ings held March 16, 17, 19, 23, 24, 26; April 20–22; May 21; and September 10, 1970.)

Chapter II—Hearings with respect to the administration of the Subversive Activities Control Act and the Federal Civilian Employee Loyalty-Security Program. (Hearings held September 23, 30, 1970.)

SECTION B: INVESTIGATIVE HEARINGS

Chapter III—Black Panther Party activities in Kansas City, Mo. (Hearings held March 4–6, 10, 1970.)

Chapter IV—Black Panther Party activities in Seattle, Wash. (Hearings held May 12–14, 20, 1970.)

Chapter V—Black Panther Party activities in Detroit, Mich., Indianapolis, Ind., and Philadelphia, Pa. (Hearings held July 21–24, 1970.)

Chapter VI—Black Panther Party National Office operations and investigation of activities in Des Moines, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr. (Hearings held October 6–8, 13–15, and November 17, 1970.)

Chapter VII—Hearings on the extent of subversive influences in leadership of New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. (Hearings held April 7–9, 15, and June 9–11, 1970.)

Chapter VIII—Hearings on aspects of life in Communist-run countries as described by refugees from the Soviet Union, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, together with information on Communist theory and practice from an American academician, expert in Communist affairs. (Hearings held June 23–25, 1970.)

SECTION C: REFERENCE SERVICE AND COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS

Chapter IX—Report of Committee's Files and Reference Section.

Chapter X—Committee Publications (including commentary on special reports on Students for a Democratic Society; Black Panther Party paper; New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam; Committee action on Emergency Detention Act; Committee action on H.R. 959—Obstruction of Armed Forces; and Inquiry Concerning Speakers' Honoraria at Colleges and Universities).

CONTENTS

Foreword.

Chapter I. Theory and Practice of Communism: testimony of escapees from communist tyranny in Red China, Latvia, and Germany. (Summary of hearings held March 23–25, 1971.)

Chapter II. Theory and Practice of Communism: testimony of two leading American academicians, one an expert on Eastern Europe and the other expert on the Far East, plus testimony of an informant who was a member of the Young Workers Liberation League (a CPUSA "front" organization) in New York and of an informant who was a high-ranking member of CPUSA in New York City. (Summary of hearings held March 29–30, April 1, and May 10–12, 1971.)

Chapter III. Theory and Practice of Communism: testimony of witnesses expert in the subject of communism in Cuba, together with a leading American academician expert in the subject of communism in Latin America generally. (Summary of hearings held October 5–7 and 14, 1971.)

Chapter IV. Origins, Organization, and Activities of the Progressive Labor Party. (Summary of hearings held April 13, 14, and November 18, 1971.)

Chapter V. The Administration of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 and the Federal Civilian Employee Loyalty-Security Program, involving testimony from executive departments and agencies. (Summary of hearings held April 21, 22, 27–29; June 2, 3, 8–10; July 27–29; August 3; and November 4, 1971.)

Chapter VI. Summary of Committee and House Floor Action on Bills to Repeal or Amend the Emergency Detention Act of 1950.

Chapter VII. Origins, Organization, and Leadership of the National Peace Action Coalition and the Peoples Coalition for Peace & Justice. (Summary of hearings held May 18–20, June 16–17, and July 21–22, 1971.)

Chapter VIII. Origins, Organization, and Leadership of the National Peace Action Coalition and the Peoples Coalition for Peace & Justice. (Summary of hearings held May 21, June 15, and July 13–15, 20, and 21, 1971.) (Committee minority witnesses.)

Chapter IX. Subversive Influences Affecting the Military Forces of the United States. (Summary of hearings held October 20–22, 27, 28, and November 9, 10, and 16–18, 1971.)

Chapter X. Summary Report on the Termination of Suit Instituted Against Publication of Committee Study of Amounts of Honoraria Paid Campus Speakers Associated with Revolutionary or "Front" Group.

Chapter XI. Report of Committee's Files and Reference Section.

Chapter XII. Summary Report on Committee Publications (Including commentary on a special report on the Black Panthers, a committee print regarding the origins and objectives of the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance, and a report on the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 Amendments.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, March 22, 1973*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Sviatoslau Kous, Byelorussian Orthodox Church, New York, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Our Lord, and God Jesus Christ, receive from us, Your humble servants, our most sincere prayers and in forgiving our sins bless all our enemies and those who would do harm unto us. Rather, show our enemies the true goodness of man. Those of us who believe in Your righteousness ask that we may never be led astray. Keep in Your grace the people of these United States of America and give guidance to our democratic principles.

Hear the lament of my Byelorussian people crying day and night for freedom. Give unto these people, through Your sacrifice, peace, and tranquillity. Do not forsake those who have forsaken You but rather make Your truth appear to all mankind. 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 PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

REVEREND KOUS DELIVERS OPENING PRAYER

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the opening prayer in the House of Representatives was delivered today by the Reverend Sviatoslau Kous, rector of the American-Byelorussian St. Cyril of Turov Independent Greek Orthodox Church in Richmond Hill, N.Y. It is an honor for all the residents of the Seventh Congressional District in Queens, N.Y., to have Reverend Kous here today and I am proud that he was invited to deliver the opening prayer.

The Greek Orthodox church in Richmond Hill where Reverend Kous serves as rector is newly built and was consecrated on October 29, 1972. Reverend Kous was born in Wilno, Byelorussia, and graduated from the Stephen Batory University in Wilno.

He came to the United States in 1949 and was ordained to be a priest by the Metropolitan Germanos of the Greek Orthodox Church on February 9, 1969. Reverend Kous, in addition to his duties as rector of the church, teaches at the high school in South River, N.J., where he lives.

It is particularly appropriate for Reverend Kous to lead us in prayer this week because March 25 will mark the 55th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

On behalf of my constituents and my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I thank Reverend Kous for being with us today to deliver the opening prayer.

ITT—$1 MILLION DONATION CONTAMINATES THE PURPOSE OF CIA

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's disclosures of an offer by the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. to contribute up to $1 million in support of any Government plan for the purpose of bringing about a coalition of opposition to President Allende of Chile suggests the likelihood of precedence and pattern of private and corporate contributions to the Central Intelligence Agency to fund activities and operations of special interest to such contributors.

It is shocking if such contributions are legal or have been made in the past. If an agency of the Federal Government can receive private contributions for specific activities of a public agency or department, the commingling of private resources with the Federal funds of a Government agency contaminates the public purpose of the agency. If an agency or department of the Federal Government can receive such funds to provide direction or support of a specific goal or purpose, it opens up a form of bureaucratic bribery which should be prohibited.

I am currently preparing legislation

precluding any agency or department of the Federal Government from receiving any gift which can contaminate its purposes. If a corporation or individual desires to make a gift to the Government, let it be made to the Treasurer of the United States—or let it be paid in the form of equitable income taxes.

I am also requesting those charged with oversight to examine the extent of private and corporate contributions to the Central Intelligence Agency.

ROBERT M. BALL: A GREAT PUBLIC SERVANT

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of our Nation's most outstanding public servants left office last Saturday after more than 20 years of dedicated service to the American people. I am referring, of course, to Robert M. Ball, who, for nearly 11 years, served as Commissioner of Social Security.

During Commissioner Ball's tenure at the Social Security Administration, that agency was recognized as one of the most effective and efficient in the Federal Government. Mr. Ball himself won the praise and respect of elected and appointed officials at all levels of government.

The Commissioner's real reward, however, is the knowledge that he has made life immeasurably better for millions of retired and disabled Americans. Older Americans will not forget that it was Robert M. Ball who fought for the enactment of the medicare program, and Robert M. Ball who successfully advocated three increases in social security benefits during the last 4 years. As a result of his efforts in their behalf, older Americans are now able to face their retirement years with more confidence and the blind, disabled, and needy have made significant strides forward. It is indeed a great loss to our country that Commissioner Ball was not asked to remain in his position.

I know that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in extending warmest aloha to Commissioner Ball and wishing him success and happiness in his future endeavors, including, hopefully, a return to public service.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in returning to the floor of the House on March 1 for rollcall No. 30, the vote on final passage of H.R. 3298. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of this legislation.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in arriving on the House floor on March 20 for rollcall No. 52. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of this resolution.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S ANTICRIME PROPOSALS

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the need for speedy consideration of President Nixon's anticrime proposals was pointed up this past weekend when the U.S. magistrate handling the hearing for the alleged attackers of Senator JOHN STENNIS greatly reduced the amount of bail being requested by the U.S. attorney's office. I was greatly shocked to learn that one of the suspects had been released on an unsecured bond of $5,000 and another had the amount of bail reduced from $25,000 to $10,000.

We are not talking about simple assault or a mugging, we are talking about suspects in an armed robbery and attempted murder case, plus assault on a Federal official.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the President's proposals will end this leniency on the part of some courts that appear to take more interest in protecting the criminal than they do the rights of the victims of crime.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

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

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which I believe will help to alleviate on a long-term basis the tremendous shortage of lumber. The bill which I am introducing provides for a balanced and efficient protection and development of the national forest system and privately owned forest lands through the establishment of a forest lands planning and investment fund.

The bill would set up a revolving fund to utilize receipts from the sale of timber from Federal forests, but the money would still have to be appropriated by the Appropriations Committee of the Congress.

It is a supply act per se because in section 5 of the bill it provides specifically for reforestation and stand improvement; nursery development; tree improvement; recreation construction and construction to facilitate visitor education and interpretive services, water resource development construction; construction projects for fire protection and general administration, pollution abatement; wildlife habitat improvement; range revegetation and improvement; and fuel modification; watershed restoration and improvement; land status and landline location; land classification; and geometronics.

The bill would provide additional funding to the Forest Service to enable them to use modern sustained methods of reforestation. By the planting of cut-over lands and by up-to-date methods of cultivation, fertilization, and thinning by utilizing modern sustained yield methods of forestry, growth of a Douglas fir tree can be speeded up by 40 percent. This would guarantee adequate lumber for future needs and complete replacement of cut lumber. The present lumber situation is very chaotic due to a tremendous demand and a shortage of supply. On the long-term basis my bill would help to alleviate this situation.

MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL FORESTS

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

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the lumber and plywood markets are in a state of turmoil today with prices skyrocketing and no relief yet in sight. Yet the present chief of the Forest Service has stated publicly that the allowable cut from the national forests can be increased by 50 percent with adequate funding to grow new forests. The allowable cut is that amount of timber which can be harvested each year and replenished so that the national forest may produce timber in perpetuity with no peril of exhaustion.

Both the Senate and House Banking Committees called for more intensive management of the national forests following exhaustive investigations of softwood lumber and plywood supply and price problems in 1969. Similar action was urged by a presidential task force in 1970. But these recommendations were never carried out.

Federal timber sales programs return nearly $4 to the Federal Treasury for each dollar invested and that must be a remarkable return for anyone's money. In spite of this, the Forest Service lacks a dependable source of funding to maximize timber production and insure that the forest environment is able to sustain increasing demands for recreation of all kinds.

As the major custodian of the Nation's standing sawtimber, the Forest Service needs both dollars and manpower. The need is critical if the national forests are to continue to supply wood fiber at reasonable prices to meet unprecedented demands for construction materials to house its people. Surely the richest nation in the world can afford to provide intensive management for its forests which have the capacity to provide us indefinitely with their bounty.

SUMMER JOB PROGRAM

(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 President has announced an interesting new way to close the generation gap between teenagers and adults. He wants to pit them in head-to-head competition for jobs this summer.

Mr. Nixon has finally recognized the necessity for a summer job program for youngsters—a program like the ones we have had for several years now. In fact, the President has requested, and the Congress has funded, a summer job program for this year.

But now Mr. Nixon tells us he does not want to use the funds we have allocated for that purpose. He wants to take the cost of the youth program out of the equally important public employ-

ment program which in the past 2 years has provided work for as many as 220,000 adults. The beneficiaries of PEP have been the returning Vietnam veteran, the welfare recipient and other unemployed, who have suffered as a result of the joblessness caused by Mr. Nixon's economic policies these past 4 years.

This PEP program, you will remember, is another one of those marked for extermination by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that we need a summer job program. But I do not believe that we should bleed the beneficiaries of PEP to pay for it. I think that both programs can stand on their own merits. I think there are places in President Nixon's big-business-oriented budget where we can trim, if we have to, to pay for two vitally important employment programs.

As a prominent Capitol Hill colleague said yesterday of the President's high-handed action:

This is impoundment and breach of promise. Cities are left with the Hobson's choice of firing the father in order to hire the son.

AMERICAN FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Nation is again at peace. We also are firmly on the course of strong economic growth at home. Now we must turn more of our attention to the urgent problems we face in our economic dealings with other nations. International problems may seem to some of us to be far away, but they have a very direct impact on the jobs, the incomes and the living standards of our people. Neither the peace we have achieved nor the economic growth essential to our national welfare will last if we leave such matters unattended, for they can diminish our prosperity at home and at the same time provoke harmful friction abroad.

Our major difficulties stem from relying too long upon outdated economic arrangements and institutions despite the rapid changes which have taken place in the world. Many countries we helped to rebuild after World War II are now our strong economic competitors. Americans can no longer act as if these historic developments had not taken place. We must do a better job of preparing ourselves—both in the private sector and in the Government—to compete more effectively in world markets, so that expanding trade can bring greater benefits to our people.

In the summer of 1971, this Administration initiated fundamental changes in American foreign economic policy. We have also introduced proposals for the reform of the international monetary and trading systems which have lost their ability to deal with current problems. The turmoil in world monetary affairs has demonstrated clearly that greater urgency must now be attached to constructive reform.

At home, we have continued our fight to maintain price stability and to improve our productivity—objectives which are as important to our international economic position as to our domestic welfare.

What is our next step?

In my State of the Union message on the economy last month, I outlined certain measures to strengthen both our domestic and international economic position. One of the most important is trade reform.

In choosing an international trade policy which will benefit all Americans, I have concluded that we must face up to more intense long-term competition in the world's markets rather than shrink from it. Those who would have us turn inward, hiding behind a shield of import restrictions of indefinite duration, might achieve short-term gains and benefit certain groups, but they would exact a high cost from the economy as a whole. Those costs would be borne by all of us in the form of higher prices and lower real income. Only in response to unfair competition, or the closing of markets abroad to our people, or to provide time for adjustment, would such restrictive measures be called for.

My approach is based both on my strong faith in the ability of Americans to compete, and on my confidence that all nations will recognize their own vital interest in lowering economic barriers and applying fairer and more effective trading rules.

The fact that most of these comments are addressed to the role of our Government should not divert attention from the vital role which private economic activity will play in resolving our current problems. The cooperation and the initiative of all sectors of our economy are needed to increase our productivity and to keep our prices competitive. This is essential to our international trading position. Yet there are certain necessary steps which only the Government can take, given the worldwide scope of trading activity and the need for broad international agreement to expand trade fairly and effectively. I am determined that we shall take those steps.

I know that the American people and their representatives in Congress can be counted on to rise to the challenge of the changing world economy. Together we must do what is needed to further the prosperity of our country, and of the world in which we live.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 22, 1973.*

NATIONAL ARTHRITIS MONTH

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 275) to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month."

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 275

Whereas arthritis and rheumatic diseases are the Nation's number 1 crippling diseases, affecting seventeen million Americans of all ages, causing limitations in their usual activities and great suffering;

Whereas arthritis and rheumatic diseases are second only to heart disease as the most widespread chronic illnesses in the United States today;

Whereas the annual cost of arthritis and rheumatic diseases to Americans is estimated to exceed $3,500,000,000 annually in lost wages, medical and disability payments, and taxes lost to the Federal Government;

Whereas advances in research and treatment show promise of significant breakthrough leading to a better understanding of and cure for these diseases;

Whereas the month of May is the period during which the Arthritis Foundation conducts its annual fundraising campaign to support its efforts in arthritis research and treatment; and

Whereas the most common form of arthritis strikes mainly older Americans and the White House Conference on Aging has been meeting during the week of November 29, 1971, to focus attention on the problem of this important group of citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation (1) designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month", (2) inviting the Governors of the several States to issue proclamations for like purposes, and (3) urging the people of the United States, and educational, philanthropic, scientific, medical, and health care professions and organizations to provide the necessary assistance and resources to discover the causes and cures of arthritis and rheumatic diseases and to alleviate the suffering of persons struck by these diseases.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer three amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On page 2, line 4, strike out the word "annually".

On page 2, line 5, strike out the words "in each year" and insert in lieu thereof "1973".

On pages 1 and 2, strike out the entire preamble.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 390, which would designate the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month."

Arthritis has failed to receive public attention, which would lead to more adequate consideration and research into the causes and cures, even though it is one of the more serious chronic diseases in our nation. Arthritis is second only to heart disease as the most widespread chronic illness in America.

The Arthritis Foundation estimates that some 20 million Americans are presently suffering from some form of arthritis or rheumatic disease. It causes

death in relatively few people, however, many of these people are totally disabled by the extent of their suffering.

This year the Arthritis Foundation will be celebrating its 25th anniversary of service to those Americans afflicted with this painful and crippling disease and I think it would be particularly appropriate if Congress would recognize their efforts. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join in support of this resolution which would declare the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month."

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, as the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 275, I rise in support of passage of this resolution. It is a great pleasure to see the resolution designating May as National Arthritis Month come before the House today. This May, the National Arthritis Foundation will be celebrating its 25th anniversary of service to those Americans afflicted with this painful and crippling disease. Consequently, our action today is most appropriate.

When we look at the great gains made by our society, we recognize that they are all a result, basically, of the great store of manpower available to this country. It is estimated, however, that a sizable portion of that pool of people, some 20 million persons, are in some way unable to participate because of the crippling and painful effects of one of the arthritic or rheumatic diseases so prevalent in our Nation. Many of these people are totally incapacitated.

Although it is one of the more serious chronic diseases in our Nation—second only to heart disease as the most widespread chronic illness in America—arthritis and rheumatic diseases have failed to receive the public attention which would lead to more adequate consideration and research into the causes and cures. This is undoubtedly because arthritis and related diseases actually cause death in relatively few people. The cost, however, in pain and suffering, and in financial loss to both those involved and to our economy, is enormous. While we cannot place a value on the pain suffered by those afflicted, it is estimated that the annual financial cost of arthritis and rheumatic diseases to Americans exceeds $4.3 billion.

There is hope, however, as some research is being done, which is beginning to lead to more and more substantial results. We have here an opportunity to recognize this work, and provide a public forum by which we may encourage more.

Indeed, National Arthritis Month provides an excellent opportunity to educate the American people in the problems and successes in this area, and I am proud to have been associated with this effort.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the month of May 1973, as 'National Arthritis Month'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HUNTING AND FISHING DAY

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 210) asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day."

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Why was the last Saturday in September selected for this observance?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I would like to refer the answer to the distinguished author of the bill, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES), if the gentleman will yield to him.

Mr. GROSS. I will be happy to yield to my good friend from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Of course, there is no mandatory reason for selecting this specific date. It was proposed because it comes in early fall, at a time when there is general interest in the outdoors from the standpoint of fishing or in some areas in hunting. It was deemed an acceptable date from most standpoints.

Mr. GROSS. I want to say to my good friend from Florida that the climate is somewhat different in his State than northern Minnesota, where some of us like to go fishing, and some of the other Northern States such as northern Michigan. It is possible that you could be fishing through the ice on the last Saturday in September.

Mr. SIKES. I suggest to the gentleman that is all the more reason to come to Florida and enjoy the hunting and fishing as well as the peaceful solitude still to be found there.

Mr. GROSS. And the "peaceful solitude" that the resolution suggests that may be found on that occasion in the outdoors might be a rather cold, peaceful solitude.

However, the objective of the gentleman is, I believe, a worthy one and I hope we can rely on the T and T Club to see to it that there is no session of Congress on the designated Saturday so we can all go fishing.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 210

Whereas in the congestion and the complexities, the tensions and frustrations of today's life, the need for outdoor recreation—the opportunity to "get away from it all"—has become of crucial importance, and

Whereas there are few pursuits providing a better chance for healthy exercise, peaceful solitude, and appreciation of the great outdoors than hunting and fishing, and

Whereas this is evident in the fact that more than fifteen million hunting licenses and twenty-five fishing licenses are issued each year, and

Whereas the purchase of these licenses bring over $200,000,000 into State and local government treasuries, and

Whereas this income provides a rich source of funds for fish and wildlife conservation and management and for the salvation, preservation, and propagation of vanishing species, and

Whereas hunters and anglers traditionally have led in the effort to preserve our natural resources, and

Whereas outdoor sportsmen also have led in the promotion of proper respect for private as well as public property, of courtesy in the field and forest, and in boating and firearm safety programs, and

Whereas there is no present national recognition of the many and worthwhile contributions of the American hunter and angler: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States declare the fourth Saturday of each September as "National Hunting and Fishing Day" to provide that deserved national recognition, to recognize the esthetic, health, and recreational virtues of hunting and fishing, to dramatize the continued need for gun and boat safety, and to rededicate ourselves to the conservation and respectful use of our wildlife and natural resources.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, first let me express my personal appreciation and that of millions of American sportsmen for the work of my distinguished friend the Congressman from California (Mr. EDWARDS), and his committee in recognizing the significance of this resolution and bringing it to the floor for passage. I respectfully urge a unanimous vote of the House in adopting the resolution requesting the President to designate the fourth Saturday in September as "National Hunting and Fishing Day."

It will be recalled that this action is similar to that a year ago when the House unanimously passed such a resolution. The bill was signed into law by the President and September 23, 1972, was a day of national celebration in special recognition of more than 55 million hunters and fishermen for their contribution to conservation and outdoor recreation.

Possibly there is no other form of recreation which provides a better prospect than hunting and fishing for healthful exercise with the opportunity to breathe fresh, clean air, to find solitude, and to forget daily cares.

As an indication of the enormous appeal of the sport of hunting and fishing, the latest report from the Department of the Interior shows nearly 16 million hunting licenses and 26 million fishing licenses were purchased in 1971. This is an increase of 607,000 hunting licenses—the largest single increase in over a decade—and 1,300,000 fishing licenses—also a record high—over the previous year.

For the privilege of hunting and fishing, the participants pay more than $208 million each year for licenses, tags, per-

mits, and stamps. This income provides a rich source of funds for fish and wildlife conservation management. Many of the activities being undertaken today to protect wildlife threatened with extinction and to reestablish breeds and strains which have been losing the battle for survival has come from hunting and fishing license funds. In addition to those millions of people who pay to hunt and fish, there are also millions who enjoy these sports who are not required to purchase licenses because of age or military service.

It is notable that the true sportsmen among the hunters and fishermen are leaders in conservation programs and preservation of fish and wildlife. Responsible hunters and fishermen are leaders in local and national efforts to stop wanton destruction of threatened breeds of wildlife, to make sure that pollution of our waters do not wipe out fish-life. In addition, they are leaders among those who promote safety in hunting and fishing. Many of the laws to help insure safety in the outdoors have been developed, brought to the attention of State legislatures, and passed into law at the behest of hunters and fishermen.

