaffirmed on April 28, 1952.

[30] Executive Orders Nos. 10896 and 10905.

[31] Effective Order No. 11037.

[32] Executive Order No. 11387.

[33] Statement by J. William Fulbright, June 1970.

[34] Article I, Section 8.

[35] Secretary Rusk described such activities as fighting for freedom in the back-alleys of the world.

[36] Whereas bureaucratic military and economic barons need Presidents as their instruments for long-term institutional interests, Presidents think tactically and see bureaucratics as instruments for their policies. During the Eisenhower period, for example, a de-emphasis on formal control over the military (that is, control over defense budgets, pact-making without commitment of troops except in Lebanon) caused the Eisenhower group to rely on the CIA. In one sense, bribery and the threat of total war were the Eisenhower mode of statecraft. Covert activities fit with the Republican need to appear capitalist. What Eisenhower's team was unable to do publicly of its anti-labor and seemingly anti-intellectual ideology, it did covertly through the CIA. The CIA became the conduit and polluter of cultural institutions and labor unions.

[37] Article I, Section 7, of the U.S. Constitution.

[38] 810502, July 31, 1967.

[39] Representative George Mahon, June 11, 1968, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 114, pt. 13, p. 16688.

[40] Representative Paul Findley, June 11, 1968, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 114, pt. 13, p. 16691.

[41] There is an incredible cynicism here. Concern for American troops manifests itself so long as they are under attack. According to the Cranston hearings on Veterans' Hospitals, the tears of concern very quickly dry up. The unemployment rate is 20 percent among black returned veterans and 13 percent among whites.

[42] *Review of the Vietnam Conflict and Its Impact on U.S. Military Commitments Abroad: Report of the Special Subcommittee on National Defense Posture,* House Armed Services Committee, GPO, August 24, 1968, pp. 6–16.

[43] A report prepared by four senators, including Mike Mansfield, said in 1963: "It should also be noted, in all frankness, that our own bureaucratic tendencies to act in uniform and enlarging patterns have resulted in an expansion of the U.S. commitment in some places to an extent which would appear to bear only the remotest relationship to what is essential, or even desirable in terms of U.S. interests." Quoted in *The Viet-Nam Reader,* eds. M. Raskin, B. Fall (Vintage, 1965), p. 193.

[44] Eugene Rostow, former Undersecretary of State, has insisted that the United States is in Indochina because of the SEATO treaty. The treaty was signed by Australia, New Zealand, France, Pakistan, the Philippines, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Although South Vietnam was not a party to the treaty, a separate protocol was added for its defense. The basis of any treaty is reciprocity. Except for the Philippines, which sent a detachment of troops, paid for by the United States, other nations have done virtually nothing. Furthermore, none has attempted to revivify the SEATO treaty or set in motion any meetings which would result in using the treaty as the justifying instrument intervention. France has specifically exempted itself from involvement in any of the treaty provisions. Under the treaty the only obligation of the parties is to "consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense." Article IV, paragraphs 1 and 2, SEATO treaty.

[45] An objective reading of the famous Eisenhower letter to Diem, which became a coat rack on which to hang every future tragedy in Southeast Asia, leaves plenty of room for a decision to give *no* aid to the South Vietnamese government. Letter and following comments below are from *Vietnam and Beyond,* by Don R. and Arthur Larson (Durham, N.C.: Rule of Law Research Center, Duke University, 1965), as reprinted in *The Viet-Nam Reader, op. cit.,* pp. 100–101:

"We have been exploring ways and means to permit our aid to Vietnam to be more effective and to make a greater contribution to the welfare and stability of the Government of Viet-Nam. I am, accordingly, instructing the American Ambassador to Viet-Nam to examine with you in your capacity as Chief of Government, how an intelligent program of American aid given directly to your Government, can serve to assist Viet-Nam in its present hour of trial, provided that your Government is prepared to give assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid were supplied.

" 'The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Viet-Nam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. The Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Viet-Nam in undertaking needed reforms. It hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Viet-Nam endowed with a strong government. Such a government would, I hope, be so responsive to the nationalist aspirations of its people, so enlightened in purpose and effective in performance, that it will be respected both at home and abroad and discourage anyone who might wish to impose a foreign ideology on your free people.'