It is important to the spiritual and physical survival of our people that Congress encourage hunters and fishermen to continue their conservation crusade and their enjoyment of outdoor recreation. I, therefore, urge that Congress honor the hunters and fishermen of America by again passing this resolution. At the same time, we can use this day to assure that we rededicate our Nation to the adequate protection of the land and water wildlife of the Nation, and to promote again and redouble our efforts to see that hunting and fishing recreation is carried on at the highest level of safety for those who participate.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer several amendments.

The Clerk read the amendments as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On page 2, line 4, strike out the words "of each September" and insert in lieu thereof "of September, 1973".

On pages 1 and 2, strike out the entire preamble.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of September, 1973, 'National Hunting and Fishing Day'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ARBOR DAY

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 289) to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of each year as "National Arbor Day."

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 289

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 annually a proclamation designating the last Friday of April of each year as "National Arbor Day" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: On page 1, line 5, strike out the words "of each year" and insert in lieu thereof "1973".

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April, 1973, as 'National Arbor Day'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICOLAUS COPERNICUS WEEK

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 5) requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of April 23, 1973, as "Nicolaus Copernicus Week" marking the quinquecentennial of his birth.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 5

Whereas the work of Nicolaus Copernicus marks the beginning of the era of modern science;

Whereas in 1973 there will have passed 500 years since the birth of Copernicus who was born, worked, and lived in Poland;

Whereas the National Academy of Sciences has accepted the inivitation from the Polish Government to assure leadership for activities associated with the observance of the quinquecentennial and named a special committee to make recommendations;

Whereas the Smithsonian Institution in cooperation with the National Academy of Sciences is conducting during the week of April 23 its Fifth International Symposium, "The Nature of Scientific Discovery," with a scientific program which focuses upon the Copernican theory, an integral part of modern science; and

Whereas scientists from the United States, Poland, and other countries will be gathered to celebrate the origins of modern science, inquire into the kinds of cultural climates which encourage the growth of scientific knowledge, and examine certain revolutionary developments in contemporary science that have grown out of the Copernican Revolution: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of April 23, 1973, as "Nicolaus Copernicus Week" and calling upon the people of the United States to join with the Nation's scientific community as well as that of Poland and other nations in observing such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of California: 1. On pages 1 and 2, strike out the entire preamble.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I am grateful to the Judiciary Committee for clearing my resolution (H.J. Res. 5) for consideration by the House today.

This resolution requests the President to designate the week of April 23 as "Nicolaus Copernicus Week" in honor of the 500th birthday anniversary of the renowned Polish scientist who is considered by many to be the father of modern science.

I want to extend my special appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee, our distinguished colleague from California (Mr. EDWARDS), for his initiative and cooperation on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, many observances have been arranged throughout the world this year in honor of Copernicus. In fact, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD we received this morning I had a separate extension of remarks listing many of the observances scheduled in the United States.

Nicolaus Copernicus was born February 19, 1473, in Torun, Poland. He had a most remarkable career over his 70 years on this Earth. He was a scholar in many fields of endeavor, as well as science, including doctor of canon law, physician, ordained priest, an authority on money, and a soldier.

But over the years his name principally has been associated with his work as an astronomer and what has come to be known as the Copernican theory.

Copernicus concluded that the centuries-old teachings on the universe were wrong. Theologians and the church, notwithstanding, he determined—and correctly—that it was the sun, not the earth, which was the center of the universe.

It was many, many years before the Copernican theory was accepted, principally because of the opposition of the church. But accepted it finally was and scientists down through the years have credited the modest Polish astronomer for having pioneered in a very vital basic of modern science.

Normally, honors and celebrations would be focused upon the birthday anniversary last month except that—under the new Monday holiday law—the date

wound up in conflict with the official national holiday honoring the father of our country, George Washington. Copernicus was not forgotten on that date by any means, however, including my own remarks here in the House on that day.

But the major national celebration of Copernicus' anniversary is being concentrated on the week of April 23. During that week the Smithsonian Institution, in cooperation with the National Academy of Sciences, is conducting a seminar for scientists from all over the world and the subject is the Copernican theory.

The Smithsonian is assembling an extensive exhibit in honor of Copernicus which will be on public display over a period of weeks beginning on April 7. A number of important historical items have been borrowed from Poland for the exhibit.

The U.S. Postal Service is issuing a special 8-cent commemorative stamp on April 23 in honor of Copernicus. The first-day ceremony will be held at the Smithsonian with many distinguished individuals invited to participate.

On the preceding evening, April 22, the National Academy of Sciences has arranged a special cultural program on Copernicus. Included will be a specially commissioned musical composition by Leo Smit of the State University at Buffalo, with narration by Sir Fred Hoyle of England, an internationally recognized cosmologist.

The musical work was commissioned by the National Academy and is entitled "Narratio et Credo." Eight Gregg Smith Singers from New York City and an ensemble of eight musicians will participate.

Following the brief ceremony marking the opening of Nicolaus Copernicus Week, the Gregg Smith Singers will give a recital in Polish of several Polish renaissance madrigals, newly discovered.

The musical work by Leo Smit and Sir Fred Hoyle will provide the climax for the opening night's festivities.

Another program is planned for the auditorium of the National Academy of Sciences on Wednesday, April 25, when a new work by Leon Kirchner called "Lily" will be presented as part of a program featuring members of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. The motif of this program is to reflect through current new music the motif of Copernicus as a creator of new intellectual concepts.

Then on Friday, April 27, there will be a Copernican musical program at the Kennedy Center Concert Hall featuring new music, the Symphony No. 2—Copernican—of Mikolaj Henryk Gorecki.

One of the final events of the year will be on November 28, when the Royal Society of Canada will have its Copernicus celebration. Here again, there will be presented a new work, "Nicolaus Copernicus," commissioned by the National Art Center to the Polish composer, Tadeusz Baird.

Mr. Speaker, appropriate recognition of Nicolaus Copernicus is most appropriate in our age, the age of space. All of our great accomplishments in space relate directly to the Copernican theory that sun, not the earth, is the center of the universe around which the earth and the planets revolve.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on all four of the resolutions just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 308 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 308

Resolved, That (a) effective January 3, 1973, the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted pursuant to clause 11 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Internal Security, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $475,000 including expenditures—

(1) for the employment of investigators, experts, attorneys, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants;

(2) for the procurement of services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a (i)); and

(3) for specialized training, pursuant to section 202(j) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 72a(j)), of committee staff personnel performing professional and nonclerical functions;

shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

(b) Not to exceed $20,000 of the total amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i)); and not to exceed $2,500 of such total amount may be used to provide for specialized training, pursuant to section 202(j) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 72a(j)), of staff personnel of the committee performing professional and nonclerical functions; but neither of these monetary limitations shall prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Internal Security shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration in accordance with existing law.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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. 55]

Aspin	Gray	Pike
Badillo	Griffiths	Price, Tex.
Bell	Gubser	Quie
Bergland	Guyer	Rangel
Biaggi	Harsha	Rees
Butler	Hébert	Reid
Carey, N.Y.	Hinshaw	Roncallo, N.Y.
Carney, Ohio	Holifield	Rooney, N.Y.
Chappell	Hosmer	Rooney, Pa.
Chisholm	Jones, Ala.	Ruppe
Clark	Karth	Ryan
Conlan	Ketchum	Stark
Conyers	King	Talcott
Edwards, Ala.	Landrum	Taylor, Mo.
Foley	McCormack	Widnall
Ford,	McSpadden	Wright
William D.	Milford	Young, Ill.
Fraser	Minshall, Ohio	
Frey	Owens	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 378 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN).

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years the House Internal Security Committee, of which I am a member spent $1,028,657.21.

Of this sum $962,889.43 was spent on the salaries of the 49 members of the staff of this nine-man committee.

Astonishing as it seems only 13 bills were referred to this committee during the 92d Congress. These 13 bills referred to seven subject matters. Only three of the bills were reported to the floor and all were defeated.

Happily we can say that in the United States today the issues surrounding subversion, espionage, and treason do not loom large.

The Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives had exclusive jurisdiction over all of these subjects from 1790 until 1945 when the House Internal Security Committee established as a per-

manent committee of the House of Representatives.

I am hoping that Members of this House will today decide that the Judiciary Committee each of the members of which is a lawyer is clearly and undeniably the unit which should handle these completely legal matters. The Judiciary Committee of the other body has exclusive jurisdiction over all matters related to subversion, espionage and treason.

If only 13 bills were referred to the House Internal Security Committee during the 92d Congress it seems clear that the House of Representatives is spending an enormous sum of money to investigate a problem where problems do not apparently exist.

Most of the incredible sum of money spent by the House Internal Security Committee went for investigations and for the maintenance of the dossiers of three-fourths of a million individual Americans concerning whom the House Internal Security Committee maintains a file.

As a member of the House Internal Security Committee over the past 2 years I have examined very closely the relatively few studies—despite the huge staff—which the committee has issued. With all due respect I am afraid that these studies proceed from a preconceived viewpoint, tailor facts to coincide with this viewpoint and have uncovered virtually no new evidence related to alleged subversion in organizations such as the Students for a Democratic Society, the Black Panthers, the National Peace Action Coalition, and the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice.

Indeed, the extensive publications of HISC seem more and more to specialize in the extensive and useless reproduction of the documents of the organizations which the staff investigates.

The documents of HISC are furthermore replete with unsubstantiated references to the alleged subversive activities of individuals. One Irving Sarnoff of Los Angeles, for example, is mentioned 16 times as a known member of the Communist Party in the 2,300 pages of documents issued by HISC in the recent past resulting from its investigation of the peace movement.

The studies issued by HISC range from the worthless to the highly objectionable. On June 22, 1972, the chairman transmitted to the Speaker a report entitled "America's Maoist: The Revolutionary Union—The Venceremos Organization" From pages 131 to 156 of this document there is a long list of names, with photographs, of American citizens identified by two witnesses "friendly" to HISC as persons associated with the Venceremos. The report of HISC indicates that each of these individuals was sent a registered letter pursuant to the requirements of House rule XI, 27(M).

The letters of the six individuals who protested their inclusion in this document and who requested to appear before the committee are reprinted, to my knowledge without the permission of these individuals as far as is known, starting on page 156 of the document.

The report states:

> None of them, in the end, availed themselves of the opportunity to appear before the committee.

One of the basic reasons why these individuals did not take advantage of the opportunity was the fact that an investigator for the House Internal Security Committee talked to or visited with each of these individuals and, in my judgment, inhibited them from exercising their rights.

The rights of these individuals, furthermore, at a hearing made available to them are very nebulous and uncertain. No one at any time has taken advantage of the opportunity to exculpate himself from the categorization made by a HISC document along with the crude "mugshot" attached to the identification.

Mr. Speaker, it is my judgment that tactics like these and publications like "America's Maoists" bring dishonor upon the House of Representatives and bring injustice into the lives of individuals—mostly young students—and should have no place in the business of the Congress of the United States.

HISC IS NOW SEEKING COMMUNISTS IN PRISONS IN AMERICA

On March 20, 1973, four members of the House Internal Security Committee over my dissent agreed to hold hearings with respect to Attica in Albany. A majority of the committee on February 27, 1973, resolved to investigate the activities of subversive organizations—

> conducted within, or directed towards, the prisons and other penal institutions and systems of the United States or of any state . . .

The resolution to investigate alleged Communist activity in the prisons of this country was passed despite the following two factors:

First. Seven volumes of hearings prepared by Subcommittee No. 3 of the Judiciary Committee during the 92d Congress covered every aspect of problems related to prisons all over the United States. In all of this massive amount of testimony no penal official or any inmate or former inmate ever at any time indicated that any subversive influence in the prisons was a source of inmate agitation.

Second. The Select Committee on Crime of the House of Representatives conducted extensive hearings about Attica. In all of the abundant material collected by this committee about Attica there were at most only one or two references to any alleged subversive influence in that institution.

The hearings which soon will be held by the House Internal Security Committee with respect to alleged subversion in the prisons of America will be another expensive adventure by this committee which can only result in adding more false issues to the difficult question of penal reform. Like the extensive hearings conducted by HISC over the past few years into other movements, these hearings will end by harming the reputations of innocent persons by including their names or the titles of their organizations in the permanent records of the files of this congressional committee.

I am afraid that the forthcoming hearings on alleged Communist influence in the penal institutions of this country will be another sad and self-inflicted wound by a committee of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, all of us today have an opportunity to improve the work of the House of Representatives by transferring the jurisdiction over subversion and espionage from the House Internal Security Committee to the Judiciary Committee.

Clearly this jurisdiction should be returned to the committee where it resided from the very birth of the Congress in 1790 until 1945. During all of those decades the Judiciary Committee had the prime and exclusive responsibility for writing and improving the laws of this Nation that forbid crimes against the Nation's security. During all of those decades the Judiciary Committee similarly had oversight function with respect to the enforcement of those laws.

The whole question of subversion, internal security and espionage involves delicate and complex issues about which lawyers rather than laymen have expert knowledge and background. It is for this reason that the Judiciary Committee, a unit made up of 38 attorneys, would be better suited to write and supervise the administration of laws related to the protection of the internal security of this country.

In 1970, 52 Members of this House so believed and so voted. In 1971, 75 Members agreed that the jurisdiction of the House Internal Security Committee should be transferred to the Judiciary. In 1972 a total of 102 members agreed with this proposition.

I have the hope, Mr. Speaker, that in 1973 a majority of this House of Representatives will agree that the important matter of possessing and enforcing strong laws against subversion should no longer remain with a committee whose credibility and effectiveness are seriously open to question but should be returned to the Judiciary Committee where they resided and were properly exercised during the first 14 decades of the existence of this Congress and this Nation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK), the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the statement by a former distinguished Member of this body from Oklahoma, Mr. Belcher, which he would make quite often. When he would watch things happen, every now and then he would say, "I feel like a Chinese foghorn. The foghorn keeps blowing, and the fog keeps coming in."

We have heard these same arguments year after year after year as to our committee, on the work that we do. I still believe that with all of the arguments we

have heard it will be just like the foghorn; we are going to keep going, to stay in business, and do the very same things. I believe this is something which has met with the overwhelming support of the majority of the Members of this body. I hope that again today we will receive the same vote.

I see no reason to go into every detail and discuss this over and over again. I merely say that I support the resolution and I hope the majority of the Members will.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to urge a "no" vote on the resolution. I would hope that the continuing number of Members who did vote "no" would be increased today.

I should like to take this moment also to pose a question to the distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. ICHORD.

In the "Dear Colleague" letter the gentleman wrote a number of months ago the gentleman referred to the fact that since he had become the chairman of this committee no longer were files kept on the Members of Congress. That is correct?

Mr. ICHORD. That is absolutely correct. I would state to the gentleman from California that no files are kept on the Members of Congress. We do have files in the committee, but they are not kept on Members of Congress. There would only be one file, in a technical sense, kept on a Member of Congress, and in a sense, that would be the file on the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD). There are a few files kept on individuals who definitely are not Members of Congress but they are few in number.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his response.

What the gentleman is saying is that previous to his chairmanship files were kept by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on Members of Congress. I do not think, if we are going to keep them on other American citizens, that we as Members of Congress should necessarily be excluded from this practice, but I think that what the gentleman is also saying is that in the event he would not be chairman at some future date, the new chairman could immediately start up a subversive file on Members of Congress again.

Is that correct?

Mr. ICHORD. Let me state to the gentleman from California that if he is opposed to the files and reference sections of the House Committee on Internal Security, why does he not introduce a resolution that would prohibit the chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security from making the information in the files and reference section available to the Members?

I understand the gentleman has not done that, nor has any other Member done that.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his response.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 191, providing a budget for the Internal Security Committee of $475,000 in addition to the $250,000 it receives as a standing committee of the House. This committee and its predecessor, the House Un-American Activities Committee, have been sources of controversy and debate in this body ever since HUAC was established in 1945, and I shall not dwell on the committee's past faults and dangers, which have been discussed so many times before.

I find ample reason for opposing House Resolution 191 set forth in the committee's plans for the current session. HISC plans to conduct an investigation to "uncover the nature and extent of subversive influences involved in prison riots, disturbances, and unrest, and in connection therewith the movement to reform practices of incarceration, probation, and parole."[1] This venture can only be characterized as jurisdictional overreaching inasmuch as Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Judiciary Committee has had jurisdiction over Federal corrections for some time, and held extensive hearings on prison problems in the last Congress.

In addition, the committee also proposes to investigate the "activities of Communist China within the United States, with particular focus upon infiltration, drug introduction, espionage, recruitment of Americans of Chinese ancestry and the formation or utilization of organizations to serve the purposes of Communist China."[2] I find it incredible that at a time when our Government has made enormous progress in normalizing our relationships with the People's Republic of China, that a committee of the House would endanger this tenuous rapprochment. An investigation of this nature would almost certainly reawaken feelings of suspicion against Chinese Americans by the mere facts of their Chinese ancestry.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House a petition signed by 377 professors of public law from some of our finest law schools requesting the abolition of the House Internal Security Committee. I wish particularly to note that the deans of 13 law schools are in support of this petition. A positive step in this direction would be to reject House Resolution 191, and I urge the Members to vote no further funding for the House Internal Security Committee.

The petition follows:

PETITION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

We, the undersigned professors of public law, for the reasons set forth below, respectfully petition the House of Representatives to abolish the Committee on Internal Security.

In February 1969 the House of Representatives voted to terminate the Committee on Un-American Activities and to establish in its place, with some modification of its mandate, the Committee on Internal Security. Since that date, under a new chairman, there have been certain changes in the style and tactics of the Committee. In essence, however, the objectives and functions of the Committee have remained the same. Thus the passage of time and the installation of new management have confirmed that, regardless of sporadic reform, the operations of any committee of this nature run counter to the basic principles of American democracy. There has been increasing recognition of this in Congress itself, in the legal profession, and in the public at large. We believe the time has come to eliminate the Committee on Internal Security from our governmental structure.

I

The principal function of the Committee on Internal Security, like its predecessor the Committee on Un-American Activities, has been to probe and expose the beliefs, opinions and associations of American citizens. The jurisdiction of the Committee extends to "Communist and other subversive activities affecting the internal security of the United States." This mandate is not limited to activities that involve the use of force or violence or other illegal measures. And the term "subversive," as the courts have many times ruled, is so vague and indefinite as to constitute very little limitation on the Committee's authority.

The Committee is also specifically authorized to investigate "the extent, character, objectives, and activities" of "organizations or groups," including their "members, agents, and affiliates," which seek to establish "a totalitarian dictatorship" in the United States, or to overthrow or alter "the form of government" by "force, violence, treachery, espionage, sabotage, insurrection, or any unlawful means." Similar authority is given to investigate organizations or groups, and their "members, agents, and affiliates," which "incite or employ acts of force, violence, terrorism or other unlawful means" to "obstruct or oppose the lawful authority of the Government of the United States" in the execution of any law or policy affecting internal security.

While these provisions make a bow toward confining the investigatory powers of the Committee to conduct involving force or violence, or similar illegality, it is clear that they impose no real bounds of that sort. The clause relating to totalitarian dictatorship is not so limited. Under the other clauses, so long as a claim can be made that a possibility of the use of force or violence exists somewhere in the remote background the Committee can investigate at will. Thus an investigation into the "character" and "objectives" of a peace organization, at one of whose demonstrations some conflict with the police may have at one time employed militant rhetoric, becomes for all practical purposes an inquiry into political beliefs, ideas and associations quite divorced from any overt acts of an illegal nature. Indeed, this broad scope of the Committee's power is explicitly confirmed by a catch-all provision which authorizes the Committee to investigate "all other questions . . . relating to the foregoing."

It is inevitable that any committee operating under such a mandate, and conceiving its function as one of protecting the nation against "un-American" or "subversive" activities, will devote most of its attention to those aspects of political conduct which constitute the kind of expression that the First Amendment is designed to safeguard. The Committee is not qualified or equipped to do anything else. Investigation of acts of force or violence, which of course constitute violation of the criminal law, must be left to the Department of Justice and other prosecuting authorities. What is left for the Committee is to probe into the ideology, the public and private statements, the associations, and the organizational activities of the

---

[1] Chairman Ichord's letter of Feb. 7, 1973, to Chairman Wayne Hays of House Administration.

[2] Ibid.

groups and individuals which become its target.

This is, indeed, exactly how the Committee on Internal Security, and the Committee on Un-American Activities before it, have operated. It is rarely overt acts of force or violence that the Committee uncovers and discloses to the public. Rather it is the names of members of executive boards, lists of speakers, statements of policy, discussions at meetings, affiliation of members, and similar legitimate affairs that are the subject of its inquiries and the object of its exposures. For example, in 1970 the Committee, ostensibly seeking to investigate "the financing of revolutionary groups," sent inquiries to 179 colleges and universities requesting information concerning the names, sponsorship and honoraria of "all guest speakers" on the campus from September 1968 to May 1970. Thereafter the Committee published a report containing a list of such speakers who were members or "supporters" of a dozen or so specified organizations, together with the remuneration each had received. As Judge Gerhard A. Gesell of the District Court of the District of Columbia said, the project served no valid legislative purpose but was intended "to inhibit further speech on college campuses by those listed individuals and others whose political persuasion is not in accord with that of members of the Committee." Again, the Committee's extensive investigation of various peace organizations in 1971 focussed almost entirely upon ideology, affiliations, and legitimate political expression.

It is clear that the Committee has had, and must continue to have so long as it is allowed to exist, a menacing impact upon our system of freedom of expression. The very design of the Committee, and the inevitable manner of its functioning, bring it directly into conflict with the constitutional guarantee of free and open discussion.

II

Not only does the Committee on Internal Security pose a serious danger to freedom of expression in America, but it serves no useful purpose in our governmental structure. The insignificant contribution made by the Committee to the legislative work of Congress is notorious. From 1945 to the present only six pieces of legislation emanating from the Committee have been enacted into law, and most of these have been declared unconstitutional by the courts or repealed. In the entire 91st Congress (1969–1970) only seven bills (other than duplicates) were referred to the Committee as compared with an average of 690 referred to other standing committees. In that Congress the Committee reported out three bills, only one of which passed the House and none of which became law. Virtually every bill ever referred to the Committee has also been within the jurisdiction of some other House committee, primarily the Committee on the Judiciary.

Nor does the Committee on Internal Security perform any significant service in connection with the oversight function of Congress. The task of checking on the operations of the various executive agencies likewise falls within the jurisdiction of other House committees, most of which have far greater knowledge of particular agencies than does the Committee on Internal Security. In the last several years the only significant work undertaken by the Committee on Internal Security in this area has been its study of the loyalty-security program. But that investigation, if necessary at all, could have been better performed by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which possesses an overall view of the Federal civil service not shared by the Committee on Internal Security.

In short, if the Committee on Internal Security disappeared overnight there would be no discernible effect upon the legitimate work of Congress.

III

One of the main activities of the Committee on Internal Security has been the creation and maintenance of an extensive system of files containing data on hundreds of thousands of Americans. The exact nature of this operation has been shrouded in secrecy. In the latest annual reports of the Committee, each running to several hundred pages, only a few lines are devoted to the working of this system even though it absorbs a major portion of the Committee's funds and staff. It is known, however, that in April 1971 the system included a set of 754,000 cards containing political information about individuals, though not every card dealt with a different person. The files as a whole occupy four rooms in the Cannon House Office Building. The extent of computerization, while not precisely known, is apparently sufficient to justify characterization of the system as a data bank.

Information stored in the Committee files consists of two kinds, only one of which the Committee has been willing to discuss. The first is what the Committee terms "public source information," obtained from such sources as newspapers, periodicals, leaflets, letterheads, programs of meetings, and published hearings and reports of legislative committees. The other kind, to which the Committee rarely makes reference, is termed "investigative" material and consists, in the words of Committee member John Ashbrook, of "sworn testimony received in executive sessions of the committee and confidential information developed by the committee staff." Neither "public source information" nor, so far as appears, "investigative" material, is checked by the committee staff for accuracy or reliability before being included in the files. On the basis of materials thus far disclosed it is evident that the overwhelming proportion of the content of the files consists of accounts of political opinions, activities and associations that are clearly protected by the First Amendment.

Members of Congress are entitled to request reports from the Committee with respect to any individual or organization included in the Committee files, and in 1971 the Committee responded to 696 such requests. In the normal case, however, and perhaps in all cases, the Committee gives to members of Congress only the "public source information." The Committee also allows 25 agencies of the Federal Government, including the Civil Service Commission, to obtain information from the Committee files in connection with loyalty-security checks of government employees or applicants; in 1971 there were 963 "visits" to the files by representatives of these agencies. Whether these officials have access to the "investigative" material as well as the "public source information" is not disclosed. Although the Committee states that the material in its files is not available to the general public, in actuality; either through the two avenues just noted or in other ways, significant amounts of material from the Committee files do reach the general public.

We believe that such a system of data collection and dissemination encroaches upon constitutional rights of free expression and invades the right of privacy. For many citizens the prospects of obtaining government employment are seriously jeopardized by the presence of unchecked and unknown data in the files of a Committee notoriously hostile to certain points of view. In wider areas, the use of such materials from official government sources to attack or disparage groups or individuals engaging in political activities has a severe depressing effect upon freedom of discussion. And the very existence of government dossiers on the political belief and associations of numberless citizens, particularly when filled with unverified rumor and gossip, prevents that "uninhibited, robust, and wide-open" discussion which is the heart of our system of freedom of expression.

At a time when all citizens are desperately concerned with the increasing incursions upon privacy which grow out of the ever-expanding collection of data and the ever-increasing surveillance of their activities, there can be no justification for continuing the sort of official dossier system maintained by the Committee on Internal Security.

IV

We do not think it is necessary to recount in detail other serious objections to the operations of the Committee on Internal Security. While its procedures have been improved in some respects, its accusatory form of investigation and hearing can never be really fair in the absence of a full right to notice, counsel, cross examination, an impartial decision-maker, and other procedural protections. Moreover, the powers of the Committee are expanding as new devices, such as the right to subpoena bank accounts, to obtain income tax returns, to gain access to the names of post office box holders, are utilized by the Committee. There are, in addition, signs that the Committee's staff has grown independent and aggressive, as evidenced by the action of two members in attempting the illegal bugging of a political meeting in Chicago some months ago.

The central point, to which we earnestly call the attention of the House, is that the Committee on Internal Security has become a permanent governmental mechanism, based upon a hardening bureaucracy of staff and files, designed to investigate and record the political opinions and associations of American citizens, and to use the data so collected to harass particular points of view which the Committee does not share. We submit that this is not a proper institution to be maintained by a legislative body.

We do not, of course, oppose the legitimate use of legislative powers to deal with matters of internal security. We believe, however, that those functions can be effectively carried out by the Committee on the Judiciary. Hence we support the proposal, advanced by many members of Congress, to amend Rule XI, clause 12 of the Rules of the House of Representatives to add expressly to the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee authority to consider "sabotage and other overt acts affecting internal security." As to the files of the Internal Security Committee, we urge that they be consigned to the Archives, not to be open for official or public inspection for 50 years.

Respectfully submitted.

December, 1972.

Vern Countryman, *Harvard University Law School,* Thomas I. Emerson, *Yale Law School, Initiating Sponsors.*

SIGNERS: PROFESSORS OF PUBLIC LAW

University of Akron, School of Law—Jeffrey M. Shaman.

University of Alabama, School of Law—Wythe W. Holt, Jr., Jay W. Murphy, C. Dallas Sands.

American University, Washington College of Law—Barlow Burke, Jr., C. Thomas Dienes.

University of Arizona, College of Law—Robert Emmet Clark.

Arizona State University, College of Law—William C. Canby, Jr.

University of Arkansas, School of Law—Morton Gitelman, Glenn E. Pasvogel.

Boston College Law School—Arthur L. Berney, Robert C. Berry, Sanford J. Fox.

Boston University, School of Law—Samuel B. Abbott, Dennis S. Aronowitz, Albert R.

Beisel, Stanley Z. Fisher, Robert B. Kent, Arthur B. La France, Thomas P. Lewis, Banks McDowell, Henry P. Monaghan, Daniel G. Partan, Eugene C. Roemele, G. P. Verbit.

University of California, School of Law, Berkeley—Richard M. Buxbaum, Jesse Choper, Robert H. Cole, Ira Michael Heyman, Sanford H. Kadish, John K. McNulty, Robert H. Mnookin, Frank C. Newman, Henry Ramsey, Jr., Michael E. Smith, Preble Stolz.

University of California, School of Law, Davis—Garry S. Goodpaster, John W. Poulos.

University of California, Hastings College of Law—Alice Daniel, Laurence H. Eldredge, John Van Dyke.

University of California, School of Law, Los Angeles—Barbara Brudno, Leon Letwin, Henry W. McGee, Jr., Melville B. Nimmer, Richard A. Wasserstrom.

California-Western, School of Law—James E. Leahy.

Case Western Reserve University, Franklin T. Backus Law School—Peter S. Greenberg, Ovid C. Lewis.

Catholic University of America School of Law—William A. Kaplin.

Catholic University of Puerto Rico School of Law—J. L. A. de Passalacqua.

University of Chicago, Law School—Grant Gilmore, Harry Kalven, Jr., Stanley N. Katz.

University of Cincinnati, College of Law—Fred A. Dewey.

University of Colorado, School of Law—Joan E. Baker, David E. Engdahl.

Columbia University, School of Law—Louis Lusky, Harriet S. Rabb, Albert J. Rosenthal Telford Taylor.

University of Connecticut School of Law—Robert L. Bard, Joseph D. Harbaugh.

Cornell Law School—Harrop A. Freeman.

DePaul University, College of Law—Donald Thomas Bertucci, Elliott H. Goldstein, Richard C. Groll, Donald H. J. Hermann, Terrence F. Kiely, Winston P. Nagan, Marlene E. Nicholson, Michael I. Swygert, Leigh Taylor, Richard C. Turkington, Robert G. Weclew.

University of Detroit, School of Law—Joseph D. Grano, Allen Sultan.

Detroit College of Law—Charles H. Clarke, Harold Norris.

Drake University Law School—Robert C. Hunter, Eliot A. Landau.

Duke University, School of Law—David L. Lange, Patricia H. Marschall, William W. Van Alstyne.

Duquesne University, School of Law—Ronald R. Davenport, Kenneth Hirsch, Sheldon Nahmod, Alfred Pelaez, Henry W. Seney.

Emory University, School of Law—Michael J. Brennan, Nathaniel E. Gozansky, Michael J. Lynch.

University of Florida, Spessard L. Holland Law Center—Fletcher N. Baldwin, Jr.

Florida State University, College of Law—David F. Dickson, Patricia A. Dore, John F. Yetter.

George Washington University, National Law Center—Monroe H. Freedman, Roger S. Kuhn.

Georgetown University Law Center—Addison M. Bowman, E. Edward Bruce, Frank F. Flegal, John R. Kramer, Thomas G. Krattenmaker, Joseph A. Page, William T. Vukowich, Heathcote W. Wales.

University of Georgia, School of Law—Michael Botein, Joe Tom Easley, Wayne McCormack.

Golden Gate College, School of Law—Michael D. DeVito.

Harvard University, Law School—Benjamin Aaron, Derrick A. Bell, Gary Bellow, Harold J. Berman, Stephen G. Breyer, Victor Brudney, Clark Byse, Abram S. Chayes, Jerome A. Cohen, Vern Countryman, Alan M. Dershowitz, Richard H. Field, Louis L. Jaffe, Lance M. Liebman, Diane T. Lund, Frank I. Michelman, Charles R. Nesson, Oliver Oldman, Albert M. Sacks, Richard B. Stewart, Donald T. Trautman.

University of Illinois, College of Law—Rubin G. Cohn, George T. Frampton, Stephen B. Goldberg, Arthur D. Hellman, Prentice H. Marshall, Sheldon J. Plager.

Indiana University School of Law, Bloomington—Morris S. Arnold, Robert L. Birmingham, Ralph F. Fuchs, William D. Popkin, Edward F. Sherman, Philip C. Thorpe.

Indiana University, Indianapolis Law School—William E. Marsh, Ken Stroud, James W. Torke.

University of Iowa College of Law—William G. Buss, James E. Meeks, Mark E. Schantz, David H. Vernon.

University of Kentucky College of Law—John Batt, Alvin L. Goldman, Paul Oberst, Robert A. Sedler.

Lewis and Clark College, Northwestern School of Law—Bill L. Williamson.

University of Louisville School of Law—Lawrence W. Knowles, William E. Read.

Loyola University School of Law, Chicago—William C. Cunningham, S.J., Lawrence Kalevitch, Thomas A. Lockyear, John L. McCormack, Allen E. Shoenberger.

Loyola University School of Law, Los Angeles—George C. Garbesi, Harry S. Laughran, Clemence M. Smith.

University of Maine School of Law—Gerald F. Petruccelli.

John Marshall Law School—Pearl H. Hart, Arthur J. Sabin, Ronald C. Smith.

University of Maryland School of Law—Richard V. Falcon.

University of Miami School of Law—Jeanette O. Smith, Thomas A. Wills.

University of Michigan, Law School—Vincent A. Blasi, David L. Chambers, Robert J. Harris, Yale Kamisar, Richard O. Lempert.

University of Mississippi, School of Law—George C. Cochran, Paul R. Rice.

University of Missouri-Kansas City, School of Law—John Scurlock.

William Mitchell College of Law—Kenneth F. Kirwin.

University of Montana, School of Law—Gardner Cromwell.

University of Nebraska, College of Law—James A. Lake, Jr.

New England, School of Law—Robert E. O'Toole.

University of New Mexico, School of Law—Charles W. Daniels, Robert J. Desiderio, Willis H. Ellis, Myron Fink, Joseph Goldberg, William T. MacPherson, Hugh B. Muir, Theodore Parnall, Cruz Reynoso, Leo M. Romero, Jerrold L. Walden, Robert W. Walker, Henry Weihofen.

State University of New York at Buffalo, School of Law—Marc Galanter, Marjorie Girth, Herman Schwartz.

New York, Law School—Carl Avner.

New York University, School of Law—Ralph F. Bischoff, Leroy D. Clark, Daniel G. Collins, Norman Dorsen, Walter G. Farr, Henry H. Foster, Jr., Thomas M. Frank, Lawrence G. Sager, Harry I. Subin.

University of North Carolina, School of Law—Thomas J. Andrews, Kenneth S. Brown, Charles E. Dave, Peter G. Glenn, Joseph J. Kalo, Arnold H. Loewy, William J. Murphy, Barry Nakell, Daniel H. Pollitt, Paul Verkuil.

Northern University, School of Law—Robert W. Bennett, Anthony D'Amato, Irving Gordon, Nathaniel L. Nathanson.

Notre Dame, Law School—Thomas L. Shaffer.

Ohio State University, College of Law—John J. Barcelo, Merton C. Bernstein, Harry Bitner, Mary Ellen Caldwell, Linda K. Champlin, Michael E. Geltner, Bruce R. Jacob, James C. Kirby, Jr., P. John Kozyris, Stanley K. Laughlin, Jr., Richard S. Miller, Keith S. Rosen, Ivan C. Rutledge, Peter Simmons.

University of Oregon, School of Law—Barbara B. Aldave, Herbert W. Titus.

University of Pennsylvania, Law School—Martha A. Field, Bernard Wolfman.

University of Pittsburgh, School of Law—William J. Brown, Thomas S. Checkley, Thomas M. Cooley II, Richard H. Seeburger, Welsh S. White.

University of Puerto Rico, School of Law—David M. Helfeld, Jacob I. Karro.

Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, School of Law, Newark—Frank Askin, Alexander D. Brooks, Norman L. Cantor, Julius Cohen, David Haber, Willard Heckel, Arthur Kinoy, Gerard R. Moran, James C. N. Paul, Paul L. Tractenberg.

St. Louis University, School of Law—Roger L. Goldman.

University of San Diego, School of Law—Herbert I. Lazerow.

University of San Francisco, School of Law—James D. Cox, Peter J. Donnici, Paul L. McKaskle, Steven F. Shatz.

University of Santa Clara, School of Law—George J. Alexander, Marcel Poche.

University of South Carolina, School of Law—Randall Bridwell, William S. McAninch, Webster Myers, Jr., William J. Quirk, Charles A. Sullivan, William T. Toal, Thomas M. Ward, Eldon D. Wedlock, Jr., Donald J. Weidner, Ralph U. Whitten, Michael J. Zimmer.

University of Southern California Law Center—Scott H. Bice, Terry J. Hatter, Jr., Michael E. Levine, Christopher D. Stone.

Southern Methodist University School of Law—Charles J. Morris.

Stanford Law School—Anthony G. Amsterdam, Barbara A. Babcock.

Syracuse University, College of Law—Jerome A. Barron, Samuel M. Fetters, Thomas J. Maroney.

University of Tennessee, College of Law—Frederic S. Le Clercq.

University of Texas, School of Law—Roy M. Mersky, L. A. Powe, Jr., George Schatzki, Mark G. Yudof.

Texas Tech. University, School of Law—Robert P. Davidow.

University of Toledo, College of Law—C. Edwin Baker, Samuel A. Bleicher, Karl Krastin, Thomas E. Willging.

Tulane University, School of Law—Vernon V. Palmer.

University of Tulsa, College of Law—James C. Thomas.

University of Utah, College of Law—Boyd K. Dyer, John J. Flynn, Jefferson B. Fordham, Lionel H. Frankel, George S. Grossman, Ronn E. Harding, Robert W. Swenson, Arvo Van Alstyne.

Valparaiso University, School of Law—Louis F. Bartelt, Jr., Bruce Berner, Jack A. Hiller, Alfred W. Meyer, Seymour H. Moskowitz, Burton D. Wechsler.

Vanderbilt University, School of Law—Junius L. Allison, Jerry P. Black, Jr., James F. Blumstein, Jonathan I. Charney, Donald J. Hall, Robert L. Knauss.

University of Virginia, School of Law—Julius L. Chambers, David B. Isbell, Richard B. Lillich, Richard A. Merrill, Stephen A. Saltzburg, Richard E. Speidel.

University of Washington, School of Law—William T. Burke, Donald S. Chisum, Geoffrey L. Crooks, John M. Junker, Richard O. Kummert, Virginia B. Lyness, Arval A. Morris, Cornelius J. Peck, John R. Price, Walter Probert, Roy L. Prosterman, Lehan K. Tunks.

Washington University, School of Law—Frederick K. Beutel, Jules B. Gerard, Alan Gunn, William C. Jones, Dale Swihart.

Wayne State University, School of Law—Florian Bartosic, Jane M. Friedman, Elwood Hain.

College of William and Mary, Marshall-Wythe, School of Law—Richard A. Williamson.

University of Wisconsin, Law School—Abner Brodie, Ted Finman, Willard Hurst, Stewart Macaulay.

Yale Law School—Lee Albert, Boris Bittker, Guido Calabresi, Jan G. Deutsch, Thomas I. Emerson, Joseph Goldstein, Louis H. Pollak, Charles A. Reich, John C. Roberts, Fred Rodell, Eugene V. Rostow, Clyde W. Summers, Harry H. Wellington.

LIST OF ADDITIONAL SIGNERS OF PETITION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO ABOLISH THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

University of Chicago, Law School—Gerhard Casper, Anthony J. Waters.

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, School of Law, Newark—Albert P. Blaustein, Alfred W. Blumrosen.

University of San Diego, School of Law—Morris D. Forkosch.

University of Texas, School of Law—Albert W. Alschuler, George E. Dix, David B. Filvaroff, Robert E. Mathews, M. Michael Sharlot.

University of Wisconsin, Law School—James E. Jones, Jr., William G. Rice.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ZION).

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1973, the Honorable JEROME R. WALDIE circulated a "Dear Colleague" letter promoting his resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and transfer its functions to the Judiciary Committee.

First. Mr. WALDIE noted in his letter that he had introduced a similar resolution in the last Congress—House Resolution 600—and that it had been supported by the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation.

Second. He also informed the Members of the House that his action had been initially prompted by some great revelation by the Representative from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN).

Members of the House: does the name National Committee Against Repressive Legislation mean anything to you? Clearly, it has a high-purposed ring sufficient to tingle anyone's idealism. Who could possibly be for repressive legislation? But the fact is that that organization's name and its true purpose differ as day to night.

The Committee Against Repressive Legislation has as its sole objective the destruction of the principal security affairs organ of the House of Representatives. It is, in fact, the direct successor to the National Committee to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities which was officially cited in 1961 as a Communist Front. When the House Committee changed its name, that organization promptly followed suit but clothed itself in a loftier title.

My colleagues, were you informed when you received Mr. WALDIE's letter in January just who the brains were behind this "idealistic" new group which fights so valiantly against so-called repressive legislation? Or was the letter silent on its true leadership?

Let me phrase it in this fashion. Would you buy a membership subscription in an organization from a used-organizational salesman who had been identified as a member of the Communist Party, not once but twice, by officially authorized, undercover operatives of the FBI? And from one whose track record on behalf of innumerable party fronts, publications, and activities is so long that were I to include it later in the RECORD, it would violate the 2-page limitation rule on extraneous matter of the Joint Committee on Printing?

Do not be mislead by the flood of petitions currently inundating Capitol Hill which are being circulated by well meaning but naive youngsters who have been lobbying your administrative and legislative aides. The man behind the scenes, the general sales manager who guides and directs this young sales force is none other than Frank Wilkinson, the executive director and field representative of the Committee Against Repressive Legislation. His job it is, to sell you, the Members of the House, on the highly questionable merits of his cleverly merchandized product—antirepressive legislation, AKA—also known as—abolish this House Committee.

Naturally, you will not see Wilkinson himself working the Halls of Congress because his style of marketing expertise was exposed years ago, in December 1956, to be exact. But he had been active long before that. To be sure he is a real pro. Even after serving time in the pen, following his conviction by a Federal District Court in 1959—a conviction upheld by the Supreme Court in 1961—he reappeared at the same old stand huckstering the same old wares—abolish the House Committee.

Although the House Committee's predecessor, the Committee on Un-American Activities, is not the Better Business Bureau, it did shed some illumination on Mr. Wilkinson's sales pitch so that hopefully his prospective consumers would be fully appraised of the true market value of his produce about repressive legislation.

Mr. WALDIE indicated in his letter that his "initial action was prompted" by a disclosure made by my fellow committee member, Mr. DRINAN. Surely this should come as no great shock to the House Membership. Mr. DRINAN is not only a member of the group headed by Wilkinson which I have just described, but to quote his own remarks made at one of our committee meetings in 1971:

I'm on the executive committee of the abolition committee.

If therefore behooves all of us to consider Mr. WALDIE's somewhat less than objective sources today when we review and debate this resolution.

Mr. WALDIE's "Dear Colleague" letter of January 19, is moreover, an out and out personal attack against the Membership of this Committee which Mr. ICHORD has done his utmost to make into a fair and impartial congressional instrument. The letter stated:

I would like to point out that this Resolution does not evolve from any disagreement with the integrity of the Chairman or Members of the Committee.

On its face this is a magnanimous tribute, which however, in the context of the remaining portion of his letter, is reduced to a piece of hypocritical hogwash. The distinguished gentleman then proceeds to smear the committee—which means its membership because the committee is the sum total of the Members who constitute it—with the following unfortunate choice of smear terms: " 'big brother' apparatus"; "thought control" concepts that are embraced by the Committee; "the trappings of totalitarianism," and so forth.

Could not the gentleman from California have been more specific? Would he care to name, here on the floor, who among our nine-man committee practices big brotherism? Is it the ranking minority member perhaps? Or the chairman? And whose thoughts have been controlled? What Member of the Committee did the controlling? And who are the totalitarians on our committee?

I have had the distinguished honor to have served as a member of the Committee for several years and I have listened to, or read about such irresponsible claptrap, ad nauseum, for years. I only regret that 22 of my colleagues saw fit to ally themselves with such a letter—a letter promoted by the distinguished Congressman from that patriotic State of Massachusetts who openly conceded that he is in fact a national official of that organ of abolishment. Mr. DRINAN was, of course, a signatory of the January missive, and as you know, has been a member of the "infamous" Committee on Internal Security.

Mr. DRINAN has, therefore, been subject, first hand, to big brotherism. Now gentlemen, I ask you in all candor, is there a Member here today who seriously believes that the gentleman from New England—the Committee on Internal Security's very own POW, could possibly have his "thoughts controlled"?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE).

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana concerning the "Dear Colleague" letter I sent out, and though in no way do I retreat from my statement of great admiration and belief in the integrity and competence and ability of the chairman, I have less conviction now as to the total competency of all the members of that committee and their understanding of the objective facts that might be submitted to them in a "Dear Colleague" letter, but it has little to do with whether or not the sources upon which I base my "Dear Colleague" letter are in fact contained within the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or the Committee on Internal Security.

My objection to that committee goes to a much deeper thing than that, and I have been voting against that committee for the last 3 years. It goes to the fact that as a Congressman and as a Member of the House of Representatives it is a demeaning thing to me to understand that we have a committee that finds its greatest delight in inquiring into the political beliefs and political associations of American citizens. That does not seem to me to be a proper role for a congressional committee.

Mr. ICHORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDIE. No. I will not yield. I am sorry. I do not have sufficient time.

I spent a very limited time going through the committee rooms, limited because access to the committee files is not readily accessible until we go through a fairly complicated process, but I was shown several rooms, or at least it seemed

to be several rooms to me, of filing cabinets that contained within them raw clips from newspapers. I assume that those raw clips from newspapers that they put together contained the source of the magnificent brief of the gentleman from Indiana which he just read about the "Committee for Repressive Legislation." The only people I saw or the majority of the people I saw were on the staff of the committee, and I did not see them all.

But of the four, I think it was four, people they were spending all day long clipping out of newspapers arbitrarily what they considered derogatory information, or at least derogatory from their personal political philosophies in terms of American individual citizens, and then those files of clippings were made accessible to the executive branch. When the executive branch seeks to employ anyone these totally unevaluated clippings from this Un-American Activities Committee were provided to the executive branch as a detrimental factor in terms of their employment.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE) 1 additional minute, since his name was used so extensively.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman doing this, yielding me this additional time.