"There are six sentences. The first says that we have been 'exploring' ways and means. The second relates that our Ambassador is being instructed to 'examine' a program with Diem, subject to a condition relating to Vietnamese performance. The third states the purpose of 'this offer,' which can only refer to the offer to 'examine' the assistance program; that purpose is to help build a viable state, which in turn would be capable of resisting subversion and aggression. The fourth sentence is another condition, the making of needed reforms. The fifth sentence expresses a hope, and so does the sixth—hopes for a strong, enlightened, effective, and respected government—hopes that seem poignant indeed today in view of the sordid story that began with the assassination of Diem.

"Where in this highly tentative, highly conditional opening of negotiations and statement of hopes is the 'commitment,' the 'obligation,' the pledging of our word? Even if we seem to have indicated a willingness to do something to help, what is that something—beyond aid in developing a strong, viable state?"

[46] The purpose of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was to show that "there was no division among us" at a time "when we are entering on three months of political campaigning." The resolution carried the House 414 to nothing and the Senate 88 to 2. The resolution read that Congress "approves and supports the determination of the President as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack" on U.S. forces, and to prevent any further aggression. Congress also left it up to the President to determine what necessary steps were needed, "including the use of armed forces," to assist any member of SEATO or protocol state covered by SEATO Public Law 88–408, August 11, 1964.

[47] 100 *Congressional Record* 18,539 (1964).

[48] In 1969 the Senate adopted the National Commitments Resolution, which expressed the sense of the Senate that "a national commitment by the United States results only from affirmative action taken by the Executive and Legislative Branches of the U.S. Government by means of a treaty, statute or concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress, specifically providing for such commitment." Senate Resolution 85.

[49] *U.S. Commitment to Foreign Powers,* Committee on Foreign Relations, GPO, 1967, p. 72.

[50] Given the geographic extension of the United States, it was hard to know what the meaning of "water's edge" was. Did the Pacific Ocean become an inland lake of the United States because of Hawaii?

[51] These Senators were ever mindful of Senator John Bricker's attempts to limit the arrangement which the Executive made without the consent of Congress. In Bricker's case, his strong move from the right did not develop momentum because of Eisenhower's opposition.

[52] Millikan and Kaplan, *op. cit.,* p. 28.

[53] *Ibid.*

[54] "Extensive interrogation of all potentially knowledgeable sources reveals that they have no information concerning a NVN attack on U.S. ships on 4 Aug. 1964. (the USS Turner Joy)". This statement of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was contradicted by Secretary McNamara. A later captive naval officer of North Vietnam "contradicted" the earlier report. McNamara said that this captive proved the Defense Department contention that the August 4 attack had taken place. Fulbright then sent for this report. But examination showed that this "source never said that there had been an attack on August 4." The Department of Defense chose not to respond to Fulbright's implication that McNamara fabricated the meaning. It was, of course, the second attack which engendered support in Congress for the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. Note *Gulf of Tonkin, the 1964 Incidents, Part II, Supplementary Documents to February 20, 1968 Hearing with Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.* Committee on Foreign Relations. GPO, December 20, 1968.

[55] Document of the Congress, entitled *Powers of the President to Send the Armed Forces Outside the United States,* February 28, 1951.

[56] Report of Foreign Relations Committee, S. Res. 85, April 16, 1969, pp. 7–34, at p. 9.

[57] Randolph S. Bourne, *War and the Intellectuals* (Harper & Row, 1964), p. 82.

[58] The para-legal system operates in all nations which flirt with authoritarianism and imperialism. It assumes that there are no limits of behavior for officials in their public role if they are able to adduce a rationale.

[59] The amount per capita was approximately $11 per person, but this figure is deceptive. For example, after each refugee left

the camps he was supposed to receive $43. The Senate Judiciary Committee noted that a "top U.S. adviser to the refugee program [estimated] that 75 percent of this amount was being siphoned off before it reached the people."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. PATMAN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ULLMAN, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUNTER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCFALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. METCALFE, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. DRINAN, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 30 minutes, on February 28.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRENZEL) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SAYLOR, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ARMSTRONG, for 60 minutes, on March 7.

Mr. SEBELIUS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURGENER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, for 1 hour, on March 1.

Mr. MILLER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRASER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. YATES and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. KASTENMEIER and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds five pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $977.50.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRENZEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEELMAN.

Mr. RONCALLO of New York.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. RAILSBACK.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. KEATING in two instances.

Mr. NELSEN in four instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. PARRIS in five instances.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. LANDGREBE in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. FORSYTHE in four instances.