Mr. Speaker, that did not seem to me to be a function of the Congress of the United States, to provide a raw file of newspaper clippings from which people that are seeking a job in the executive branch can have those clippings submitted to the executive branch simply by having the executive branch send a letter to the Committee on Un-American Activities saying, "Do you have anything on this individual American?", and then the Un-American Activities Committee sends them back what it has on this individual American, all that it has on this individual American which is an accumulation of newspaper clippings from suspect organs of the press in this country. There ought to be better things for Members of this Congress to do with their time, and there ought to be better things that committee staff employees can do with their time, and there ought to be a higher purpose for Members of this Congress other than to provide unverified raw newspaper clippings in a manner that would influence or damage Americans who are seeking employment.

If that is to be done, then it ought to be done by the FBI, who have the opportunity to evaluate and who have the opportunity to determine what these matters constitute, not by staff people or a committee whose members are clearly prejudiced; that should have no place in our branch of Government. We ought to stay out of that kind of business, Mr. Speaker, because this Congress is too great an institution to demean itself with that sort of nonsense.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG).

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I think we have had an interesting illustration this morning of the way we operate on the floor of the House. The House Internal Security Committee operated on the floor of the House just now, attacking a civil liberties organization, demonstrating that it still is what it always was, the Committee on Un-American Activities. It has an unbroken record of contempt for freedom of speech and of the press, as well as of harassment of those who seek to exercise these cherished rights.

The House is a serious body, and it is engaged in some very terrible problems right now. Yet only four bills came from this committee during the 92d Congress, and none of those four was passed by the House. The total legislative production of this committee in the last session of the Congress, was zero. Its total function was harassment.

I myself saw constituents who were octogenarians subpenaed to come before this committee for alleged activities which probably they knew nothing about, alleged violations that occurred some 50 years earlier.

Now this committee is seeking to go into the prisons—where we have grave problems; problems caused through poverty, crime, drug addiction, and the failure to recognize that our prison system is not working and is not rehabilitating people, yet we are not preventing those prisons from being filled. So it is not surprising that people become concerned over our prisons, and want to do things that may correct this situation.

But the committee attacks those in prison and those who would help them—concentrating as always on the weak, the miserable, and the helpless.

The main thing is what does this committee have to do with the kind of activities that the first amendment is designed to protect and sanctify?

I believe that all of its data and all of its information, as was pointed out by the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE) is irrelevant, it is ex parte, it is hearsay, and neither the subjects, nor even Members of the Congress, are permitted to inspect or correct these files. If this is not an "Un-American" subversion of due process of law, I do not know what would be.

I urge the Members to vote against any appropriations for this committee. The kind of appropriations that this committee seeks here would provide a year's day care service for over 300 children in this country.

I believe that we cannot afford this extravagant waste to furnish that kind of information to executive branches of this Government. If there are any real problems of un-American activities, of sabotage or espionage, then we have the Committee on the Judiciary which can take care of those problems.

President Nixon in his 1974 budget provided no funds for the Subversive Activities Control Board for the same reason—that it did nothing, as indeed this awesome Un-American Activities Committee, now known as the Committee on Internal Security, does nothing.

I would suggest that we try to address ourselves in this very serious legislative session to the human problems of all our people, and not seek to divert funds into areas such as this which have nothing to do with the people in this country, their hopes and their aspirations. When we take from their weekly payroll checks tax money, I suggest that we use those tax dollars for the purpose of improving their lives and conditions, and not use it to subvert the Constitution of the United States by attacking innocent people.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the committee (Mr. ICHORD).

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised, and I am sure that the Members of the House are not surprised, at the opposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) to the committee. At the time he went on the committee, he was reported to have said that he went on the committee for the purpose of destroying the committee from within. So I think that the Members of the House should be aware of the long-established feeling of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN).

Let me say as a member of the Committee on Internal Security, I do not attack the sincerity, I do not attack the integrity, I do not attack the patriotism of any Member of the House of Representatives in opposition to the committee or to its work. I think there is honest room for disagreement.

However, Mr. Speaker, I feel that there have been so many misrepresentations, so much misinformation, so many distortions, so much false information disseminated to the Members of the House, that some of the Members are accepting those allegations without an examination of the facts.

The Members have been swamped in recent weeks with material from a committee called the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation. I am not going to take the time to lay out the origin and the purposes of that committee. I did that in a speech on the House floor on January 9. I would refer the Members to that speech.

This is the committee which used to be known as the National Committee to Abolish HCIS, which used to be known as the National Committee to Abolish HUAC. It is a very well financed nationwide organization, and I submit if the Members will examine the facts, they will find that under the guise of protecting constitutional rights, this committee seeks to eliminate inquiries into revolutionary activities altogether. To support that allegation, I would point out that the same committee, the committee which asked the Members to transfer the jurisdiction of the Committee on Internal Security to the Commit-

tee on the Judiciary, is on record publicly opposed to the Senate Committee on Internal Security, already a part of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I say that I believe some Members are accepting these allegations without examination of the facts, and I hope the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE) is still on the floor. He circulated in his letter that he has been advised that the House Committee on Internal Security maintains a special highly secret file wherein are kept the dossiers of the Members of Congress. I do not dispute the fact that the gentleman was so advised, but I would like to ask him who did advise him that dossiers were kept in a highly secret file by the House Committee on Internal Security? I do not see the gentleman on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Internal Security I recognize that I am put to a greater annual burden than the chairmen of other standing committees to justify the continued existence of the committee and the need for adequate funds. This is so because a number of Congressmen suffer ideological or tactical differences with the purposes of the committee. It is my intention to explain to my colleagues today how prejudices against the functions of the previous Committee on Un-American Activities have been unfairly applied to the Committee on Internal Security, how the Committee on Internal Security served the national interests during the last Congress and why there is an even greater need for its continuance with adequate funding in this Congress.

Some of my colleagues have suggested to me that it is not necessary to present a bill of particulars by way of jusitfying the existence of the committee, but that because of the substantial number of votes in favor of committee appropriations in the past, steadily in the vicinity of 300, we could simply say "Let's vote." I do not choose to do this because I feel it would be unfair to those Members who have sincere and well-intentioned reservations, or to those who are new to the issues, having been just elected to Congress.

In February 1969 the House of Representatives voted to terminate the Committee on Un-American Activities and to establish the Committee on Internal Security with a totally different mandate. Although the new mandate was tightly drawn with respect to investigation of organizations which seek to overthrow the Government by force or violence, it is interesting to contemplate that some Members of Congress objected to the transition because they felt the former committee was more vulnerable to abolition. The old mandate had congenital infirmities such as the use of the word "un-American" with the wide diffusion of concepts concerning its meaning, and the burden to investigate the dissemination of propaganda with all the obstacles presented by the first amendment.

Since I became chairman in 1969, the committee has functioned upon principles totally different from the previous committee. We have responded to the expression of congressional and public interest in the activities of emerging revolutionary organizations apart from those which were dominated or controlled by the Soviet Union. There was great public interest in an examination of the Students for a Democratic Society. The committee responded by holding extensive hearings and issuing a most comprehensive report. At a time when the Black Panther Party constituted a great mystery, even fear, to the American people the committee undertook an in-depth investigation and held public hearings. The inside story was revealed through dozens of knowledgeable witnesses, including former Panthers who voluntarily testified. Again a comprehensive report was issued for the benefit of Congress and the general public. I know from the thousands upon thousands of copies of these reports which were sent upon request to the offices of Members and to citizens writing directly to the committee that a genuine public need was fulfilled.

Contrary to the methods of operation of the previous committee which in reality formed the broadest base for criticism, the Committee on Internal Security has not indulged in the technique of issuing subpenas to individuals whom it was obvious would refuse, on fifth amendment or other constitutional grounds, to furnish any information of value. No witnesses have had their rights abused in any degree during my chairmanship.

Nevertheless, the age-old critics of the Committee on Un-American Activities have continued to apply the same cliches and timeworn arguments to the new committee. They have perverted logic and reason in vain attempts to identify the new committee with the old. The record establishes the falsity of their arguments.

Great reliance is placed by committee critics upon a petition submitted to the House of Representatives in January of this year by professors of public law. The purpose of the petition was to urge the House to abolish the Committee on Internal Security. It is my understanding that the petition was circulated to the signators by Professors Vern Countryman and Thomas I. Emerson, of the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation.

On January 9, 1973, I delivered remarks to the House in rebuttal to the petition. I will not take the time today to reiterate the facts and arguments which I submitted. They fully refute the allegations of the petition. I suspect that most of the signators would have withheld their support if they had had the benefit of an analysis of the validity of the petition's allegations. Furthermore, they surely could not have known that the motives of the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation are made transparent by the fact that the executive director of the NCARL has been identified as a member of the Communist Party.

The three prongs of attack of the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation petition are: First, that the principal function of the committee is to expose the beliefs, opinions, and associations of American citizens; second, that the committee's contribution in the field of legislation and oversight has been insignificant, and, third, that the committee maintains an extensive system of files. In the petition's closing argument, it states that the central point is that the committee's staff and files are used to "harass particular points of view which the committee does not share."

The perennial antagonists of the committee choose to ignore the manner in which the mandate of the new committee has been tightly drawn to limit investigations into organizations seeking to overthrow the Government by force or violence. They are not willing to acknowledge that this constitutes a vast difference from the mandate of the old committee. And each of the investigations of the Internal Security Committee since it was created have been closely confined to the mandate. With regard to the legislative output of the committee the critics likewise choose to ignore that the principal responsibilities of the committee are investigative. While it does have a bill reference function, the narrowness of the field necessarily restricts the bills which it handles.

Through the years a number of pieces of major legislation have been enacted into law in the field of internal security. During my chairmanship the committee has reported out only six bills. Two of them were passed by the House but not acted upon by the Senate. Another one received much more than a majority vote of the House but not the two-thirds vote required under the suspension of rules procedure. Each of the bills would have served a vital need. That they were not taken up by the Senate cannot be regarded as a deficiency of the House committee. Subsequently I will explain vital legislation which is scheduled for early attention of the committee this year.

The argument of the petition concerning the files of the committee is specious. Each of my colleagues well knows, as professional men, that projects cannot be undertaken without resource data. One has to know what has already been written or said about the subject matter under consideration. No other agency, including the Library of Congress, is known to assemble the data which is necessary for resource in the peculiar field of operation of the committee.

The best example I can provide here is the investigation of the Black Panther Party. Before the investigation commenced, a preliminary study had been underway. For some time the Black Panther Party had been publishing its own newspaper, giving valuable insight into its leadership, objectives, and activities. The committee staff began the collection of these newspapers, all of which were in the public domain but not knowingly compiled by any other agency save perhaps the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Without this advance collection process, additional months would have been required before the hearings could have been held.

The committee files are not used to

harass individuals or to blackball them from employment. What then are the purposes of the files? They are constituted and maintained for the use of the committee staff in conducting investigations and hearings and in preparing reports of such. Because they exist we encounter other demands upon them. Members of the House should be well aware of a rule of the House of Representatives which stipulates that committee records are records of the House and that they shall be accessible to any Member. If the House deems this accessibility to be unwise, then change the rule but do not deny the committee the use of its own resource material for purposes within its mandate.

One other access to the files is by agencies of the executive branch of Government. They have access only to index cards, not to the files themselves. The information thus obtained is not used to disentitle applicants to Federal employment, but rather as lead information which must be independently validated or invalidated. The arrangement with the executive branch is simply a cooperative measure between two coordinate branches of Government. A report on this matter was submitted to the Speaker last year in response to his request.

Again, if the House in its wisdom deems this arrangement to be undesirable then a resolution could be adopted to that effect. I want to assure all of my colleagues that the tightest control is exercised over the committee files. Even members of our own staff gain access only by following established procedures. Members of the press and public are not permitted entry.

With regard to the productivity of the committee during the last Congress, 191 witnesses were heard during 78 days of hearings. The committee reported a bill proposing amendments to the Emergency Detention Act, a bill pertaining to the jurisdiction of the Subversive Activities Control Board and a bill authorizing the imposition of penal sanctions for travel to countries engaged in armed conflict with the United States in violation of area travel restrictions.

The committee also issued a most comprehensive legislative report on a 2-year inquiry into the Subversive Activities Control Board and the Federal civilian employee loyalty-security program. Investigative attention was directed toward the Progressive Labor Party—a Maoist revolutionary organization—the National Peace Action Coalition, the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice, subversive influences affecting the armed forces, the Revolutionary Union and the Venceremos organization, the latter two also being Maoist revolutionary organizations. During the last year a detailed report was issued on the Revolutionary Union and the Venceremos organization showing that these two organizations which have newly emerged on the American scene have engaged in paramilitary training and are dedicated to violent overthrow of the Government.

Last year the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER) and I introduced H.R. 11120, a bill to repeal the Subversive Activities Control Act and to provide a mechanism for correcting many deficiencies we have found in the maintenance of a personnel security program in the executive branch. After still further study we have further modified the bill for this Congress and we intend to move to expedite its consideration by the committee. It is a major piece of legislation. It will fill a most vital need in the interests of national security.

The President's budget for the next fiscal year provides no funds for the SACB. The law will remain on the books but it will be a hollow shell. The bill we propose will establish more viable and realistic policies and procedures for insuring that persons are not employed in the executive branch of Government unless they are disposed to protect and defend the Constitution.

Due to the labyrinth of judicial decisions in the field of personnel security it is necessary to walk a constitutional tightrope, carefully balancing individual rights against the rights of the Government and society as a whole. We have already this year undertaken a major investigation into the activities of revolutionary organizations in, and directed toward, the penal systems in the United States. Preliminary evidence indicates that this is becoming a most fertile ground for indoctrination and recruitment. I think the American people and their Representatives in Congress want a revelation of information in this regard and aside from the Internal Security Committee there is no legally constituted body available to do the job other than our counterpart in the Senate.

We are witnessing an age in which terrorism transcends national boundaries, where violence directed against heads of State and their diplomatic representatives has become a device for achieving the goals of guerrilla organizations and where the most powerful nations of the world must stand by helplessly while hardened revolutionaries draw the blood of helpless victims when their demands are not met. We are in an age where Soviet communism is no longer monolithic. The proliferation of Communist ideology has resulted in Cuban communism, Chinese communism, and still others giving us cause for concern even within the borders of the United States.

If the SACB indeed becomes defunct there will be an even greater need for the work of the Committee on Internal Security. But I do not prefer this course. It is my philosophy that a duly constituted agency or commission of the Government other than the Congress should be utilized for the development of a body of evidence concerning subversive organizations which cannot be made available to the Congress or to the public through such customary means as a criminal investigation by the FBI. Except for very special and select occasions, a committee of Congress should not serve as a body to continually investigate subversive organizations.

The Committee on Internal Security could more appropriately occupy itself with legislative matters and overseeing executive branch administration of laws affecting internal security. This is one objective which I have in mind with the personnel security legislation which I previously mentioned. The bill includes provisions for the establishment of a Federal Employee Security and Appeals Commission which would serve as a hearing body for evidence presented by the Attorney General in connection with the personnel security program of the executive branch. The work of this Commission would obviate the necessity for hearings on the same subjects by the Internal Security Committee. But if the SACB is deactivated, and if this new Commission is not created, there will be an even greater need for the work of the Committee on Internal Security.

Last year the House provided $525,000 for the operation of the committee's staff. Due to some carryover from the previous year—1971—committee expenditures in 1972 totaled about $543,000. This year I have asked for $575,000. I know that my colleagues are well aware of a 5-percent pay raise which went into effect in January of this year. This pay raise constitutes the principal basis for the increase to $575,000.

I have no intention to enlarge the staff of the committee. On the contrary, I have been gradually reducing the size of the staff by attrition. There are now only 46 employees on the payroll as opposed to 53 employees at the beginning of 1972 and I want you to know that we operate with economy in mind. A study I made of seven other committees comparable in size discloses that we have far fewer employees earning over $30,000 than the others. So in reality I have implemented a self-imposed reduction in the size of the staff and in the amount of money we need to function efficiently.

The Committee on House Administration has reported to the House a resolution which would cut $100,000 from the amount I have requested. Some colleagues have urged me to challenge this on the floor. I have elected to accept the reduction to $475,000 because I know that the Committee on House Administration has broad responsibilities for the management of the funds for the entire House and has judiciously applied reductions to other committees as well. At a time when the American taxpayer is taking an evermore critical look at the expenditure of public funds, and is holding his elected representative more closely accountable, we must all make a serious effort to provide greater public service for each dollar spent.

The Committee on Internal Security will take a notch in its belt to do a still better job with less money. I have already issued instructions to increase the number of hours in the workday of each employee. Existing vacancies on the staff will not be filled. But I pledge to each of you, and especially those who have been concerned that the work would suffer from a reduction in funds, that we will manage to fulfill the mandate effectively. I have been given assurance by the leadership of the Committee on House Administration that if our expenses should increase inordinately during the year due to a great change in requirements that I will be given every consideration in a request for supplemental funds. I

consider this to be a satisfactory arrangement. I assure you I will supervise the committee's budget with prudence, and I will return for additional funds only in the event of extraordinary circumstances.

I urge support for the resolution of the Committee on House Administration providing the Committee on Internal Security with $475,000 for 1973. In the end it is not the individual Members here who will decide the fate of the Committee on Internal Security, but rather our constituencies. If the Committee on Internal Security should be abolished, or if its funding is so atrophied as to render it unable to fulfill its mandate then the American people will require us all to answer.

To those who are demanding zero funding as a means to abolish the committee, I say this is not the way to meet the issue forthrightly. The House has constituted a select committee, chaired by my distinguished colleague from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) to analyze committee structure and report to the House next year. Let us give the Bolling committee a fair chance to do the job.

Just within the last several months I have received thousands of letters of support for the committee from all over the United States. Perhaps each Member here receives communications to this effect. It is perfectly obvious to me that the American people as a whole are truly concerned about national security. As one example I want to include in the RECORD as I close my remarks an unsolicited message of concern from a member of the bar of the State of Washington. It is as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 9, 1973.*

Hon. RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Chairman, Committee on Internal Security, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HONORABLE RICHARD ICHORD: I write this letter to you in my capacity as chairman of the Rule of Law Committee, Washington State Bar Association.

At a most recent meeting of our committee, held February 9, 1973, a motion was unanimously passed that we express to you, as chairman of the committee on internal security, United States House of Representatives, our appreciation for the services rendered by you and by your committee, and to express further our complete sympathy with the function performed by your committee.

We understand that an attack has been made on your committee, by some communist front organization, with the objective of having your committee disbanded, or otherwise eliminated. If this is correct, we will be most appreciative if you can transmit to us any information along this line, for this is of grave interest to our committee.

Permit me to add that if you have any suggestions to make to our committee, as to how we might more effectively accomplish our objective, or as to how we might possibly be of any assistance in supporting the continuation of your activities, we will be most appreciative in hearing from you. With regard to our Rule of Law Committee, we consider that it is the rule of law promulgated by duly constituted government as a means to an ordered society which provides the guarantees and assures the highest products of civilization-freedom, order and respect for the rights of others. As members of the Bar, with society as our client, therefore, we feel we have the primary responsibility to promote and protect the basic political and legal values inherent in the Rule of Law.

I add that the members of our committee do have the text entitled, Union Calendar No. 605, 92d Congress, 2d Session-House Report No. 92-1166, this being a report of your committee. We have considered this report by your committee to be most informative and helpful to us.

I am sending a carbon copy of this letter directly to the Congressional Representatives from the State of Washington, as you may observe.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES V. MOREN.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be useful for the chairman of the committee to tell us just where those dossiers are kept that his predecessors kept on the Members of Congress. Where are they kept, I ask the chairman?

Mr. ICHORD. If the gentleman will yield additional time I will explain.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Missouri 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, let me say when I became chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security I did find some files on Members of Congress. I immediately had those files packaged and sent to the Archives. I would state to the gentleman from California that I have stated on the floor many, many times that this is what was done with those files.

Let me say to the gentleman from California if he is opposed to the files in the reference section, why does he not introduce a resolution and I will help him bring it to the floor. Under the rules of the House I am required to make this information available to the Members of the House, and I am going to continue to do so, but if the gentleman is opposed to the files in the reference section why does he not introduce that resolution and let the Members of the House pass upon it?

I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE), I think his opposition is highly irresponsible. If he is opposed to this information in the reference section being made available to the 25 departments of the executive agency, why does he not introduce a resolution prohibiting the committee from making that available? I will help the gentleman bring that to the floor of this House. This is the way to cure those objections, not by passing on unsubstantiated statements that we are maintaining dossiers on Members of Congress, not by passing on the false charges of the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation that we are abusing and infringing upon the rights of individuals. I ask the Members to do that, and I will not fight bringing the matter to the floor of this House. In that manner we can let the Members of this House pass upon the question.

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

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

Mr. ICHORD. If the gentleman from New Jersey will yield me additional time I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Missouri 1 additional minute.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I shall yield.

Did the gentleman from Massachusetts advise the gentleman from California that the committee maintains dossiers on Members of Congress in a highly secret file?

Mr. DRINAN. No.

Mr. ICHORD. Who did advise the gentleman of that?

Mr. DRINAN. I do not know.

Mr. ICHORD. I ask the question: Who did advise the Member from California of that?

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman yielded to me. I would like to make the point, Mr. Chairman, as I have in the committee and elsewhere and to the Speaker and to the Democratic Caucus, that it is illegal for 25 agencies of the executive branch to come here on a daily basis to inspect the documents of this House of Representatives. That is not allowable under Executive order.

Mr. ICHORD. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I do not yield any further, that no Executive order could make this Congress release its own papers and there is no such Executive order, but there is an Executive order authorizing executive agencies to check those files, and the House Committee on Internal Security is permitting the practice as a matter of courtesy to the executive agencies.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we are presently going through a tired old routine, familiar to those of us who have served one or more terms in Congress—the annual effort to kill a standing committee of the House; namely, the Committee on Internal Security.

One of the time-worn arguments used by this committee's enemies is that it submits little legislation to the Congress for consideration. There are those who submit that the less legislation proposed in each Congress, the better off both the Congress and the Nation be. But that aside, I would like to offer a few facts, information rather than the emotion in which the committee's opponents prefer to indulge.

I maintain that a rather exceptional amount of work was performed by this nine-member committee and its staff during the 92d Congress.

Aside from prehearing investigations and studies, the House Committee on Internal Security held 78 days of hearings, listening to the testimony of 191 witnesses and reviewing almost 7,000 pages of testimony, reports, and appendices—6,996 pages to be exact.

The Committee on Internal Security and its subcommittees held 29 meetings in addition to the hearings and issued nine congressional reports, four of them concerning proposed legislation.

Thirteen bills referred to the Internal Security are presently under review.

Perhaps most important of all, the committee, its investigators, and re-

searchers conducted eight major investigations covering five different topics.