Mr. WHITEHURST in two instances.

Mr. COLLINS in two instances.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. HUDNUT in two instances.

Mr. BROTZMAN in three instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. THONE.

Mr. ERLENBORN.

Mr. HEINZ.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURGENER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HOGAN in two instances.

Mr. RONCALLO of New York in two instances.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. FISH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GUNTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRADEMAS in six instances.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. BURTON in three instances.

Mr. MCKAY.

Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.

Mr. GAYDOS in 10 instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California.

Mr. ROYBAL in 10 instances.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mr. DAN DANIEL.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD.

Mr. HANNA in five instances.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in four instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. WON PAT.

Mr. TIERNAN in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. RANGEL in three instances.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DORN in three instances.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. REID.

Mr. PREYER in two instances.

Mr. GIBBONS in five instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 28, 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:

495. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the 1972 crop year, pursuant to the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

496. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Department of Agriculture for "Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service," for the fiscal year 1973, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

497. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting a report of all expenditures during the period July 1 through December 31, 1972, from moneys appropriated to him, pursuant to section 105(b) of Public Law 88-454; to the Committee on Appropriations.

498. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a copy of the statistical supplement to the stockpile report covering July to December 1972, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (Public Law 79-520); to the Committee on Armed Services.

499. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report for fiscal year 1972 on foreign assistance, pursuant to section 657 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

500. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the Commission's 26th Report on the information, educational and cultural programs administered by the U.S. Information Agency, pursuant to section 603 of Public Law 80-402; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

501. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Annual Report of the Office of Coal Research for 1973, pursuant to Public Law 86-599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

502. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting the final determinations of the Commission in docket No. 342-A, *The Seneca Nation of Indians, Plaintiff*, and docket No. 368-A, *The Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians, Plaintiff*, v. *The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

503. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report on the recovery of resources from solid wastes, pursuant to section 205 of Public Law 91-512; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

504. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 318 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to enable the Federal Communications Commission to authorize translator broadcast stations to originate limited amounts of local programing, and to authorize FM radio translator stations to oper-

ate unattended in the same manner as is now permitted for television broadcast translator stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

505. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit immediate retirement of certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

506. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting an amendment to the draft of proposed legislation submitted by the Commission on January 30, 1973, to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

507. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a list of reports issued or released by the General Accounting Office in January 1973, pursuant to section 234 of Public Law 91-510; to the Committee on Government Operations.

508. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a Report on the status of the procurement by the Navy of the F-14 weapon system as of June 1, 1972; 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. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 18. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct full and complete investigations and studies of all matters within its jurisdiction under the rules of the House or the laws of the United States (Rept. No. 93-22). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 72. Resolution to authorize investigations by the Committee on Agriculture; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-23). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 74. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-24). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 134. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to conduct an investigation and study with respect to certain matters within its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 93-25). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 163. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes with amendment (Rept. No. 93-26). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 175. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct certain studies and investigations (Rept. No. 93-27). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 180. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct full and complete investigations and studies of all matters within its jurisdiction under the rules of the House or the laws of the United States (Rept. No. 93-28). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 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 (Rept. No. 93-29). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 255. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 3298, a bill to restore the rural water and sewer grant program under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (Rept. No. 93-30). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 256. Resolution creating a select committee to investigate all aspects of crime affecting the United States (Rept. No. 93-31). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 257. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the District of Columbia to conduct studies and investigations (Rept. No. 93-32). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. Conference report on House Joint Resolution 345 (Rept. No. 93-33). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 4731. A bill to prohibit most-favored-nation treatment and commercial and guarantee agreements with respect to any nonmarket 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. ANDERSON of California (for himself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 4732. A bill to establish a national environmental data system and State and regional environmental centers pursuant to policies and goals established in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KOCH, Mr. CORMAN, and Mr. ANDERSON of California):

H.R. 4733. A bill to amend title 32 of the United States Code to establish a Commission to oversee and improve the capability of the National Guard to control civil disturbances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BADILLO:

H.R. 4734. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to prohibit discrimination by creditors on the basis of sex or marital status in connection with any extenson of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 4735. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain that recipients of aid or assistance under the various Federal-State public assistance and medicaid programs (and recipients of assistance or benefits under the veterans' pension and compensation programs and certain other Federal and federally assisted programs) will not have the amount of such aid, assistance, or benefits reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 4736. A bill to change the name of the Department of Commerce Laboratories in Boulder, Colo., to the Dwight David Eisenhower Laboratories; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROE, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. THONE, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. NELSEN, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 4737. A bill to provide for purposes of computing retired pay for members of the Armed Forces, and additional credit of service equal to all periods of time spent by any such member as a prisoner of war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 4738. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the statehood of Colorado; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROE, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. THONE, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. NELSEN, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 4739. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as creditable service for purposes of civil service retirement certain periods of imprisonment of members of the Armed Forces and of civilian employees by hostile foreign forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MILLER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STOKES, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. VANIK):

H.R. 4740. 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. SEIBERLING, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. MOSHER):

H.R. 4741. 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 (for himself, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. GUDE, and Mr. PARRIS):

H.R. 4742. A bill to authorize a Federal payment for the planning of a transit line in the median of the Dulles Airport Road and for a feasibility study of rapid transit to Friendship International Airport; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BURLESON of Texas, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. RHODES):

H.R. 4743. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend certain transitional rules for allowing a charitable contribution deduction for purposes of the estate tax in the case of certain charitable remainder trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY of Ohio:

H.R. 4744. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1974, to establish a Food Price Control Commission in order to control the wholesale and retail level of food prices; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4745. A bill to terminate the authorization of Muddy Creek Dam, French Creek, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FLOOD, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HAYS, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SISK, Mr. STEELMAN, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 4746. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for expenses incurred by a taxpayer in making repairs and improvements to his residence, and to allow the owner of rental housing to amortize at an accelerated rate the cost of rehabilitating or restoring such housing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 4747. A bill to amend section 1331(c) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the granting of retired pay to persons otherwise qualified who were Reserves before August 16, 1945, and who served on active duty during the so-called Berlin crisis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4748. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 4749. A bill to provide certain privileges against disclosure of confidential information and the sources of information obtained by newsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRONIN:

H.R. 4750. 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. DANIELSON (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MOSS, Mr. REES, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SISK, Mr. STARK, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 4751. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that certain social security benefit increases provided for by Public Laws 92-336 and 92-603 be disregarded for the purposes of determining eligibility for pension or compensation under such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 4752. A bill to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint students at State maritime academies and colleges as Reserve midshipmen in the U.S. Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4753. A bill to amend the cargo preference law; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4754. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to associations of fishing vessel owners and operators organized to provide insurance against the damage or loss of fishing vessels or the injury or death of fishing crews, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4755. A bill to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of species or subspecies of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction or likely within the foreseeable future to become threatened with extinction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4756. A bill to provide for the conservation and management of fisheries and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DENT (for himself and Mr. PERKINS):

H.R. 4757. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rates under that act, to expand the coverage of that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. STEELE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. MILLS of Maryland, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. TOWELL of Nevada):

H.R. 4758. A bill to provide for the conservation, protection, and propagation of species or subspecies of fish and wildlife that are presently threatened with extinction or likely within the foreseeable future to become threatened with extinction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. STEELE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. PRITCHARD):

H.R. 4759. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assist the States in controlling damage caused by predatory and depradating animals; to establish a program of research concerning the control and conservation of predatory and depredating animals; to restrict the use of toxic chemicals as a method of predator control; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. GROVER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. STEELE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. MILLS of Maryland, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 4760. A bill to provide for the conservation and management of fisheries and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4761. A bill to prohibit most-favored-nation treatment and commercial and guarantee agreements with respect to any nonmarket 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.

H.R. 4762. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) to provide that under certain circumstances exclusive territorial arrangements shall not be deemed unlawful; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DORN (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. HALEY, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. DANIELSON, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. MARAZITI, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. HUBER, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 4763. A bill to amend section 355 of title 38, United States Code, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to readjust the schedule of ratings for the disabilities of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. PREYER):

H.R. 4764. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide a more effective program to prevent aircraft piracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 4765. A bill to enlarge the Sequoia National Park in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 4766. A bill to amend the Education Amendments of 1972 with respect to orders requiring the transportation of students in elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4767. A bill to establish a National Institute of Population Growth and to transfer to the Institute the functions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity relating to population research and family planning services; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4768. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to provide income tax simplification and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH (for himself and Mr. HILLIS):