These included probes into the leadership of the National Peace Action Coalition and the so-called People's Coalition for Peace and Justice, the groups that prompted mass demonstrations in Washington and proposed to close down Government operations. The Committee has already warned that while membership of these organizations is probably composed largely of persons sincerely concerned about the now ending war in Indochina and other controversial issues, the leadership of the former was completely in the control of the Trotskyist Communist Socialist Workers Party and its youth arm, the Young Socialist Alliance while the leadership of the latter contained a number of prominent Communist Party, U.S.A. members.

Other investigations concerned a continuing study of the theory and practice of communism, which falls under the committee's mandate by order of Congress; the Federal employee loyalty-security program; overt attempts to subvert and undermine morale of the Armed Forces; and the Progressive Labor Party, a movement that constantly advocates violent revolution in this country and expresses admiration for a Castro-like form of government.

Reports of all five of these major investigations are presently in various stages of preparation and I maintain that they will be most valuable in keeping those of us in this body informed fully of the activities of those who seek to overthrow our democracy and constitution by force and violence if they deem it necessary.

As an example of two particularly valuable and informative HCIS investigative reports of the recent past, I would like to cite those issued on the Students for a Democratic Society—1970—and the Black Panther Party—1971. Both have been acknowledged by various authorities as the last word on their respective subjects. Both are cited frequently as authoritative—and objective—documents.

Some more facts and figures from the year just ended:

The Internal Security staff distributed through its publications section some 92,000 committee documents during the 92d Congress.

The committee answered 2,068 requests for information by Members of this Congress.

Other individual pieces of correspondence received and answered amounted to at least 3,900.

The committee membership brought to the attention of the executive branch 21 matters in connection with its function on oversight.

And, of course, committee staffers answered innumerable telephone inquiries and handled countless personal visits from persons either seeking or volunteering information.

As I said, there are those of us who hold that some congressional committees offer too much rather than too little legislation, that it would be better if fewer bills found their way to this floor.

The House Committee on Internal Security submits only the most vital and thought-provoking, carefully studied legislative proposals for our consideration. More often than not, it finds new legislation unwarranted if our executive branch can just be persuaded to use and enforce laws already on the books. Most importantly, the committee acts as the eye of the American eagle to keep this Congress and, concurrently, the American people informed about those who, if left unexposed and unchallenged, would happily destroy our system of government and its institutions by violent means.

One of the great accomplishments in the last 2 years of HCIS is the exhaustive examination we made of the entire Federal civilian employee loyalty-security program.

This subject required many days of hearings, thousands of words of testimony, and hours upon hours of committee and staff time in assessing what we learned in order to translate into findings the vast material we had accumulated.

No such searching survey of the employment security operations of the executive branch of our Government had been conducted for at least 20 years. It was long, long overdue. It had to be done and ours was the committee which undertook the task.

What we found, on behalf of the Congress, was that the Federal loyalty-security program is in such disarray today that when the issue of loyalty is indicated, it is resolved under the catch-all "suitability"—that is, other than loyalty—category with respect to Federal employment. It is the bureaucracy's way of brushing "loyalty" under the proverbial rug.

Those lengthy hearings have enabled several of us on the committee to make recommendations to the executive branch which, we are advised from a number of sources, are now being put into effect. At the same time, we have been able to draft a comprehensive legislative proposal to provide the machinery required to make the loyalty-security program function efficiently and effectively.

When the complete record of our accomplishments in this field become fully understood by the membership of this House, I think there will be little question that the Internal Security Committee plays a vital role in our deliberations and has been of immense assistance in meeting its oversight responsibilities toward the security of our Nation.

We must not place ourselves in the position of legislating in a vacuum and this goes for security matters as well as any other important subject. Without the Internal Security Committee we would be in a vacuum in a field so closely tied to the stability and survival of our system and institutions of government.

Besides these undeniable facts, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to note that the Internal Security Committee under the chairmanship of the Honorable RICHARD H. ICHORD, of Missouri, has consistently conduced itself with the utmost decorum and dignity.

I happen to serve on that committee and it has been my pleasure to work with the gentleman from Missouri. He has always been most fair with those of us who serve on the committee, affording every member of it full opportunity to be heard no matter what his political or philosophical convictions—and I might point out that committee's members range widely in political and philosophical beliefs.

I am very proud of my membership of this committee and I think all of us here are proud of our colleague from Missouri.

It is a truism that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." The House Committee on Internal Security pays that price for us. Let not this Congress deny the resources to sustain eternal vigilance.

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the continuation of the Internal Security Committee. I do not do so because of past performance but because of future potential.

There is a compelling need for improved internal security in the public interest. The people of this Nation have paid much for public improvements and the safeguard of the public interest is less than mediocre.

Last summer a tragic flood occurred in Rapid City, S. Dak., a small dam above the city was massively overrun and washed out. It was built during the WPA days of decades ago. Several feet of silt was swept by the raging waters to the homes and places of business throughout the city below. The capacity of that dam was nil in flood control—the cloudburst on that occasion rendered the capacity of the dam equal to a tea cup saucer against a gallon of water. Of course, like the saucer the small dam could not have controlled the massive quantities of water that suddenly poured in during the tragic hours of the night. However, I cite the circumstances to illustrate the need for public awarenesses for internal security.

How many large dams are silted beyond reasonable capacity of flood control? How many hydroelectric systems, constructed at public expense, gate our waterways and stand exposed absent of any reasonable security? Is there a need for greater security in the public interest? Who is in charge? Does the Congress care? Is it a proper matter for inquiry of the Committee on Internal Security? What is the capacity of destruction by a gallon of glycerine well placed in the bottom of a hydroelectric generator on a huge dam on a major waterway? There are four major dams on the Missouri River and the destruction of the Oake, the largest earth dam in the world, would discharge an amount of water sufficient to totally destroy every dam and generating facility downstream between Pierre and St. Louis, plus destruction by flooding of all in the wake thereof. And so, I ask are these reasonable matters of internal security?

I shall vote to sustain the House Committee on Internal Security not for the purposes of controversy today or in the past—but for useful purposes in the interest of all. If the committee does not have such authorization, function, or purpose, then and in that event, we should immediately redefine the authority, the functions, and the purposes of the committee without delay. The members that oppose the committee today

are also opposed to the abrupt termination of many public programs by the administration because it is alleged the constructive usefulness is no more. The termination of a program of public service is acceptable when the objective has been accomplished but if it is terminated because those in charge cannot administer the functions for a constructive purpose then those charged with the administration of the program have publicly sounded the final feebleness of total failure.

The Committee on Internal Security is within the dominion and control of the Congress. It is our baby and it is our responsibility. I do not agree with those here or elsewhere that favor throwing out the baby because of dirty water.

Mr. Speaker, the committee should be sustained until a total evaluation is available as a result of the Bolling committee investigation of all committees of the Congress and I urge an affirmative vote accordingly.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I think this is my 10th—or perhaps 15th—effort to talk about this rather undistinguished appendix on the congressional body politic.

I remind you that it was a number of years ago, when there was a good deal of unrest abroad in the land, when there were a number of our colleagues who privately were a little concerned about voting against these funds because they feared the possibility of misunderstanding at home. But, as the years have gone on, we all know as a matter of record that if we had a vacancy on our side of the aisle this year, we would have great difficulty dragooning anyone into service on this committee. This is an open secret.

The mortality rate for those who serve on this committee is the highest in the House. Twenty-five percent to one-third, every Congress, of those serving on this "enormously important" committee to the national interest somehow get creamed at the polls or do not run.

There was a time when this committee had a dreadful influence upon the political dialog in the country. It has reached the stage currently—and we all know it—of just being a dreary joke.

Even if we succeed today in slashing this budget by stopping this supplemental add-on HISC will still have a budget in excess of $250,000 per year.

Perhaps, rather than trying to slash money in past years, we should have limited the appropriation to deny them their paperclips, their scissors and their scotch tape. That would have effectively put them out of business as it will be if we are successful in approving the position advocated by my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. EDWARDS) and others.

This committee represents a dreadful usurpation of the judicial function and it should be abolished.

We are not mischaracterizing any of our colleagues who serve on the committee. All we do know is that most of us would not consider touching it. That also must be self-evident to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote against the resolution to increase the already excessive funding that this committee receives.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER), a member of the committee.

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the appropriation for the House Internal Security Committee.

I am not a crusader for or against the Internal Security Committee. I did not seek appointment to the committee, but was assigned to it, and have sought to carry out the assignment as fairly as possible. There are several points I would like to make from my experience on the committee, as one who has no special axe to grind.

First, I have been impressed with Chairman ICHORD's scrupulous adherence to procedural due process in running the committee and its hearings. The reputation of the committee for circus hearings, for chasing the daily headline, and browbeating reluctant witnesses may have been true in the past, but it is not true under Chairman ICHORD. When our first hearings began under Chairman ICHORD, there was a large delegation from the press present. They gradually began to drop off, as the atmosphere of the hearings became more like that of the courtroom than an auto da fé. As a result, the committee has made less news and been less sensational but has been more fair and constructive. The committee's written rules of procedure under which it operates seem to me to be exemplary.

Of course, procedural due process is not everything. There is such a thing as substantive due process—that is, the nature of what is investigated can be unfair, can violate due process and civil liberties, by investigating merely unpopular ideas, even if the manner in which the investigations are carried out is technically in accord with due process. Here the committee does walk a tightrope. It operates in very difficult areas—where political power conflicts with personal freedom, the interests of national security with private liberties. But because the problems are difficult and sensitive is no reason to ignore them and abandon the field. If you hold the absolutist view of first amendment rights expressed by Justices Black and Douglas you might well conclude that any approach to these problems is unconstitutional, and that practically all the investigations of the committee are unconstitutional and illegal and exert a "chilling effect" on first amendment rights. But the majority of the Supreme Court has never adopted these views and, indeed, has expressly rejected them. The Court has always required the balancing of individual and governmental interests in matters of internal security. The Court has recognized the importance of the freedom and privacy of political belief and association, but has also found an overriding governmental interest sufficient to warrant intrusion upon them in some instances. The Court has always recognized that it is essential in a democratic society to protect the Government and the society not from a point of political view but from an illegal mode of change—that which utilizes secrecy and violence, that which would change by force rather than through persuasion.

This balancing of individual and governmental interests in security matters is, therefore, a proper field of inquiry for a House committee. It is something more than and different from espionage, which comes under the Judiciary Committee. There are such things as revolutionary movements, and they must be dealt with. The House Internal Security Committee could do a better job than it is presently doing in this area, and I think it will. But I am not aware of any other committee that has shown any interest in the field. The interest is in abandoning the field because a good civil liberation should not dirty his hands with it.

Finally, let me say to my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle that I think it would be a bad political mistake for us to bear the primary responsibility for voting this committee out of existence. Such a vote would be greeted with the applause of the New Left, the liberal editorial writers, and the universities. But it would gain us the scorn of the average American voter. We have suffered in the past from being thought soft on law and order; now we would risk being soft on subversion. Why do we give the devil all of the best tunes? Subversion is not a code word for anticivil libertarians. There is no good reason to be soft on either crime or subversion. We can and should be tough on both—in a way that is consistent with civil liberties and the Constitution. Our argument should be that we Democrats can do a better and fairer job of being tough.

If Mr. BOLLING's committee, after reviewing the entire committee jurisdictional setup in the House in a considered way, should recommend that the functions of the House Internal Security Committee be shifted elsewhere, that is one thing. For us to vote it out of existence mainly on its past reputation and prove we are good civil libertarians is something else, politically speaking.

I hope the appropriation will be approved.

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

Mr. PREYER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ZION. I thank the gentleman.

In order to clarify a question that was raised recently, in the letter from the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE), he said:

> My initial action was prompted by the disclosure by Congressman Robert F. Drinan (d-Mass.) that there are over 754,000 files containing unverified information on individual Americans. I was also advised that there is a special, highly secret file wherein are kept the dossiers of Members of Congress.

Following which he said:

> I do not like this "Big Brother" apparatus. I fear "Big Government," "secret files," and the "thought control" concepts that are embraced by this Committee.

This type of scare language has no place in the legislative process.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Internal Security is a bizarre anachronism, a remnant of the McCarthy era, when the mere mention of a person's name in a congressional hear-

ing room could smear his reputation and ruin his career. It is interesting to recall that the Committee on Un-American Activities, the forerunner of the present committee, was created in 1946 by a close vote of 146 to 135; even in that postwar year of concern over subversive activities, the creation of a witch-hunting committee was considered a highly controversial matter. Since that time, our society at large has adopted more rational attitudes toward people who adhere to unconventioanl ideologies; but the Internal Security Committee is still around, spending more money and accomplishing less than ever before. As Congressman ROBERT DRINAN, a member of the committee, has written:

> There have been a few—very few—cosmetic modifications, including a more modern name, and more funds with which to operate, but the Internal Security Committee . . . is in fact substantially identical to the HUAC of 1949, 1950, and 1951. In no respect is this committee any less dangerous or wasteful today than it was 20 years ago.

On the issue of waste, the facts speak for themselves. During the 92d Congress, the Committee on Internal Security spent over $1 million and employed over 50 staff members. These vast resources were used to produce no legislation whatsoever and to do no other visible good. During the same period, by contrast, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs spent less than one-half million dollars, employed about 20 persons, and produced 102 bills which were signed into public law.

At the present time, Internal Security has 14 employees whose salaries exceed $20,000 per year, and 12 more with salaries of between $15,000 and $20,000. So there you have it—26 professional staff members with salaries of over $15,000, and not a single piece of legislation during the entire 92d Congress. What in the world were these 26 blue-ribbon staff members doing during the past 2 years?

In the 78 days since Congress convened, 19 of the 20 House Committees have held hearings and have pursued their legislative duties. Only the Internal Security Committee has not held, or scheduled, any hearings. Apparently its legislative program for this year, as in previous years, calls for these 50 employees to sit back, do nothing, and watch those fat paychecks come rolling in every month.

The worst extravagance of this committee, however, is its data bank. In hearings before the Subcommittee on Accounts of the House Administration Committee, Chairman ICHORD testified that approximately $175,000 from the committee budget is spent yearly on the accumulation of data on individuals and organizations. This glorified clipping service has compiled hundreds of thousands of dossiers on American citizens. While I strongly oppose data banks in principle, I particularly oppose spending $175,000 a year on a clipping service. If the committee really wants such a service, there are numerous commercial clipping services to which the committee can subscribe, at a fraction of the price which it now pays to its staff members to do the clipping.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot justfy this extravagance to myself or to my constituents. The legislative functions of this committee can be more successfully assumed by the Judiciary Committee; and the enforcement of internal security laws must be left to the Justice Department and the courts. The clipping service is a monumental waste of time and money. So, if we are going to retain Internal Secrurity as a standing committee during the 93d Congress, let us exercise at least a small degree of fiscal responsibility by limiting the funding for this unproductive committee.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in its continuing search for a reason for existence, the House Internal Security Committee has apparently now come up with subversion in the movement for prison reform as a focus for its attention. The distinguished chairman of the committee, in a letter of February 7, 1973, to the distinguished chairman of the House Administration Committee, reports:

> The investigative staff is continuing a preliminary inquiry to uncover the nature and extent of subversive influences involved in prison riots, disturbances, and unrest, and in connection therewith the movement to reform practices of incarceration, probation, and parole. Several organizations of a subversive and revolutionary nature are known to have established objectives in these areas and are exerting effort among prison inmates.

In a sense, I appreciate the interest of the Internal Security in prison reform. Certainly, the more awareness of the dismal state of corrections, the better. However, what I do find less appropriate are, first, the Internal Security Committee's intrusion into the jurisdiction of the House Committee on the Judiciary; and second, its totally misplaced views about what is going on in the prisons and outside of them.

For the edification of those who might perhaps otherwise not be aware of the jurisdictional intrusion this program of the Internal Security Committee presents, I would note that Subcommittee No. 3 has, since May 1971, conducted 30 days of hearings into the issue of corrections. We have developed a hearing record in excess of 4,100 pages, and have conducted hearings not only in Washington, but in the field as well—including California, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Illinois.

Suffice it to say that a considerable amount of time, effort, and money has been expended by my subcommittee, both for the purpose of holding generalized hearings to air the issues involved in corrections, and for the purpose of developing specific legislation.

If, then, the members of the Internal Security Committee indeed are concerned about the prison reform movement, I think it quite clear that the appropriate body to which they may direct their concerns is alive and well in the House Judiciary Committee. Certainly, then, those funds embodied in the resolution before us today which are allocable to the Internal Security Committee's prison reform endeavors are more money thrown into the file entitled "waste."

Apart from the matter of congressional jurisdiction, there is another issue here also—the Internal Security Committee's oft-expressed urge to find subversion and revolution behind every tree. My subcommittee certainly made no effort to exclude such views. For example, Mr. Moe Camacho, then president of the California Correction Officers Association, made clear his endorsement of this view of the world when he testified before subcommittee No. 3 on October 25, 1971, in San Francisco.

Notwithstanding, the existence of such a view, I think that we are compelled to deal with reality, not with imagined assaults upon the so-called establishment. Prison reform is a burning issue because corrections is such a dismal failure. Virtually every knowledgeable observer joins in this conclusion. President Nixon has termed our prisons "colleges of crime." Chief Justice Burger has stated that the penal and correctional institutions and processes are "the most neglected phase of our system of criminal justice in America." Certainly, the side on which the angels stand is clear, and I fear that whatever chimeras the Internal Security Committee has dreamed up, they are the product of wishful thinking alone.

Moreover, while neither I, nor any other thoughtful and sincere proponent of prison reform would support and encourage prison disturbances, I am led to query what the Internal Security might make of the following statements:

> It is a melancholy truth that it has taken the tragic prison outbreaks of the past three years to focus widespread public attention on this problem [of corrections].
>
> [W]e must learn—that prisoners who do not complain are often the truly lost souls who have surrendered and cannot be restored.

Lest anyone think these statements emanate from some underground revolutionary pamphlet, let me relieve the suspense and identify their author as Chief Justice Burger, the first being made in an article by him in the March 1973 issue of Student Lawyer magazine, and the second taken from a speech the Chief Justice delivered on February 6, 1970, before the National Association of Attorneys General.

Before the Internal Security Committee starts finding revolutionaries at the prison gates, I suggest that the hearings conducted by Subcommittee No. 3—or for that matter, the publications of any thoughtful examiner of corrections—first be studied. I think perhaps some understanding of what is wrong with prisons, and what accounts for the surge of unrest and discontent, may perhaps follow. First let us attend to reality—the reality of lack of programs, lack of trained personnel, lack of rehabilitation, lack of due process, lack of fundamental rights, and the reality of the presence of brutality, unfairness, disparate sentences, unchecked parole board discretion. After dealing with reality, maybe we can then descend into fantasy.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently the Members of the House have been bombarded by a flood of propaganda attacking the House Internal Security Committee. This propaganda is replete with inaccuracies and obviously willful distortions of the true facts. This

material, much of which has apparently been lifted wholesale and used in mailings to some of our Members, has come from an organization with the high-sounding title of the "National Committee Against Repressive Legislation."

Now the fact is—and every member of this body should know this by now—that the NCARL is nothing but a continuation of the old National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, 7 of the founding 13 leaders of which had been previously publicly identified as Communists.

The 1970 report of the California Un-American Activities Committee includes a detailed discussion of the abolition committee as a Communist Party front group, a finding made years earlier by the House Un-American Activities Committee. Those findings were not made lightly, but only as a result of careful research and investigation.

One item that has been circulated by the NCARL is a petition signed by numerous professors of public law. The petition states that it was initiated by Prof. Vern Countryman of Harvard and Prof. Thomas Emerson of Yale. Countryman, of course, is a longtime foe of the Internal Security Committee who serves NCARL as a vice chairman of its New England region, and his record of association with certain front organizations and causes of the Communist Party is a significant one.

In the case of Emerson, who serves NCARL as its adviser on constitutional law, the information is even more interesting. As with so many others associated with NCARL, Emerson has demonstrated over the years a marked predelection for Communist Party fronts and causes, including a close association with the National Lawyers Guild, long ago identified as the chief legal bulwark of the Communist Party, and an equally close relationship to the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, also long ago cited as a CPUSA front organization.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another item of information that the Members of this body may not be aware of, and that is that in 1952, in sworn testimony before a House committee investigating tax-exempt foundations, ex-Communist Party member Louis Budenz testified as follows:

> Thomas I. Emerson, from repeated official communications, especially in regard to activities in the Lawyers' Guild and in other fronts, was a member of the Communist Party.

Professor Emerson sent a letter to the committee denying such membership and pointing out in his letter, that he had differed specifically with the Communist Party on several key issues. In fairness to Professor Emerson this fact should be pointed out and noticed.

However, Budenz also testified before another committee, in another matter, that certain party members who occupied positions of influence and were prominently in the public eye, were from time to time, allowed to take public positions in seeming opposition to the party. This was to make their positions seem more credible and to conceal their party membership more effectively.

Furthermore, Budenz, as managing editor of the party's official newspaper, the Daily Worker, had to know precisely who was and who was not a member of the party in order that he could treat their activities with the proper slant. This was especially true in the cases of concealed members who were under party discipline but whose membership was an extremely closely guarded secret.

Still further, as observed by William F. Buckley, Jr., and Brent Bozell in their definitive volume "McCarthy and His Enemies," "the FBI, out of long experience, has given him the highest rating for reliability and accuracy."

It is a matter of public record that Louis Budenz was a reliable witness in case after case, used by the government time and time again in cases before the Subversive Activities Control Board, cases in which their was the right of extensive cross-examination. In none of these cases was his testimony ever shaken or impeached to the slightest degree.

So there it stands: a petition circulated to Members of Congress by an organization known to be a front for the Communist Party and initiated by two professors with long records of support for Party fronts and causes, with one of the two identified in 1952 by a witness of unimpeachable reliability as having been a member of the Communist Party. And this petition, with its unfounded allegations and distortions, is one of the primary sources used by opponents of the Internal Security Committee within this very body.