H.R. 4769. A bill to provide greater assurance for fiscal responsibility; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 4770. A bill to establish a comprehensive system for regulation of weather modification activities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FAUNTROY:

H.R. 4771. A bill to regulate the maximum rents to be charged by landlords in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4772. A bill to establish a national program of Federal insurance against catastrophic disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 4773. A bill to amend sections 112, 692, 6013, and 7508 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces of the United States returning from the Vietnam conflict combat zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORSYTHE:

H.R. 4774. 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. 4775. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4776. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to allow a State in its discretion, to such extent as it deems appropriate, to use the dual signature method of making payments of aid to families with dependent children under its approved State plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4777. A bill to allow a credit against Federal income taxes or a payment from the U.S. Treasury for State and local real property taxes or an equivalent portion of rent paid on their residences by individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORSYTHE (for himself, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MOSHER, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 4778. A bill requiring congressional authorization for the reinvolvement of American forces in further hostilities in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DRINAN,

Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. STARK, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 4779. A bill to provide for the conversion of the United States to the metric system; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 4780. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4781. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, in order to extend until June 30, 1979, the authorization for appropriations to assist the States to construct nursing home facilities for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 4782. A bill concerning the allocation of water pollution control funds among the States in fiscal 1973 and fiscal 1974; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4783. A bill to amend section 516 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4784. A bill to create a special tariff provision for imported glycine and related products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 4785. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, in order to provide a special bonus for members of the Armed Forces of the United States who were held as prisoners of war during the Vietnam era; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4786. A bill to amend chapter 11, title 38, United States Code, to provide a statutory compensable rating of not less than 10 per centum for any veteran who was a prisoner of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY (for himself and Mr. HOWARD):

H.R. 4787. A bill to amend section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, relating to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4788. A bill to establish an Executive Department to be known as the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (for herself, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. BURKE of California, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mrs. HOLT, and Ms. ABZUG):

H.R. 4789. A bill to provide a remedy for sex discrimination by the insurance business with respect to the availability and scope of insurance coverage for women; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 4790. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 4791. 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.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mr. DENT, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. MACDONALD, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. FISH, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. HAWKINS):

H.R. 4792. 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.

By Mr. HALEY (for himself, and Mr. SAYLOR):

H.R. 4793. A bill to provide for the addition of certain eastern national forest lands to the National Wilderness Preservation System, to amend section 3(b) of the Wilderness Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4794. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act, to provide that an individual may simultaneously receive both an old-age or disability insurance benefit and a specially reduced widow's or widower's insurance benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 4795. A bill to provide for the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to assist in the improvement and operation of museums; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts Mr. HICKS, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KYROS, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.R. 4796. A bill to provide compensation to U.S. commercial fishing vessel owners for damages incurred by them as a result of an action of a vessel operated by a foreign government or a citizen of a foreign government; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4797. A bill to provide that respect for an individual's right not to participate in abortions contrary to that individual's conscience be requirement for hospital eligibility for Federal financial assistance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUDNUT:

H.R. 4798. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 4799. A bill to provide procedures for calling constitutional conventions for proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States, on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 4800. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to extend certain transitional rules for allowing a charitable contribution deduction for purpose of the estate tax in the case of certain charitable remainder trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. MARAZITI, and Mr. WARE):

H.R. 4801. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of certain public safety officers who die in the performance of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 4802. A bil to amend title 38 of the United States Code, in order to establish a National Cemetery System within the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4803. 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. 4804. 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.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 4805. A bill to exempt from Federal income taxation certain nonprofit corporations all of whose members are tax-exempt credit unions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 4806. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. FREY, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. KEMP, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. WYATT, Mr. THONE, and Mr. COLLINS):

H.R. 4807. A bill to guarantee the right of criminal defendants to a speedy trial and to reduce crime and injustice by improving the supervision of persons released on bail and probation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. BROWN of California):

H.R. 4808. A bill to amend chapter 235 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the appellate review of sentences imposed in criminal cases arising in the district courts of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 4809. A bill to limit subsidy payments under the wheat, cotton, and feed grain programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4810. 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.