Perhaps these facts will aid the Members in evaluating the validity of the objections to the Internal Security Committee here today and help them to realize the truth about them so that they will not be misled by this obviously Communist-inspired propaganda campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the continuation of the Internal Security Committee and the granting to it of sufficient funds so that it can carry on its vital work in helping us to legislate intelligently and effectively in defense of the internal security of our country.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. 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 289, nays 101, answered "present" 1, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

YEAS—289

Abdnor	Grasso	Pike
Alexander	Green, Oreg.	Poage
Anderson, Ill.	Griffiths	Powell, Ohio
Andrews, N.C.	Gross	Preyer
Andrews, N. Dak.	Grover	Price, Ill.
Archer	Gubser	Quillen
Arends	Gunter	Railsback
Armstrong	Haley	Randall
Ashbrook	Hamilton	Regula
Bafalis	Hammer-schmidt	Rhodes
Baker	Hanley	Rinaldo
Beard	Hanrahan	Roberts
Bennett	Hansen, Idaho	Robinson, Va.
Bevill	Hansen, Wash.	Robison, N.Y.
Biester	Harvey	Roe
Blackburn	Hastings	Rogers
Bowen	Hays	Roncalio, Wyo.
Bray	Heckler, Mass.	Rose
Breaux	Henderson	Rostenkowski
Breckinridge	Hicks	Roush
Brinkley	Hillis	Rousselot
Brooks	Hinshaw	Roy
Broomfield	Hogan	Runnels
Brotzman	Holifield	Ruppe
Brown, Mich.	Holt	Ruth
Brown, Ohio	Horton	Sandman
Broyhill, N.C.	Huber	Sarasin
Broyhill, Va.	Hudnut	Satterfield
Buchanan	Hungate	Saylor
Burgener	Hunt	Scherle
Burke, Fla.	Hutchinson	Schneebeli
Burleson, Tex.	Ichord	Sebelius
Burlison, Mo.	Jarman	Shipley
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Shoup
Byron	Johnson, Pa.	Shriver
Camp	Jones, N.C.	Shuster
Carter	Jones, Okla.	Sikes
Casey, Tex.	Jones, Tenn.	Sisk
Cederberg	Kazen	Skubitz
Chamberlain	Keating	Slack
Clancy	Kemp	Smith, Iowa
Clark	Kluczynski	Smith, N.Y.
Clausen, Don H.	Kuykendall	Snyder
Clawson, Del	Landgrebe	Spence
Cleveland	Landrum	Staggers
Cochran	Latta	Stanton, J. William
Cohen	Lehman	Stanton, James V.
Collier	Lent	Steed
Collins	Litton	Steele
Conable	Long, La.	Steelman
Coughlin	Lott	Steiger, Ariz.
Crane	Lujan	Steiger, Wis.
Cronin	McClory	Stephens
Daniel, Dan	McCollister	Stratton
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	McDade	Stubblefield
Daniels, Dominick V.	McEwen	Stuckey
Davis, S.C.	McFall	Sullivan
Davis, Wis.	McKay	Symington
de la Garza	McKinney	Symms
Delaney	Madigan	Taylor, N.C.
Dellenback	Mahon	Teague, Calif.
Denholm	Mailliard	Thomson, Wis.
Dennis	Mann	Thone
Dent	Maraziti	Thornton
Devine	Martin, Nebr.	Towell, Nev.
Dickinson	Martin, N.C.	Treen
Dorn	Mathias, Calif.	Udall
Downing	Mathis, Ga.	Veysey
Duncan	Matsunaga	Vigorito
du Pont	Mayne	Waggonner
Edwards, Ala.	Mazzoli	Walsh
Erlenborn	Melcher	Wampler
Esch	Michel	Ware
Eshleman	Miller	White
Evins, Tenn.	Mills, Ark.	Whitehurst
Fascell	Mills, Md.	Whitten
Findley	Minish	Widnall
Fish	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wiggins
Fisher	Mizell	Williams
Flood	Mollohan	Wilson, Bob
Flowers	Montgomery	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Flynt	Moorhead, Calif.	Winn
Foley	Morgan	Wright
Ford, Gerald R.	Murphy, N.Y.	Wyatt
Fountain	Myers	Wydler
Frelinghuysen	Natcher	Wylie
Froehlich	Nelsen	Wyman
Fulton	Nichols	Yatron
Fuqua	O'Brien	Young, Alaska
Gaydos	O'Neill	Young, Fla.
Gettys	Parris	Young, S.C.
Gibbons	Passman	Young, Tex.
Gilman	Patman	Zablocki
Ginn	Pepper	Zion
Goldwater	Perkins	Zwach
Goodling	Pettis	
	Peyser	
	Pickle	

NAYS—101

Abzug	Forsythe	Nedzi
Adams	Fraser	Nix
Addabbo	Frenzel	Obey
Anderson, Calif.	Giaimo	O'Hara
	Gonzalez	Patten
Annunzio	Green, Pa.	Podell
Ashley	Gude	Pritchard
Barrett	Hanna	Rangel
Bingham	Harrington	Rees
Blatnik	Hawkins	Reid
Boland	Hechler, W. Va.	Reuss
Bolling	Heinz	Riegle
Brademas	Helstoski	Rodino
Brasco	Holtzman	Rosenthal
Brown, Calif.	Howard	Roybal
Burke, Calif.	Johnson, Colo.	Ryan
Burke, Mass.	Jordan	St Germain
Burton	Kastenmeier	Sarbanes
Carey, N.Y.	Koch	Schroeder
Clay	Kyros	Seiberling
Conte	Leggett	Stark
Corman	McCloskey	Stokes
Cotter	Macdonald	Studds
Culver	Madden	Thompson, N.J.
Danielson	Mallary	Tiernan
Dellums	Meeds	Van Deerlin
Diggs	Metcalfe	Vanik
Dingell	Mezvinsky	Waldie
Donohue	Mink	Whalen
Drinan	Mitchell, Md.	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Edwards, Calif.	Moakley	
Eilberg	Moorhead, Pa.	Wolff
Evans, Colo.	Mosher	Yates
Ford, William D.	Moss	Young, Ga.
	Murphy, Ill.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Derwinski

NOT VOTING—41

Aspin	Gray	Owens
Badillo	Guyer	Price, Tex.
Bell	Harsha	Quie
Bergland	Hébert	Rarick
Biaggi	Hosmer	Roncallo, N.Y.
Carney, Ohio	Jones, Ala.	Rooney, N.Y.
Chappell	Karth	Rooney, Pa.
Chisholm	Ketchum	Talcott
Conlan	King	Taylor, Mo.
Conyers	Long, Md.	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	McCormack	Ullman
Dulski	McSpadden	Vander Jagt
Eckhardt	Milford	Young, Ill.
Frey	Minshall, Ohio	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Derwinski for, with Mr. Young of Illinois against.

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Karth against.

Mr. Chappell for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Carney of Ohio against.

Mr. Conlan for, with Mr. Conyers against.

Mr. Guyer for, with Mr. Eckhardt against.

Mr. Ketchum for, with Mr. McCormack against.

Mr. Roncallo of New York for, with Mr. Owens against.

Mr. Davis of Georgia for, with Mr. Aspin against.

Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Badillo against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Bergland with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Long of Maryland.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. McSpadden.

Mr. Rarick with Mr. Milford.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Talcott with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Frey with Mr. Price of Texas.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YOUNG). If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 56 I was in the Chamber and was in the process of voting when my attention was momentarily diverted by a colleague. As a result, I inadvertently pressed the "yea" button, instead of the "nay" button. I am thus incorrectly recorded.

I intended to vote "nay." I therefore ask unanimous consent that this statement appear in the RECORD immediately following the vote in question.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 307 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 307

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1973, the further expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 162 by the Committee on the District of Columbia, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $275,000 including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, consultants, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration. Not to exceed $50,000 of the amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202 (i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purposes.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 4. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 5. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 307, for the Committee on the District of Columbia, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS), calls for $275,000 for investigations and its committees. This amount was given very careful consideration.

There is agreement between the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN), and the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS). The amount represents a 5.5-percent pay raise received by the employees and includes moneys to fund all subcommittees. The committee has added two new subcommittees.

In the first session of the last Congress the committee received $220,000. This amount would be $275,000.

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.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 306 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 306

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1973, the expenses of conducting the investigations and studies to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 18, Ninety-third Congress, by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $1,226,300 for the first session of the Ninety-third Congress, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of investigators, attorneys, individual consultants or organizations thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. However, not to exceed $100,000 of the amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a (i)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose. Not to exceed $407,500 of the total amount provided by this resolution shall be made available for the expenses of the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency in accordance with this resolution which shall be paid on vouchers authorized by such subcommit-

tee, signed by the chairman of such subcommittee or the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 306 for the Committee on Banking and Currency, chaired by the distinguished dean of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), and having as its ranking minority member the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL), asked for $1,226,300. Mr. WIDNALL and Mr. PATMAN are in agreement. The minority has been guaranteed a substantially larger staff than in the past. Some $407,500 is specifically set aside for the Subcommittee on Housing, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. This is a requirement of the Banking and Currency Committee for $1,226,300 for 1 year; is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. That is an increase of $251,300 over the first session of the 92d Congress?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The first session of the 92d Congress was $975,000.

Mr. GROSS. So it is an increase of $251,300 in 1 year for the committee?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I think that the amount recommended by the gentlemen on this committee is very modest.

Mr. GROSS. I think the only other observation I should like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the dollar is in orbit, and apparently the Committee on Banking and Currency is going to help keep it there.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota for purposes of debate only.

Mr. FRENZEL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be appropriate for the gentleman to comment on the description of the generous provision for minority so all Members might know what the provisions for the staffing of the minority are. Some 2 years ago there were eight minority staff members and 37 majority staff members, a ratio of approximately 4½ to 1. I am advised, I hope correctly, as of today the ratio of staff is 40 for the majority and nine for the minority. In my judgment as one Member of the minority, this is not a handsome increase, it is not a fair apportionment of staff, and it simply again presents the necessity of changing the rules of the House to provide one-third minority staffing for all committees. The Banking and Currency Committee is an egregious example of malapportionment of staff. Certainly there are others like it. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will say to the gentleman my attitude is and has been to staff to the extent possible the minority. I have had numerous conversations with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL), on this subject, as a result of which I believe—and I would like the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) if he will, to verify this—following the hearings and following the conversation between the gentleman and myself, the distinguished chairman agreed to give him one more employee. Is that correct?

Mr. WIDNALL. That is my understanding.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Is the gentleman satisfied at the moment with, as he indicated to me and notwithstanding that he does not have one-third, the professional and clerical staff available to him?

Mr. WIDNALL. Yes, I said so.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. 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.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 309 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 309

Resolved, That, for the further expenses of conducting investigations and studies pursuant to H. Res. 256, by the Select Committee on Crime, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $331,160.20 including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, individual consultants or organizations thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. However, not to exceed $50,000 of the amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the House Select Committee on Crime shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulation established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 309 provides funds for the committee chaired by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) and calls for $331,160.20 for the first session of this session of Congress. In the first session of Congress the amount was $675,000 and in the second session the amount was $470,000, or an amount available for the 2 years of $1,145,000. It is our understanding that this will be the last such resolution since the Select Committee on Crime will finish its work in the first session. It will not come before us again.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, for discussion of the travel only.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is, in view of what it provides, a rather nice going away present. I hope the gentleman is correct in his assumption that on June 30 that will be the last money for this particular Select Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I think the gentleman from New Jersey can assure his distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, that will be the fact.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to outline briefly what the Select Committee on Crime intends to do in the remaining months ahead. The committee will report to the Congress our findings and recommendations on:

First. Drugs in our Nation's schools;

Second. Corrections;

Third. Securities frauds; and

Fourth. Organized criminal influences in horseracing.

Further, we intend to prosecute vigorously an investigation of "Street Crime In America." This investigation will provide the basis for our final report to the House of Representatives.

PREPARATION OF FINAL REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

During the past year our committee concluded intensive investigations involving four distinct areas of crime and criminal justice administration. The committee is now engaged in the task of distilling voluminous investigative reports, testimony and staff memoranda reports into final reports which will describe our findings and recommendations. The reports which the committee is now preparing include:

DRUGS IN OUR SCHOOLS

This in-depth look at narcotic and drug addiction in America's school system is, in our judgment, a comprehensive assessment of the nature and extent of youthful drug abuse. The investigation—as most of you know from the hearings transcripts which have been sent to every Member of Congress—was extensive. Indeed, the investigation included detailed study of drug abuse in school systems located in and around six of our major cities: New York, Miami, Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. I must tell you in all candor that this national investigation of teenage drug abuse was very time consuming; frankly, Mr. Speaker, the subject matter warranted the extraordinary attention we devoted to it. The testimony of parents, teachers, policemen, students, doctors, and interested citizens fills many volumes with valuable information about the drug menace. I do not wish to take up your time here with tales of horror about the tragedies caused by narcotics and dangerous drugs but I can assure you that my colleagues and I—within the past year—have come to the firm conclusion that drug abuse is epidemic within our school systems and that those school systems are presently ill-equipped to handle the problem.

Our final report on "Drugs In Our Schools" will describe the problem and will propose recommendations for congressional action. We regard the completion of this report as a most important agenda item.

CORRECTIONS

The Nation's correctional system has been described as a national disgrace. That description emanates from those who are most familiar with the failure of our prisons to rehabilitate offenders. To defend that proposition one need only cite the fact that over 70 percent of our serious crimes are committed by recidivists.

The failure of our prisons is one of the central problems within the criminal justice system, and, until we can improve appreciably the record of prisons, we can make no real fundamental progress in the national effort to turn the criminal justice system around. Unfortunately, prison failures are brought to public attention only on rare occasions. The 1971 Attica riot was one of those rare and regrettable occasions. The Attica riot provided the immediate basis for our inquiry regarding corrections. That inquiry focused not only on the actual riots at Attica, Rahway and Raiford Prisons, but on the underlying causes of those riots and on recommendations.

CONVERSION OF WORTHLESS SECURITIES INTO CASH

In late 1971 the committee undertook an extensive investigation into organized criminal influence in legitimate businesses. The committee focused its attention on two sophisticated securities frauds, the Baptist Foundation of America, Inc.—which is not associated in any way with legitimate Baptist Associations, and in which there was no intentional effort to disparage the Baptist faith—and the Dumont Datacomp Corp. Our investigations revealed the utter worthlessness of an allegedly reputable charitable foundation and described how it parlayed a slick brochure and fraudulent financial statement into $20 million worth of "paper" assets which defrauded countless businessmen and banks out of hard cash.

The Dumont Datacomp stock manipulation was another example of sophisticated "white collar" crime that our committee exposed. Our hearings exposed the various underworld figures who were involved in that manipulation. Our investigation also brought to light negligent business practices which greatly facilitated the fraudulent B.F.A. scheme.

The committee staff prepared a report on our investigations and findings in this area and this report is entitled, "Conversion Of Worthless Securities Into Cash." The report is now in the final stages of preparation and will soon be printed and presented to the Congress.

ORGANIZED CRIME IN SPORTS—RACING

This report, which is now being revised, will detail the committee's extensive investigation of horseracing in the United States. The subject of organized crime activity in sports has a number of law enforcement ramifications. First, profits from gambling operations on sporting events constitute a very major portion of income for the underworld, in the opinion of most law enforcement experts. In addition, moneys gained are then invested in sports facilities or activities. Moreover, criminal activities in the sports field enable underworld figures and their associates to establish contacts with legitimate sports and business organizations.

The report which we will issue will describe our findings and recommendations regarding the nature and extent of criminal activity in racing—it will also suggest ways to cope with and eliminate underworld activities in racing.

NEW UNDERTAKINGS—STREET CRIME IN AMERICA

This committee was reconstituted for the period January 3, 1973, through June 30, 1973, so that it could complete the reports listed above and so that it could also address issues involving street crime in America.

The committee has formulated plans for holding hearings on street crime in Washington, D.C., Chicago, and New York City. The purpose of these hearings is to assess the nature and extent of street crime and to assess the quality of anticrime programs which have been instituted to reduce crime and violence. The committee regards this as a vital part of its overall activity and we would feel remiss if we were to close down our operation on June 30, 1973, without having examined that kind of crime which most closely touches the lives of our citizens.

We have planned our hearings on street crime so that we will have ample time to prepare a final report to the Congress on street crime in America. That report will also summarize the activities which the Select Committee on Crime has undertaken since its beginning. It will also recommend to the Congress a continuing plan of action for reducing crime.

Specifically, we intend to elicit testimony from chiefs of police, law enforcement administrators, and police supervisors; from State law enforcement planning agency directors; from judges, court administrators; from correctional officials; from professional associations—ABA Correctional Commission, NCCD, National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, Conference of Mayors and so forth—from former members and staff directors of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, the job of fighting crime is an enormous and complex task, and, as I have stated many times previously, I firmly believe the House of Representatives should have a single permanent committee to deal with all aspects of crime, be it a legislative committee or a permanent select committee. I intend the work of the Select Committee on Crime to be regarded as a blueprint for action by the House of Representatives in this area of vital concern to all our citizens.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, when the reconstitution of the Select Committee on Crime was being debated by the Members on the floor, February 28, 1973, it was suggested that the Select Committee on Crime spent over $30,000 last year for telephone calls, at a rate of $4,000 to $5,000 per month (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 5923). In fact the committee spent such a total for the 2 years combined in the 92d Congress, and the monthly bills averaged $1,250. We must bear in mind that the Select Committee on Crime was charged with a responsibility to investigate all aspects of crime in the United States. With such broad investigative duties encompassing the entire United States, it was most prudent for the committee to save on investigators' travel expenses to the maximum extent possible by use of the telephone.

It was also suggested on the floor, February 28, 1973, that the committee spent $4556.59 for the single month of September 1972, for telephone expenses. In fact, this total was for 4 months combined. Consequently I am submitting herewith exact copies of the telephone bills themselves for these 4 months, as well as a summary of committee telephone expenses for the entire 2-year period, in order to correct the RECORD as I assured my distinguished colleagues I would do at the time of our funding resolution.

MEMORANDUM

To: Chairman Claude Pepper.
From: Chris Nolde, Chief Counsel
Date: March 6, 1973.

Attached is a copy of our September, 1972 Expense Report submitted to House Administration containing our telephone expenses.

As you can see, the $4556.59 figure reflects telephone expenses actually paid for in September 1972 without any indication that 3 prior months telephone bills were also included.

Attached are the C & P Telephone Co. facing sheets for the four months bills paid in September, 1972 as follows:

April 30, 1971	$956.31
May 31, 1971	882.14
June 30, 1971	1384.01
August 31, 1972	1334.13
Total (paid September, 1972)	4556.59

(NOTE.—C & P facing sheets referred to are not reproduced in the RECORD.)

TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH EXPENSES

January, could not pay until funded.
February, could not pay until funded.
March, could not pay until funded.
April, none.
May, $763.26 (Jan.).
June, were not billed.
July, were not billed.
August, were not billed.
September, were not billed.
October, $2,347.90 (July & Aug.).
November, none.
December, $5,031.97 (Sept., Oct., & Nov.).

1972 MONTHLY REPORTS SUBMITTED TO HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

January, $1,087.63 (Dec. '71).
February, $898,50 (Jan.)
March, $1,175.22 (Feb.)
April, $1,528.06 (Mar.)
May, $1,324.21 (April).
June, $2,474.27 (May).
July, $2,018.44 (June).
August, $3,160.02 (Feb. & Mar. '71 and July 1972).
September, $4,556.59 (Apr., May, June '71 and Aug. 1972).
October, $939.72 (Sept.).
November, $877.63 (Oct.).
December, $2,392.59 (Nov.–C&P and GSA–San Francisco & Kansas City).

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. 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.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 291 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 291

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1973, the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 163, by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $694,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, individual consultants or organizations thereof, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. However, not to exceed $50,000 of the amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(i); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 291 is for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Its chairman is the distinguished new chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY).

The subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration held extensive hearings on this committee. There is agreement between the majority and the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), and Chairman HALEY.

Chairman HALEY has undertaken what we consider to be a very constructive reorganization of the committee and is turning over to its respective subcommittees a great deal more responsibility than they had in the past.

Mr. HALEY is not known, as all of us realize, as one of the last big spenders. As a matter of fact, he is a very distinguished and careful gentleman with respect to the administration of his affairs in charge of this committee.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on this resolution and all other resolutions before the House today the Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

CLEAN AIR ACT EXTENSION

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 316 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 316

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. 5445) to extend the Clean Air Act, as amended, for one year. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 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.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 316 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 5445 which is a bill to extend the Clean Air Act by authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 1974 at the same funding level authorized for fiscal year 1973. The appropriations under the current act expire on June 30, 1973.

The cost of H.R. 5445 is broken down as follows: Research on fuels and vehicles, $150,000,000; payments for low-emission vehicles, $25,000,000; general authority, $300,000,000. The total authorization for this program is $475,000,000.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce plans hearings on H.R. 5445 to examine many of the policy issues, but the committee does not feel that there is adequate time available for the hearings before the program's funding expires on June 30, 1973. Therefore the committee feels that a 1-year extension of the programs provided for in the act is necessary to allow their careful and responsible consideration.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the bill by a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of House Resolution 316 in order that we may discuss and debate H.R. 5445.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 316 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 5445.

The purpose of H.R. 5445 is to provide a 1-year extension of the Clean Air Act of 1970. Unless Congress acts, the present law will expire on June 30, 1973.

This bill provides funding for ficsal year 1974 at exactly the same rate authorized for fiscal year 1973. The total

amount authorized in this bill for fiscal year 1974 is $475 million.

The 1-year extension will allow the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce sufficient time to hold in-depth hearings on the Clean Air Act of 1970 before trying to alter present programs.

The administration supports this 1-year extension of the present program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time but I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and 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. STAGGERS. 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. 5445) to extend the Clean Air Act, as amended, for 1 year.

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

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 consideration of the bill, H.R. 5445, with Mr. DORN 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 West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I hope consideration of the bill will not take very long, because it is a similar bill to the one we considered yesterday. It is simply a 1-year extension of the Clean Air Act.

This legislation was first passed in 1967, because we recognized at that time our air had become polluted to the extent that it was dangerous to our health in America. It was renewed in 1970 for the same reason. We made a great many comprehensive changes in the bill at that time. Some of them have not been put into operation, because we gave the automobile manufacturers and others time to come forth with the implementation.

I might say that when the bill was passed in 1970, the vote was 374 to 1.

We explained the bill fully at that time. At this time I would just like to say that we have had some concrete results from many of the things that have happened as a result of the bill. Most of the Members know, if they have kept up with the current articles in the media, about the automobile pollution and pollution from our stationary plants across the country.

Mr. Chairman, in some of our cities, like Detroit, since 1968 there has been an 80-percent reduction in SO_2, which is sulphur dioxide, and a 45-percent reduction in total suspended particulates. We have had reductions in St. Louis and in several of our other cities, in Philadelphia and the District of Columbia, here where we live.

So it is doing a job. We are talking about health now. We know in several situations that the health of our citizens has been endangered. In fact, one time it got so bad in Birmingham, Ala., as a result of the smoke and the smog in the air, that several deaths resulted. Some Members of our committee went down to take a look at what was going on. They suspended the operation of some of the steel plants for about 3 or 4 days, and after that the air cleared up and everything went on as before.

Certainly we need to continue to do what we are doing now, cleaning up the air of America, so that we will have cleaner air to breathe.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, we are talking about the health of our citizens and not money. The whole principle is based on the health of people. Air pollution causes an increased incidence of bronchitis, emphysema, asthma, eye irritation, and possibly lung cancer.

So we are asking that the bill be extended for 1 year so that we can go in again and study the things that need to be changed. There are many things, we realize, at the present time that need to be changed, and we will have to take the time to study it.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN).

Mr. WYMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia does realize this proposal today is before us on a special rule?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, sir

Mr. WYMAN. This is not, however, the decision of the committee: that it does regard with favor or will not regard with favor today any amendments going to the substance of the Clean Air Act standards?

Mr. STAGGERS. Let me say this, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman's question:

The other body has passed this bill identically for an extension, and they are going to have hearings too, and we are going to have hearings on the question. It has to be passed by June of next year, with all of the different ramifications taken care of and the things which we know need to be done. That is the reason we are going to try to prevent amendments from being attached to it today.

We would be glad to have any colloquy from the Members on anything that needs to be done and to define anything or answer any questions for any Member of Congress who has a problem in his individual district. They can come before the committee and explain their problems to the committee, and they may give them the benefit of their thinking as to what should be done as to the bill.

Mr. WYMAN. Will the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), yield further?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN).

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), that further on in the proceedings I would like to ask the gentleman one or two questions.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to answer them.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN).

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), the chairman of the committee, in supporting this extension as indicated here in the legislation. I do want to point out, however, that there are a few problems that will be brought to the attention of the Members in the colloquy, for example, as to the great State of Colorado, where there is a different altitude.

In that situation, you deal with different problems, and this has created a problem in that area.

Likewise, I think there is some problem with the mechanical devices we hoped for in our automobiles. They are finding it difficult to get the design that will do the job and at the same time give us some reasonable mileage per gallon. This is a problem, and we do intend to go into it with extensive hearings and review all of it.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding. I hope the bill passes under the 1-year extension.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN). The gentleman is a very valuable citizen of this country; he certainly is a very valuable member of the committee. He has been very helpful and has always been very cooperative. I think the items he mentioned are very pertinent to the Nation, and I think we need to answer those questions.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a couple of questions?

Mr. STAGGERS. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WYLIE).

Mr. WYLIE. May I ask the gentleman, did anyone from the administration testify on this bill?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, Mr. Ruckelshaus appeared and gave his approval and said that he approved the extension of the bill.

Mr. WYLIE. Did he approve the authorization recommended in this bill?

Mr. STAGGERS. As an extension. That is correct.

Mr. WYLIE. $75 million?

Mr STAGGERS. That is correct. That is all we are asking for, is an extension of the bill, just as we did yesterday on the solid wastes.

Mr. WYLIE. There is one additional question I have, although I do not want to prolong this. There is some technical

language on line 5 of page 1 of H.R. 5445 which says the act "is amended by striking 'and $150 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973,' and inserting in lieu thereof, '$150 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973,' " those seem to be the same to me.

Mr. STAGGERS. They are the same, but it is a technical matter of writing the bill to make it conform to what we need to do for the extension and what the Senate has done.

Mr. WYLIE. It is not intended that this bill will have any retroactive effect?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, indeed.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like very much to compliment not only the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS), but the ranking minority member (Mr. NELSEN), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ROY), and all of the other members of the committee for a fine job in handling this bill.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5445, which will provide a simple, 1 year extension of the Clean Air Act. The funding provisions of the act expire on June 30, 1973, and it simply will be impossible for the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment to afford ample consideration to the various substantive changes which have been proposed for this legislation prior to that time.

As I stated yesterday during consideration of the Solid Waste Disposal Act extension, there are 12 health bills under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee that also expire at the end of this fiscal year. Many of these programs are the subject of rather percipitous action from the executive branch. In order to protect the prerogatives of the Congress, our subcommittee must commit the next 3 months to these health programs.

There is another reason, Mr. Chairman, why a delay in consideration of the substantive provision of the Clean Air Act is desirable. As you know, the Environmental Protection Agency is presently involved in two complex and controversial proceedings under the act. One involves implementation of a State plan for California which includes a proposal for gasoline rationing. A second proceeding involves consideration of the petitions of the automobile manufacturers for a 1-year delay in implementation of the 1975 emissions standards. The latter proceeding is due to a remand from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Neither proceeding is likely to be resolved by June of this year, and intervention by the Congress before these proceedings reach finality would be premature. I believe it is in the best interests of all concerned that we limit ourselves at the present time to a simple extension of the act until these administrative and judicial proceedings are exhausted.

I assure my colleagues that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment will conduct extensive hearings on substantive provisions of the Clean Air Act later this year.

I think the chairman has fully explained the purpose of this bill. The administration has endorsed it, and it will afford the subcommittee flexibility because the deadline is so close on us.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of the legislation.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I have supported this legislation in the past. Does the gentleman happen to know whether the EPA, in some of its contracting work for research on fueled vehicles, is planning to utilize the recently established facility at El Monte, Calif., set up by the State of California to test the 1975 refitted vehicles as to the effect of the air emission standards?

Mr. ROGERS. For 1975?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. For 1975; yes.

Mr. ROGERS. I would hope they would and I would think they would make use of all the existing facilities wherever possible to do the testing. We can make an inquiry of the EPA on this specific item for the gentleman and let him know the result of that, but I certainly hope that the EPA will use these facilities if the facility at Ypsilanti, Mich., is not sufficient.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I hope so, too, and I hope they do not duplicate existing facilities which have been set up. The State of California has already taken the lead in this research, because the Los Angeles basin is an area where this work is particularly necessary.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. They have been leaders in the field.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. They did this early. Dr. A. J. Haagen-Smit of Cal Tech, chairman of the California Air Resources Board, is the one who first analyzed the process to find out what smog really is. The El Monte facility is designed for testing vehicles on an ongoing basis and also those refitted for 1975 use. I hope the gentleman from Florida will urge the EPA to make use of this facility.

Mr. ROGERS. I am sure the committee will join in urging the EPA to use all existing facilities where necessary. I appreciate the gentleman bringing this matter to our attention.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his efforts. I know it has been a difficult subject to deal wtih and to determine what is a fair standard. I hope the gentleman will continue to press to see that this new vehicle testing and laboratory facility at El Monte is used, because a tremendous amount of thought has been given there to the development of proper testing procedures.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman, and we will certainly do that.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish at this time to state that I am in full support of the bill H.R. 5445, to extend for 1 year the Clean Air Act of 1970.

During the hearings held before the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee, all testimony—including that of the administration—was in favor of such an extension. In fact, there really seems to be no controversy over the matter of this simple extension.

It is my belief that the Congress must fully examine the Clean Air Act, and make necessary changes as soon as possible. It is clear, however, that an appropriate review of this measure cannot be made before existing legislation expires on June 30 of this year.

I, therefore, urge my distinguished colleagues to view the complexity of the problem of air pollution, and support this important measure.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as everyone here knows the Clean Air Act of 1970 is a very complicated act which has been the subject of controversy on several fronts. Some of the issues require thorough consideration at the subcommittee and full committee level. No hurried or casual treatment would be in the best interests of Congress, the executive branch, or the public.

The authority for the appropriations necessary for the ongoing activities of the Environmental Protection Agency as to clean air expires in a little over 3 months. It is for this reason, and this reason only, that your committee brings to the floor a simple 2-year extension of all authorities including appropriations. It is not the intention hereby to delay or sidetrack consideration of the Clean Air Act. On the contrary, it is the intention to give it prompt and intensive attention.

In view of the purpose of H.R. 5445 it is hoped that Members will refrain from opening the matter by amendment proposals. It is impossible here and now to give any kind of proper consideration to them. We know there are these issues, and it certainly is expected that all parties will have opportunity to suggest changes at such time as the committee takes up the overall renewal of the Clean Air Act of 1970.

Probably the most evident issue has to do with the request of automobile companies to obtain favorable action by EPA to delay the deadline for auto emission levels to 1976. Whatever EPA finally decides I am sure that those who disagree with the decision will be coming forth to get a legislative reversal. There is nothing wrong with that but it would, in my opinion, be improper to try and work it out here and now.

H.R. 5445 provides authorizations for appropriations up to $475 million for fiscal year 1974. This is the same level in each part of the act as found in the act for fiscal year 1973. The administration agrees with the desirability of extension on these terms.

I recommend passage of H.R. 5445.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROTZMAN).

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, the 1970 Clean Air Act will undoubtedly go down in history as the turning point in the war to conquer air pollution in this country. In one bold, comprehensive stroke, the Congress set our Nation on the path to cleaner air for our beleaguered cities. I was proud to serve with the Interstate and Foreign Com-

merce Committee which drafted that legislation and I gave it my firm support.

However, today I am just as thankful that the Commerce Committee has unanimously recognized the important need for extensive review of the 1970 act as is set out on page 2 of the report. The experiences of the last 3 years have given us more scientific information and insight into how we may improve on this act even more.

Specifically, one area to which I feel the committee should address itself at the earliest possible date involves the peculiar problems with air pollution that metropolitan areas at higher altitudes are suffering. Through congressional oversight, the 1970 Clean Air Act is actually preventing Colorado and other high altitude States from enjoying the cleaner air they are capable of achieving.

The reason for the dirtier air is this simple: The largest component of smog for cities in the Rocky Mountain area comes from auto emissions. Since the enactment of this legislation in 1970, it has been determined that a well-tuned car in Denver, Salt Lake City, or Albuquerque emits almost twice the pollutants that a well-tuned car at sea level emits, because automobiles tend to run fuel rich at higher altitudes. Yet Federal emission level standards do not reflect this fact. Low-cost adjustments by the manufacturer in the carburetion and timing of a car can easily eliminate excessive high altitude emissions, yet such adjustments are specifically prohibited by the 1970 act.

What is the net result of this? These areas have dirtier air not because the technology does not exist to clean it up, but because the law prohibits us from making corrections. Also, less efficient automobile engines mean millions of gallons of gasoline wasted every year at a time when rumors are rampant that gasoline rationing is just around the corner.

Dirtier auto emissions also mean that more people will suffer and die from respiratory diseases in these areas than should be the case.

In special environmental hearings conducted last year by former Congressman McKevitt and myself in Denver, witness after witness came forward to ask that this law be amended. They felt that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should be directed to take altitude variances into account in establishing allowable auto emission levels. Thus, a car at 6,000 feet could inexpensively be made to emit no more pollutants than a car at sea level. In the interest of equity for all citizens of the United States, I feel the Congress can grant no less.

It was also pointed out in these hearings that the 1970 act should be amended to allow the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to waive the restrictions on adjusment of Federal auto emissions control equipment in those areas where State and local governments can demonstrate that such adjustments would lower emission levels.

Finally, I want to stress that the Rocky Mountain States will have a severe problem meeting the ambient air standards for 1975 set by the Clean Air Act, because of this situation. EPA should have the power to extend this deadline if it determines that noncompliance has been caused by dirty automobile engines which Colorado and the other high-altitude States were prevented by Federal law from correcting.

We have tried to work this out administratively with the Environmental Protection Agency to no avail, their contention being that they are banned by the law from doing anything.

I, therefore, urge the members of the Commerce Committee to take up the matter of higher altitude urban areas and their specific problems with air pollution at the earliest possible date.

Colorado's State Department of Health has estimated that nearly 50 percent of that area's automobile traffic would have to be curtailed in 1975 unless the measures I am suggesting today are considered and passed soon.

Of course, I completely support thorough hearings to study these problems as carefully as possible and to work out the best practicable solutions. But I must stress again that such hearings must be started at the earliest possible date if they are to help prevent severe problems for the high-altitude States later.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that time is short here today, but it has been mentioned in prior colloquy that we might look forward to some hearings on this particular subject—and I have had private conversations with the chairman of the committee—and at this time I might yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) to ascertain if it is in fact the intention of the committee to hold hearings so that those of us who may have problems such as I have mentioned might present testimony for the committee to consider?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct, and I might add that all of the things that have been brought up in the colloquy today will, of course, be in the RECORD, and will be thus made known to the committee, and I can assure you that they will be given consideration by the committee when the time comes.

I also have instructed our committee counsel of our concern as to all of these problems, and have made plans so that all Members of the Congress who have any problems such as those the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BROTZMAN) has just mentioned in his district, and in the Rocky Mountain areas, that they will be certainly most welcome to come before our committee and present their views.

I might also add that I know that the gentleman from Colorado served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The gentleman stated that he was there when this bill came out, and I know that the gentleman was there, because the gentleman gave many valuable contributions, not only to this bill, but to all the other bills that were eventually enacted into statutes, and we appreciate the gentleman's help.

I further wish to congratulate the people in the district the gentleman represents for returning the gentleman to the House of Representatives, because the gentleman has certainly been an excellent Member of the Congress. And I know that in the Rocky Mountain area that there is an exceptional problem, and I agree that this should be given consideration.

I also know that as you get higher into the air that the atmosphere becomes dirtier, and that you do have to make adjustments. And I intend when the time comes to ask those representatives from the automobile manufacturers and also the EPA to see what improvements are needed to control this problem.

I again assure the gentleman that it will be brought up at the proper time.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia very much for his response on this particular matter.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I heard the remarks by the gentleman from Colorado about elevation, and where the gentleman comes from, the very lovely State of Colorado, the air is rarer the higher one gets. I come from a place where the air is not very rare. We are sort of in the lowlands in New Jersey, not very far above sea level.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Colorado for bringing this air pollution matter up, because of the internal combustion engine.

I read an article in the paper the other day regarding this matter. I do not know how true it is. I hope the committee will see fit when they have their hearings to bring in the Honda people who claim that there is a part in the chamber of the emission system that can be totally obliterated and this burned off. I hope we do have that matter taken up when it comes before the committee.

Mr. BROTZMAN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his very fine comments and concern.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ARMSTRONG).

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding to me. I rise to associate myself with his remarks and join him in thanking the Chairman for his assurance that some consideration will be given to our State and other States in the mountain West.

I am for clean air for all Americans, not just those who happen to live at sea-level.

And it is cruelly misleading to call the legislation being considered today the Clean Air Act. As it affects the people of my State, and other high altitude areas of the country, it might as well be called the Dirty Air Act.

This legislation does not solve the air pollution problem at mountain elevations. And what is worse, it actually precludes responsible action by State and local officials to solve problems in their own jurisdictions. Many Members of Congress may be surprised to learn just how critical air pollution has become in the mountain West. The purity of Colorado mountain air is legendary; and the sinister pall of smog that hangs over our mountains and cities would have been unthinkable even a few years ago.

But far more is at stake than esthetic considerations. There is also a serious and well-documented health concern:

Metro Denver has the worst carbon monoxide problem in the Nation today. And EPA—Environmental Protection Agency—has ranked Denver as one of the top six priority areas of the country in need of air pollution control.

Coloradoans have acted decisively to deal with this critical problem. Colorado was among the leaders of State government in early air pollution research and legislation.

Today our State continues to lead in affecting air quality. Two noteworthy examples are the progressive land use planning and transportation planning programs underway in our State.

And I am proud that by State and local action we have controlled air pollution or obtained compliance schedules from 95 percent of the stationary sources of air pollution.

Yes, the people of Colorado have made a strong and responsible effort. But any air pollution control worthy of the name must come to grips with automobile exhaust emissions, the cause of an estimated 90 percent of total air pollution in Metropolitan Denver. It is in this respect that the so-called Clean Air Act discriminates most unfairly against Colorado and other mountain States.

The need is underscored by Federal preemption which precludes State legislatures from acting to solve the problem.

And since Federal law prohibits car leaders from adjusting automobile engines for high altitude driving conditions, the only hope for restoring air purity in Colorado and other affected States is to amend the Clean Air Act.

In closing, may I call your attention to the dilemma which will arise if automobile manufacturers are given an extension of time to comply with Federal air quality standards. I take no position on this at the present time. But if EPA extends the deadline for manufacturer compliance, many communities, particularly Denver, Colorado Springs, and others in the mountain West, will be unable to comply with Federal air standards. Yet the existing law does not provide for an extension for compliance by local jurisdictions beyond 1977—an impossible deadline in Colorado unless the Federal act is amended.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to criticize the sponsors of this extension nor of the original legislation. I know that their effort is motivated by the highest and most sincere purpose and I am therefore going to support extension of this act for an additional year.

But I did not wish to vote to do so without taking this opportunity to call attenion of my colleagues to the urgent need for amendments so that this legislation will truly be a Clean Air Act for all Americans.

The bill we are extending today requires that 1975–76 automobiles meet Federal vehicle emission control standards at sea level. But in atmospheric conditions of mountain driving a car adjusted to sea level standards will discharge up to twice as much hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide as at lower elevations.

The Clean Air Act must be amended to require new cars to meet standards at all altitudes. Automobile manufacturers are moving in this direction:

The development of barometric carburetor controls will compensate for changing atmospheric conditions as well as altitude changes. It is essential this be required by law.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

H.R. 5445: CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS EXTENSION

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5445, legislation extending the Clean Air Act of 1970 for 1 year, until June 30, 1974. The House Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment, of which I am a member, and the full House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, have both unanimously approved the proposed legislation. I urge my colleagues in the House to follow that leadership today by adopting this important bill.

The current law will expire June 30, 1973; the committee bill simply extends authorization for appropriations at current dollar amounts until June 30, 1974.

H.R. 5445—Authorizations for fiscal year 1974 (identical to fiscal year 1973)

[In millions of dollars]

Authorization category:	
Research on fuels and vehicles	$150
Payments for low-emission vehicles	25
General authority	300
Total	475

Mr. Chairman, the major sources of air pollution in our country today are automobiles, powerplants, and industrial facilities. In some parts of the United States automobiles contribute up to 80 percent of total air pollution. In my own county of Allegheny, in southwest Pennsylvania, because of the large industrial presence there, automobiles are responsible for a smaller proportion of total air pollution.

Air pollution contributes greatly to environmental deterioration. Oppressive and seemingly ever-present haze, smoke, and, in some areas, smog blankets our cities and even our countrysides. But more importantly, air pollution constitutes a serious health hazard, endangering the lives of people who suffer respiratory and heart diseases. In a 1966 temperature inversion that locked much of the Northeastern United States in its grip for 4 days, the death rate in New York City shot up by nearly 10 percent. Currently, in Los Angeles, schoolchildren are prevented from engaging in strenuous exercise during heavy smog periods.

Air pollution also imposes a financial burden on the Nation in the form of higher medical costs, cleaning bills, and deterioration of buildings, paint, clothing, and other material possessions. While damage to plant life is still to be fully assessed, we do know that sensitive crops and some types of forests are adversely affected by air pollution. For instance, in areas south of Pittsburgh, Christmas trees have been stunted and malformed apparently because of high concentrations of sulfur dioxide.

Of course, it is most difficult to ascribe precise monetary values to the economic costs of failing to control air pollution. Estimates have been made, however, and they do serve as rough measures which are helpful in analyzing the various pollution abatement strategies. In 1971, for instance, the President's Council on Environmental Quality estimated the loss due to uncontrolled pollution was nearly $11 billion each year. The Office of Science and Technology, in a 1972 report, set the total annual cost as somewhere in the range of $11 to $16 billion.

Such estimates do not include the loss of esthetic values, nor the losses suffered by those who are forced by pollution to change life patterns. We can never measure the loss of a deep blue sky or of a crystal clear lake. Nor can we measure the loss of recreation values or changes brought about in land utilization because of environmental pollution.

It was in response to this appalling toll on our environment, our health, and our pocketbooks that Congress in 1967 enacted the Air Quality Act, and 3 years later broadened and bolstered that legislation by adopting the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970. Under the 1970 law, procedures were established for setting and enforcing primary national ambient air standards to protect health, and secondary national air quality standards to protect the public welfare. Moreover, this legislation provided tough enforcement mechanisms through the establishment of criminal penalties for offenders and court authority to issue abatement orders.

But only now is the full impact of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970 starting to be felt across America. State governments and cities are, in conjunction with EPA, attempting to devise air pollution abatement plans that will assure that 1975 standards are met. Simultaneously, the American automobile industry is struggling to devise equipment which will guarantee that new automobiles meet congressionally enacted standards for 1975 and 1976. These standards dictate a 96-percent reduction in levels of automobile emissions from 1970 model levels.

Not unexpectedly, controversy has ensued. Surely we can expect that conflict over these strict air quality standards, particularly the auto emission standards, will continue to grow. The 1-year extension of the Clean Air Act provided in H.R. 5445 will provide the House Public Health and Environment Subcommittee with the opportunity to come to grips with a series of key questions facing the Congress and, indeed facing the American people.

Here are some of the issues that we in Congress must delve into in an effort to arrive at reasonable and appropriate policy decisions:

First. Are the American people ready and willing to change extensively many urban transportation habits in order to meet strict air standards? For example, will the American people ever accept—

Gasoline rationing to restrict auto emissions in urban areas?

Parking taxes set at prohibitive levels to discourage commuting by individual auto?

Increased public expenditures to build and subsidize operating costs of urban-suburban mass rapid transit systems.

Second. Are Federal standards on air pollution tougher than standards set on other forms of pollutions?

Third. Are present air quality standards fully justified for health reasons? Are they too weak? Are they too strict?

Fourth. What is the basis for the current conflict between American auto manufacturers and the EPA over the requested 1-year extension of the 1975 deadline for compliance with auto emission standards?

In adopting the catalytic converter, has Detroit taken the wrong approach to meeting the 1975 standards; that is, have they adopted equipment which is the least efficient, the most expensive, and the most likely to break down, thereby requiring frequent and expensive maintenance?

Why do Japanese manufacturers seem to be having little difficulty designing equipment which complies with the 1975 standards, and does so inexpensively and with no gasoline consumption penalty?

Fifth. Have we in Congress assessed fully the cost/benefit calculations involved in these strict auto emission standards? This question is particularly pertinent in light of projected additional costs to automobile owners for—

New emission control equipment;

Unleaded gasoline required by catalytic converters;

Required maintenance of emission control equipment; and

Apparent increased gasoline consumption resulting from present and future pollution control mechanisms.

These are just a few of the many tough questions which must be answered. I believe that a 1-year extension of the Clean Air Act is a most responsible and appropriate step for the Congress to now take. With major changes being proposed in the current law, but with the act expiring soon, this extension will allow the committee sufficient time to consider any necessary revisions.

It must be made clear to all, however, that in limiting the extension to only 1 year it is our intention to affect neither the current 1975 deadline for automobile emission standards, nor the authority of the Administrator to, if necessary, extend that deadline, nor the present hearings on the automobile industry's request for an extension of that deadline.

While all testimony, including that of EPA Administrator William Ruckelshaus, was favorable to the passage of H.R. 5445, substantial debate and controversy will continue over the Clean Air Act as it currently stands. I want to assure my colleagues that I am sure my fellow members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment will carefully weigh and analyze the positions on all sides of the controversy when the committee once again takes up this legislation.

I urge Members to vote "yes" on H.R. 5445.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, in 1970, Congress passed the Clean Air Act amendments, setting extremely strict air pollution control standards. I felt at the time that Congress was reacting emotionally to dire, but unsubstantiated, predictions of environmental enthusiasts, with little or no actual knowledge of the levels of and the dangers of air pollution, and with little consideration of the economic and social consequences of such strict regulations.

Since we are now considering the extension of the Clean Air Act, I rise to protest the lack of responsible consideration and discussion of: First, the necessity for the excessively strict pollution control standards, and second, the disastrous consequences that may result from these standards.

The question of the necessity of the strict pollution control standards is a scientific one. What level of contaminants in the air actually constitutes a danger to our health? It would seem that we need only turn to scientific research to find the answer. But even a superficial glance at the literature in this field yields much emotionalism, much myth, many contradictory claims, but little fact or valid proof.

The Government has the responsibility of protecting the American people from pollution that will in fact endanger their health. However, it also has the responsibility of going no further than this. There is no justification for the Government controlling or restricting the actions of American citizens when there is no imminent danger.