H.R. 4811. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of tuition, in addition to educational assistance allowances, on behalf of veterans pursuing certain programs of education under chapter 34 of such title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 4812. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend for 5 years (until June 30, 1978) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDGREBE:

H.R. 4813. A bill to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4814. A bill to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LENT (for himself, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 4815. A bill to establish a contiguous fishery zone (200-mile limit) beyond the territorial sea of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 4816. A bill to amend the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 to extend for 3-years the provision for full Federal payment of relocation and related costs for victims of Hurricane Agnes and of certain other major disasters; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4817. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that payments of benefits pursuant to the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for veterans' or widows' pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McFALL (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. WALDIE, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. SLACK, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. DENT, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. STARK, and Mr. PREYER):

H.R. 4818. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for a 1-year period; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McFALL (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. McSPADDEN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. RARICK, Mr. HAYS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WHITE, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. STEELE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. BENITEZ, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. MEEDS, and Mr. LOTT):

H.R. 4819. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for a 1-year period; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McFALL (for himself, Mr. MINISH, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. McDADE, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. SIKES, Mr. VANIK, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. McKAY, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. SAYLOR):

H.R. 4820. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for a 1-year period; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McFALL (for himself, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. GUNTER, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. CASEY of Texas, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. FUQUA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. FULTON, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, and Mr. ROSE):

H.R. 4821. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for a 1-year period; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McFALL (for himself, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. REES, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. PATMAN):

H.R. 4822. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for a 1-year period; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 4823. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs from the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 4824. A bill to promote the peaceful resolution of international conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H.R. 4825. A bill to repeal section 411 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972, thereby restoring the right of aged, blind, and disabled individuals who receive assistance under title XVI of the Social Security Act after 1973 to participate in the food stamp and surplus commodities programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. McDADE, Mr. McKINNEY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 4826. A bill to repeal section 411 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972, thereby restoring the right of aged, blind, and disabled individuals who receive assistance under title XVI of the Social Security Act after 1973 to participate in the food stamp and surplus commodities programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 4827. A bill to amend section 39–704, District of Columbia Code relating to the jurisdiction of courts-martial of the militia of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request):

H.R. 4828. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4829. A bill to provide waiver of premiums on national service life insurance policies for certain totally disabled veterans without regard to age limitations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (by request) (for himself, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. MARAZITI):

H.R. 4830. A bill to amend section 1481 of title 10 of the United States Code to extend funeral expense coverage thereunder with respect to military retirees who expire while patients in U.S. hospitals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4831. A bill to establish a congressional Office of Budget Analysis and Program Evaluation; to provide participation by State and local officials and the general public in the departmental budget making process; to provide investigations by the Comptroller General of impoundment reports; to provide legislative oversight and veto of impoundments; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4833. A bill to provide an annual general outline for the current Federal budgetary and fiscal situation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 4834. A bill to define the authority of the President of the United States to intervene abroad or to make war without the express consent of the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4835. A bill requiring congressional authorization for the reinvolvement of American forces in further hostilities in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4836. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs, produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4837. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to promote full employment and restore a diversified production base; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to stem the outflow of U.S. capital, jobs, technology, and production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 4838. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 with respect to rent stabilization; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4839. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to limit the power of the Secretary of Transportation to delegate his authority to examine medical qualifications of airmen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 4840. A bill amending the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to provide for the nondiscrimination on account of age in government employment, and in Federal Government employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 4841. A bill to create a special tariff provision for imported glycine and related products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 4842. A bill to amend the antitrust laws to provide that the refusal of nonprofit blood banks and of hospitals and physicians to obtain blood and blood plasma from other blood banks shall not be deemed to be acts in restraint of trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MANN, Mr. McSPADDEN, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. THONE):

H.R. 4843. A bill to provide for an overall limit on appropriations for a fiscal year, legislative control over impoundment of Federal funds, and modification of the fiscal year so that it coincides with the calendar year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. PREYER, and Mr. THORNTON):

H.R. 4844. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new chapter 404 to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 4845. 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.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FRASER, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. METCALFE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland):

H.R. 4846. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to safeguard the constitutional and civil liberties of the citizens of the United States with regard to lawful guarantees of participation in the democratic process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 4847. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to safeguard the constitutional and civil liberties of the citizens of the United States with regard to lawful guarantees of participation in the democratic process; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 4848. A bill to amend the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 to authorize disclosure of patient records where such disclosure is necessary to effect interstate transfers of probationers and parolees under the Interstate Probation and Parole Compact; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RARICK (for himself, Mr. DOWNING and Mr. ICHORD):

H.R. 4849. A bill to provide for the increase of capacity and the improvement of operations of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REID:

H.R. 4850. A bill to establish a commission to study and make recommendations on methods for compensating authors for the use of their books by libraries; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4851. A bill to consolidate certain Federal programs relating to housing and urban development into a single program of community development block grants, while continuing and emphasizing existing Federal programs designed to provide housing for low- and moderate-income families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 4852. 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.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 4853. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that licenses for the operation of a broadcasting station shall be issued for a term of 5 years, and to establish certain rules for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RONCALLO of New York (for himself, Mr. MARAZITI, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. DENHOLM, Mr. FROEHLICH, Mr. LENT, and Mr. BRASCO):

H.R. 4854. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 in order to terminate the oil import control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 4855. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 to establish an Urban Parkland Heritage Corporation to provide funds for the acquisition and operation of open-space land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 4856. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide for the development and implementation of programs of units of local government to provide comprehensive year-round recreational opportunities for the Nation's underprivileged youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 4857. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act, to extend for 5 years (until June 30, 1978) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 4858. A bill to make rules governing the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in the absence of a declaration of war by the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4859. A bill to designate certain lands in the Isle Royale National Park in Michigan as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4860. A bill to designate certain lands in the Isle Royale National Park, Mich., as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4861. A bill to amend the act of October 4, 1961, providing for the preservation and protection of certain lands known as Piscataway Park in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina):

H.R. 4862. A bill to establish a national policy encouraging States to develop and implement land-use programs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SEBELIUS, and Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina):

H.R. 4863. A bill to provide for the cooperation between the Federal Government and the States with respect to environmental regulations for mining operations and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, and Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina):

H.R. 4864. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, and Mr. REGULA):

H.R. 4865. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. TOWELL of Nevada):

H.R. 4866. A bill to authorize the acquisition of the Big Cypress National Fresh Water Reserve in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPLEY (for himself and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H.R. 4867. 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. SHRIVER:

H.R. 4868. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of disability and death pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SISK, for himself, Mr. REES, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. RONCALLO of New York, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STARK, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WIGGINS, and Mr. PETTIS):

H.R. 4869. A bill to prohibit the imposition by States of discriminatory burdens upon interstate commerce in wine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 4870. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 4871. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance and encouragement for the establishment and expansion of health maintenance organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4872. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for the registration of practitioners conducting narcotic treatment programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4873. A bill to assure protection of public health and other living organisms from the adverse impact of the disposal of hazardous wastes, to authorize a research program with respect to hazardous waste disposal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4874. A bill to assure protection of environmental values while facilitating construction of needed electric power supply facilities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 4875. A bill to suspend the duty on cyclohexanone oxime until the close of December 31, 1973; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4876. A bill to make permanent the dairy indemnity program, the armed services and veterans' hospitals dairy programs, and the suspension of the butterfat support program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4877. 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. TIERNAN (for himself, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. QUIE, and Mr. SARASIN):

H.R. 4878. A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961, to provide for Federal regulation of the travel agency industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN,

Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MEEDS, and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 4879. A bill to amend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. Moss, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. PREYER, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROY, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SARASIN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 4880. A bill to amend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ULLMAN (for himself, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. DELLENBACK, and Mr. WYATT):

H.R. 4881. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to reimburse cooperators for work performed which benefits Forest Service programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 4882. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand the authority of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism, and Digestive Diseases in order to advance the national attack on diabetes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 4883. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to add to such act a new title dealing especially with kidney disease and kidney-related diseases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 4884. A bill to encourage earlier retirement by permitting Federal employees to purchase into the civil service retirement system benefits unduplicated in any other retirement system based on employment in Federal programs operated by State and local governments under Federal funding and supervision; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 4885. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to stabilize and "freeze" as of January 1, 1973, the Veterans' Administration Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1945 edition, and the extensions thereto; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 4886. 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.

Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. REID, Mr. FULTON, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. ESCH, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 4887. A bill to require States to pass along to individuals who are recipients of aid or assistance under the Federal-State public assistance programs or under certain other Federal programs, and who are entitled to social security benefits, the full amount of the 1972 increase in such benefits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. KYROS, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 4888. A bill to require States to pass along to individuals who are recipients of aid or assistance under the Federal-State public assistance programs or under certain other Federal programs, and who are entitled to social security benefits, the full amount of the 1972 increase in such benefits, either by disregarding it in determining their need for assistance or otherwise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN (for himself, Mr. MANN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CRONIN, Mr. POWELL of Ohio, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. GINN, Mr. MATHIAS of California, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. FISHER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. SISK, Mr. STEED, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. DENNIS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MYERS, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. ESHLEMAN, and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts):

H.R. 4889. 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. WYMAN (for himself, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HALEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MANN, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 4890. 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. ZWACH:

H.R. 4891. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part of imported meat be labeled "imported" at all stages of distribution until delivery to the ultimate consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.J. Res. 379. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to neighborhood schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON (for himself, Mr. BELL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GUDE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.J. Res. 380. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a comprehensive study of the relationship of motor vehicle size to air pollution, fuel consumption, and motor vehicle accidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. FISH, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.J. Res. 381. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim a Vietnam Veterans Day, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself and Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland):

H.J. Res. 382. Joint resolution repealing the Military Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MIZELL (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HUBER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. SIKES, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TREEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YOUNG of South Carolina, and Mr. ZION):

H.J. Res. 383. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.J. Res. 384. Joint Resolution prohibiting U.S. rehabilitation and reconstruction aid to the Republic of Vietnam, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, or any other country in Indochina until certain conditions have been met, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Miss HOLTZMAN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.J. Res. 385. Joint resolution to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.J. Res. 386. Joint resolution designation of the first full week of March of each year as "American Heritage Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.J. Res. 387. Joint resolution to create an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 388. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 1,000 additional hearings entitled "Year-Round Schools"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PIKE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. STARK):

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the treatment of Jews in Iraq and Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NIX:

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to take affirmative action to persuade the Soviet Union to revise its official policies concerning the rights of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES V. STANTON (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. CAREY of New York, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to providing military training in the United States to the armed forces of certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. DENHOLM):

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution providing recognition for Columbus; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. STARK, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. YOUNG of Illinois):

H. Res. 248. A resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Res. 249. A resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies by the Committee on House Admin-

istration; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NIX:

H. Res. 250. A resolution maintaining U.S. sovereignty, Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 251. A resolution Canal Zone sovereignty and jurisdiction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. Res. 252. A resolution to declare U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Res. 253. A resolution to authorize the Committee on Science and Astronautics to conduct studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to aeronautical and other scientific research and development and outer space; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H. Res. 254. A resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct an investigation and study of prices of lumber and plywood; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

46. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to Federal subsidized housing programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

47. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to proposed assistance to North Vietnam for the rebuilding of the country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

48. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to construction of the pipeline from the North Slope to tidewater in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

49. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

50. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to designating November 11, as Veterans' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

51. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

52. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to continuing the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

53. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, relative to income tax credits for nonresident State income tax liabilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

54. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to the capital gains treatment of timber under the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRONIN:

H.R. 4892. A bill for the relief of the New York Toy Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):

H.R. 4893. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Orlando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 4894. A bill for the relief of the Southeastern University of the Young Men's Christian Association of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 4895. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wallace S. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUDDS:

H.R. 4896. A bill for the relief of Chiu Wong (also known as Roverto Sing); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Tuesday, February 27, 1973*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life; since we know not what a day may bring forth but only that the hour for serving Thee is always present, help us to serve Thee in faithfulness each moment of this day. Consecrate with Thy presence the way of our work that Thy way may be made known to us. In all things draw us to the mind of the Master that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done among men and nations.

We pray in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 26, 1973, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nomination under New England Regional Commission on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination under New England Regional Commission on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL COMMISSION

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Russell Field Merriman, of Vermont, to be Federal Cochairman of the New England Regional Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR PRINTING OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the inaugural address delivered by President Richard M. Nixon on January 20, 1973, be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) is now recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

THE NEXT STEPS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, yesterday, what could turn out to be one of the most important conferences of the century began meeting in Paris.

While for several years I had predicted that the Paris conferences called to find a peaceful solution to the Indochina war could not be successful, yet on January 27 a cease-fire agreement was signed in Paris and I am delighted that my predictions of several years' standing turned out to be wrong.

Now another and more widely representative conference is being held in Paris and I sincerely hope that any agreements reached this time will be even more far reaching in the search for world peace than the one agreed to last month.

While we cannot be sure as to what agreements may be reached or if they would be effective or not, yet the hopes of the world for an era of peace seem brighter because of the effort being made.

During his visit to the Senate last week, Secretary Rogers said that the purpose of the international conference that opened yesterday—Monday, February