This leads to the question of whether it is proper or necessary to approach this whole problem by setting Federal standards that blanket the country, when we are dealing with a problem that is highly localized. Many densely populated areas obviously need to control their pollution more than they have in the past. Rural and less populated areas, on the other hand, may have no air pollution problem. Why should the people in the areas where pollution is no problem be made to suffer the adverse economic effects of the Federal standards? Could the air pollution problem be more efficiently and effectively dealth with on a more localized level? Surely, this is a question that at the very least deserves honest consideration.

As for the economic and social consequences of these standards, we are already experiencing them. Our current energy crisis has been made worse by the approximately 30 percent increase in fuel consumption of motor vehicles equipped with air pollution control devices. How much more will fuel consumption increase when the 1975 automobile emission control standards go into effect? What effect will this have on the energy crisis?

This past winter many farmers suffered great loss, literally dumping their corn in the streets, because there was a shortage of fuel for grain dryers. How many others will be made to suffer in the future?

Well, one inkling of how many has been given to us by Mr. William Ruckelshaus, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, who indicates that to meet the 1977 air pollution standards, Los Angeles, Calif., will have to reduce its automobile traffic by 80 percent. I trust that I need not explain what a disaster this would be to the people of that city. The proposal is so incredible that, I suspect, no one really believes it. And yet Mr. Ruckelshaus says there is no other known way for Los Angeles to meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act.

I have, of course, not even scratched the surface in regard to the economic effects of this act. Estimates of the added cost to the price tag of a new car for compliance with the standards range up to $1,000 per vehicle. Add to this the increased cost of fuel and the result is greatly increased cost of transportation. This means greatly increased costs for everything and everyone requiring transportation, from food to junketing Congressmen.

I will vote against H.R. 5445, not because I believe that we should not control air pollution, not because I believe that we are already doing enough to combat air pollution, but rather to draw attention to the absence of responsible consideration of the implications of and the consequences of the Clean Air Act.

If my vote results in a more rational study of the problem of air pollution, and thus helps to achieve relatively clean air without causing unnecessary harm to the citizens of our country due to excessively strict regulations, then whatever the political consequences, they will be worth it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN).

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to take these 5 minutes, because this subject is so important. I have an amendment which I wanted to offer today, but I am not going to offer it, because of the position toward amendments at this time indicated by the chairman of the committee. My amendment deals with the subject the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE) was just talking about; namely, the emissions requirements of the Clean Air Act of 1970. The present requirements of the Clean Air Act of 1970 are about 6 or 7 percent unnecessarily too high. It is that last 6 or 7 percent which is going to mean in this country consumption of 3 million barrels of oil additional per day in this country in 1976. It is going to mean cars that will cost upward of $500 more apiece for gadgetry under the hood. It is going to mean upward of $225 more a year per car for gas consumption for the cars that will get 8 miles to the gallon.

When the public fully understands this, people will be really cross unless the Congress can honestly tell the public that this standard is required for the public health, which it is not. The fact is that not one person in America is going to

get emphysema or be poisoned by the air pollution if we take the standard to 90 percent instead of the 96 percent required by present law in 1976.

I have a bill pending, H.R. 5376, that would change this act to take the air pollution level down to 90 percent. This bill is now before the committee chaired by the gentleman from West Virginia. I would like to ask the gentleman at this time: Will this matter be heard fairly soon? I ask this, if I might say, because of the fact that the automobile industry has to tool up and they need something like 15 to 18 months advance notice if they have to comply with a standard that exceeds the reasonable requirements of the public health of this Nation. I do not believe Congress should persist in this unreasonably high requirement.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is he talking about H.R. 4313?

Mr. WYMAN. Yes. There have been additional cosponsors so the bill was reintroduced under another number, but it is the same bill. I referred to H.R. 5376. That was a subsequent reintroduction.

Mr. STAGGERS. If the gentleman will yield, as soon as we get through with our important health bills—there are many that have to be renewed this year—which are pressing, we will get into this as a part of the Clean Air Act.

Mr. WYMAN. How long is that going to be?

Mr. STAGGERS. I cannot say now. I would hope sometime in midsummer.

Mr. WYMAN. The trouble with this is, if I might observe to the gentleman, if that happens we might get into a situation where we will have to have a layoff of a great many workers in Detroit and across the Nation in places where automobiles and their components are manufactured. There is no sense in requiring a 96-percent pollution-free level and all the gadgets for that on cars if reasonable and rational public health needs only a 90-percent level. Does not the gentleman think this problem, with the backup problem of labor behind it, ought to be heard sooner than midsummer?

Mr. STAGGERS. Let me say to the gentleman that the Agency itself is right now holding hearings on this very problem, and I do not think we would want to go into it until after the Agency goes into it. They will go into it in a more complete form than we ever would.

Mr. WYMAN. I understand that, but part of the problem is that the courts say the standard the Congress has imposed in the Clean Air Act of 1970 is not susceptible to being changed by EPA by regulation. It is a standard that seems crystal clear and, therefore, the courts must require that it be enforced.

Mr. STAGGERS. I believe it could be released in 1 year if the courts made up their minds. They could do it. The courts have not definitely made up their minds as yet.

Mr. WYMAN. Has the gentleman from West Virginia come to any opinion as to whether or not it is necessary to go to 96 percent? Has the gentleman from West Virginia looked into this question?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, we have had hearings and we believe that until we have further hearings and have heard from the manufacturers and EPA, we ought to wait until after the EPA has come up with its judgment first and then the Congress can go forward.

Mr. WYMAN. It is one of the problems. Even in California, with the air inversion problem in Los Angeles, California law does not require anywhere near 96 percent emission controls. I cannot understand why we should impose on the entire Nation a greater standard than that which is applied by the California Assembly for that particular area that suffers such a tremendous air inversion problem.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would say that if the gentleman would look at the California statute and what it requires, the difference between the Federal and the California requirements is so small that I feel in my judgment, and I believe the committee would also, that we ought to wait until EPA has come up with its decision.

Mr. WYMAN. The difference may be small in percentage points, but it is the taking of the automobiles to that last few percentage points that is creating all the trouble with these catalytic converters and the other gadgetry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN).

Mr. WYMAN. I say, simply, that if the country does not need to do this, we ought not to do it, to say nothing of 3 million barrels of oil per day. It is arguable whether it is 3 or 4 million. It is arguable whether a car is going to need 33 percent more gasoline or 25 percent more gasoline.

However, there is no argument that it is going to use more gasoline and this means millions of barrels more oil in which we are in acute deficit. Anything like 3 million barrels per day is the equivalent of the entire proposed Alaskan pipeline, from the North Slope. Yet, if the unreasonably high emissions requirements of this act continue in effect, we are going to require it and for something our public health does not really need.

It seems to me this is the height of foolishness. I do not think we ought to impose on all the motorists of this entire country, in some of the areas of which there is no air pollution problem whatsoever, a standard that applies to only a few locations in this country.

Up in my own State, in the State of New Hampshire, for example, I do not believe there is a place in the State which would have a true air pollution problem from auto emissions if we did not put a filter on any automobile. Yet, New Hampshire motorists will be required to put on a 96-percent control which is going to cost them dearly.

The Nation ought not to endure this tremendous demand on our resources and on our pocketbooks if we do not actually need such a high standard across the Nation for the health or our people.

I submit that in this country we do not need to go beyond 90 percent pollution-free emissions.

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

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. I would like to answer concerning one point. In the first place, gasoline consumption is not going to increase that much. Mr. Ruckelshaus testified before our committee that there would be only a 7-percent increase in the amount of gasoline used.

Not only that, the cost per car would not be more than $259. Every company in this country has been working on this problem for many years. It is not going to take a new effort on their part, but increased dedication.

Not only that, we have three makes of cars today, the Mazda, the Honda, and the Mercedes diesel, all of which are reaching the projected standards of 1975.

Why is it that our manufacturers are not doing this? They are a little bit delinquent in this. They can reach the standards certainly, if the Japanese and German cars can do so at an equally low level of gasoline consumption.

Mr. WYMAN. May I say that I do not know where the gentleman got his figures. He may have gotten them from Mr. Ruckelshaus.

Mr. CARTER. From Mr. Ruckelshaus—the 7-percent increase in gasoline consumption.

Mr. WYMAN. This statement runs directly counter to expert testimony. The automobiles to which my friend makes reference are all foreign imports.

But the point is this, and the point of my observation is that I am not trying to protect any particular industry.

I am saying to the gentleman, who is a doctor, that there is no need in this country to require 96 percent effluent-free emissions from automobiles. Ninety percent is all we possibly need. If that is the case, those responsible in the matter—and it is the responsibility of Congress—should take us down to 90 percent, and do it in time to keep American industry running and American people working.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire I say that air pollution today is a grave danger to the country everywhere, and I say that air pollution has not been significantly diminished throughout the United States despite the efforts that we have made.

I want to point out that our industries can reach these standards, and they should reach them. I am glad to see we have many friends of industry around here, who want to lengthen the time during which they may reach these standards. That is fine, but if foreign countries can reach these standards, we can do it here in the United States as well, and we should call upon industry to do that today.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, would my colleague from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CARTER. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS. There have been a number of speakers this afternoon who have referred to the fact that the new automobiles will consume from 30 to 100 percent additional fuel, to push the automobiles, because of these devices.

Does the gentleman know of any studies which have been made looking into the fact that perhaps some of these mechanisms to control emissions may be creating greater problems, or is there any study at all?

Mr. CARTER. No, sir; but in all fairness I can say that these mechanisms which we put on the cars do cause some problems. In order to accomplish our goal, to get purer air, we must be willing to face and solve the problems that confront us.

Mr. MYERS. This is fine, if the gentleman will yield further, and there is no question as to the goal, but I certainly do support the argument of our friend from New Hampshire, who is concerned about seeing all of the automobiles produced in 1976 and subsequent thereto, if we cannot build them in this country.

I do not know what the extension of this time is for, if we are not getting the additional time to build the necessary engines and devices.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I want to tell the gentleman right now, if Japan can reach these standards, if Germany can reach these standards, if this country of ours has the mechanical and electronic ability to put people on the moon, we can also develop an automobile which will not pollute above the 1975 standards. We should make every effort to do it.

Furthermore, we should build automobiles that do not use more gasoline than foreign-made automobiles.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 5445 extending the Clean Air Act for 1 year.

The need for this legislation is all too evident. Reports of increasing air pollution problems, health problems stemming from pollution and economic dislocation require strengthened research and regulatory efforts.

This country faces severe energy shortages. We cannot simply shutdown or look upon the energy crisis as an inevitable concomitant of an advanced society. We must continue to explore ways in which to utilize existing energy sources more effectively and to create new power sources.

Ultimately, the individual citizen is involved. If efforts are not continued to clean up the environment, serious health problems arise. If our industrial base shuts down because of pollution, severe economic problems develop. Clearly, the importance of this pending bill cannot be overstated. We must provide the wherewithal to continue working on these interrelated problems.

There must be commitment with this effort. I am concerned that the administration has budgeted only $150 million to fund clean air programs in fiscal year 1974. The pending measure authorizes $475 million which is the same funding level authorized for the current fiscal year.

This bill authorizes $300 million to fund regulatory programs for motor vehicle emissions, to implement air quality standards and to assist State and local air pollution control agencies. The Environmental Protection Agency is allocated $150 million to develop technology and to award research and development grants for controlling auto and plant pollution. Also, $25 million is authorized for the certification and purchase of low-emission vehicles by the Federal Government.

If these authorization levels were too high, I would commend the administration for being concerned with excessive and wasteful spending. In this instance, however, such a case cannot be made. The stakes are too important. The protection of human life, cleaning up the environment, and promoting economic well-being are not peripheral issues. They are important national priorities that demand full commitment.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, appropriations for the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970 expire on June 30, 1973. The Congress is now confronted with the choice of either extending the provisions in the present law by providing new funding for the next few fiscal years to carry on work which is now in progress, or writing a new law which would incorporate possible changes.

I believe it is imperative that we continue the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970. The requirements of this law promise to go far toward greatly improving our ambient air and restoring a healthy environment, especially in our large cities. I am aware that the Council on Environmental Quality reported last year that the level of air pollution in several major cities across the United States is declining. This list of cities did not include New York, where an increase, not a decrease in air pollution by particulates was reported in the same year. A significant abatement of air pollution there, as in other large metropolitan areas will take several years, as States and municipalities follow the timetables of their EPA-approved implementation plans. They will need the professional and technical assistance of the Federal Government to carry out their control measures, and continued funding will be required to provide this help. What is not required, I am convinced, is a watering down of the present law, which would inhibit the adoption of measures to cut air contamination drastically, especially in heavily polluted regions.

For many months all large metropolitan areas have worked to design feasible plans for a significant and lasting reduction of air pollution which would result in measurable benefits by safeguarding and improving public health and welfare, and preventing deterioration of materials and property. While admittedly the remedies prescribed to meet the Clean Air Act requirements are drastic in many instances, necessitating alternate strategies or extended timetables, the cities recognize the need for ultimately meeting them, and have set the necessary machinery in motion to do so.

I think we should give our country and its citizens a fighting chance to rid themselves of excessive, destructive air pollution. We can do so by extending the present law. To weaken or alter it at this time would only serve to delay, at great future expense, an effort which ultimately cannot be avoided.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, my reasons for supporting the extension of the Clean Air Act for 1 year are twofold. First, I would like to see the continuation of a comprehensive law that will effectively curb air pollution. Second, continuation of this program for another year will enable the appropriate committee to hold intensive hearings on necessary changes or modifications required as a result of information brought to light since the law was first enacted. I am particularly interested in the effects on small businesses of compliance with this act.

In 1971, the Council on Environmental Quality, along with the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Commerce undertook a series of studies of pollution control costs and their impact on the economy. The study found that these controls had their greatest impact on individual industries.

The studies indicate that some firms will earn lower profits, some will curtail protection, and others firms will be forced to close. Most of the plants that will be forced to close are marginal operations that are already in economic jeopardy due to other competitive factors. In these instances, the impact of the environmental standards is to accelerate such closings.

There are approximately 12,000 plants currently operating in the industrial activities studied. Of these, it is expected that approximaely 800 would close in the normal course of business between 1972 and 1976. It would appear from the contractors' evaluations that an additional 200 to 300 will be forced to close because of pollution abatement requirements.

I do not believe that any of us intended to legislate small business out of existence. However, I do not mean that our pollution control requirements be less stringent. We definitely need strict controls with costly fines for all violations, but we also must be sensitive to the economic needs of small businesses when they find themselves forced to comply with these requirements.

The Clean Air Act must be extended for 1 year. But equally important are the in-depth hearings which the committee has promised next fall. At that time, I intend to testify on the problem that is facing small business. Assistance to these small firms to enable them to meet the pollution control requirements is essential, and this assistance should be in the form of low-interest loans. The exact details of this proposal will be given in my statement when I introduce the Small Business Pollution Abatement Loan Assistance and Worker Readjustment Act (H.R. 5135) next week. However, I wish

to emphasize here the need for these hearings and for the extensive investigation of the impact of these requirements on small business. Therefore, I urge you to pass H.R. 5445 and extend the Clean Air Act for 1 year to make these hearings possible.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970, Public Law 91-604, the basis for the Nation's program to combat air pollution, are due to expire at the end of the current fiscal year. I firmly believe that the implementation of this comprehensive and complex legislation is in the best interests of all Americans, and must be continued.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues today to join me in supporting H.R. 5445, a bill introduced by the distinguished Chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS of West Virginia, which would extend the Clean Air Act for 1 additional year at existing funding levels.

The task of cleaning the air is difficult and expensive. Some progress has been made since Congress enacted the Clean Air Act in December 1970; much more remains to be done. The 1970 Clean Air Act is providing us with direction as we deal with the air pollution problem, and is beginning to help us find some of the answers.

Primary and secondary ambient air quality standards for the Nation have now been established to protect public health, reduce property damage, and insure esthetic quality against the insidious effects of the most common classes of air pollutants. State plans have been drawn up, designed to make sure that the national standards are upheld in the years to come. As a result of the Clean Air Act, new technologies to reduce air pollution from stationary and mobile sources are being developed. Gasolines with low-lead content are more prevalent; more lead-free fuels will be introduced soon. More sophisticated monitoring techniques are being utilized.

Strong, new Federal enforcement power, authorized under the 1970 act, has resulted in the installation of pollution abatement equipment across the country. A potential health crisis was averted in Birmingham, Ala., when the Federal Government, armed with the Clean Air Act's emergency injunction powers, took decisive action reducing air contamination after local officials were unsuccessful.

Continued Federal help in meeting the high cost of clean air is needed. Though it is very difficult to make accurate cost estimates, the Environmental Protection Agency forecasts expenditures of $42 billion between 1973 and 1977 to control air pollution. The benefits, not as clearly defined as the costs perhaps, are substantial as well. The health, social and esthetic effects cannot be neatly reduced to formulas expressed in dollars and cents. One attempt to define the economic benefits of clean air, a 1970 Public Health Service study, placed the direct costs of air pollution at $25 billion annually.

Mr. Chairman, I am under no illusion that the 1970 Clean Air Act, which I rise to support today, is the optimum legislative program to deal with air pollution. Undoubtedly, there are imperfections, blemishes, and perhaps omissions in the act and in its administration which will need to be rectified. Much is still to be learned about the nature and effects of air pollution. Some say we are playing havoc with our economy by acting too hastily and emotionally in response to our pollution problem; others argue that we are jeopardizing our citizens' health by not acting more vigorously.

I do not pretend to have the answers to these questions, nor do I think the Congress is equipped at this time to legislate a better air pollution program in the short time between now and June 30. We will have to wait until more of the facts are in, sorted, and analyzed. I, for one, will closely follow the Federal and State air pollution programs in the months to come, and I am certain the appropriate congressional committee will hold extensive oversight hearings. Time does not allow us to adequately examine the effectiveness of the 1970 Clean Air Act Amendments before their June 30 expiration date. I feel we have no reasonable choice but to continue the present program so that our efforts to have clean, healthy air will not be interrupted, a course of action which H.R. 5446 provides.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge and hope that the important legislative proposal presently before us, H.R. 5445, the Clean Air Act Extension, will be promptly adopted by the House.

This measure, which extends the 1970 Clean Air Act for 1 year, and thus affords the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee the opportunity to conduct comprehensive and extensive oversight and legislative hearings on the act, represents, in my considered opinion, a necessary and prudent legislative action to achieve our national objective, a clean and healthy environment. Quite simply, this bill provides for continued funding of regulatory programs for motor vehicle emissions, State implementation of air quality standards and Federal assistance to State and local air pollution control agencies. In addition, the bill provides continued funding for the Environmental Protection Agency to develop urgently needed technology to control automobile and power plant pollution.

Mr. Chairman, it is my very earnest belief that the crisis of air pollution is one of the most significant and critical domestic problems facing our Nation today. In many areas, including my own home State of Massachusetts, the heavy concentration of air pollution clearly endangers the public health and welfare. Since our national recognition of the substantial danger posed by air pollution requires the continuation of proven effective and substantive programs which will assist in improving the quality of the air we breathe, and since this bill clearly addresses itself to this wholesome objective, I urge the House to resoundingly approve it without further delay.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5445, which would extend through June 30, 1974, the Clean Air Act of 1970, and authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1974 at the fiscal year 1973 funding level. The current law, unless extended, will expire on June 30, 1973.

Under present law, authorization for appropriations to carry on the clean air programs are divided into three categories:

First, $150 million for the Environmental Protection Agency to develop technology to control auto and powerplant pollution and to award research and demonstration grants for that purpose;

Second, $300 million, primarily to support regulatory programs for motor vehicle emissions, State implementation of quality air standards, and to assist State and local air pollution control agencies; and

Third, $25 million for certification of low-emission vehicles and purchase of same for use by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, the continued life of these programs under the Clean Air Act is as important as ever to our national health and well-being. It is understood, however, that the committee considers it necessary to examine by means of extensive hearings certain policy questions which have arisen since the passage of the act in 1970. Today's legislation would enable the committee to hold such hearings; the committee ought to be given the opportunity it seeks to discharge its duties in a responsible and thorough manner.

Passage of H.R. 5445 would be another link forged in the chain of vital environmental legislation. Overwhelming support for the legislation on the floor today would reassure the American people that, despite White House propensity to curtail or abandon important national programs, Congress will continue to meet its responsibilities in providing for the Nation's needs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a unanimous vote in favor of extending the Clean Air Act for 1 year.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues of the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee in urging passage of the bill H.R. 5446.

Recognizing the immense complexity of solid waste disposal and resource recovery, we seek to extend the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, for 1 year at present funding authorization levels in order to provide adequate time for responsible and extensive hearings on proposals to restructure the entire solid waste program.

The existing act expires on June 30 of this year, and I share the concern of many of my colleagues that much work remains to be done in this area. We simply cannot afford to thoughtlessly toss away this program just as some people would toss bottles and cans out of their windows.

It is my firm belief that if we are going to effectively coordinate our efforts to halt environmental injustice, we cannot delay in our close examination of the efficiency of this and similar programs. On the other hand, an even greater delay would prevail if were were to permit existing machinery to grind to a halt.

The burden of helping to give guidance to "take the garbage out" has clearly fallen upon the Congress. While we are in the process of carrying it out, however, we must decide what to do with it. By seeking this simple 1-year extension of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, we are reasserting our determination to find a reasonable answer to the question of what to do with our garbage, paper, packages, plastic, and pop bottles. I feel that we have made much progress through focusing our attention upon the need to reconvert to fuel, and recycle and reuse solid waste rather than merely considering it to be a nuisance.

As the focus of our attention and the direction of our efforts change, we must have the necessary time to fully review the existing act and to give careful consideration to pending reform proposals.

I urge my distinguished colleagues to view the complexity of this pressing problem and support this important measure.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe very strongly that we must continue an effective air pollution control program and I fully support the bill before us to extend the Clean Air Act.

My home State of California has been the leader in this field. It was the first to recognize the seriousness of the air pollution threat and the first to respond with effective action.

We have made great strides in the last decade toward controlling and reducing the sources of air pollution. In addition, intensive research and development programs have added to our pollution-fighting technology.

Of course, there is a great deal of work left to do. With this in mind, I would like to comment on two aspects of this future program.

First, we must make certain that each State is permitted to promulgate pollution control regulations beyond those of the Federal Government, if it so desires, because of its own particular pollution problems.

This will properly reflect the Federal relationship between States and the National Government and it will permit each State to respond to its own needs—which may differ substantially from the average national problem.

And, second, we must insure that the economic and social costs of pollution control standards and devices are very carefully considered before regulations are made final.

I have heard from a growing number of constituents who express concern about the items they must buy whose costs are being forced up by pollution control regulations. I am fully aware that we are going to have to pay the costs of pollution control but there has been very little debate as yet on the effects of proposed regulations on costs. In my judgment, there should be more and on a wider scale.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (c) of section 104 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (84 Stat. 1709), is amended by striking "and $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973." and inserting in lieu thereof ", $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.".

(b) Subsection (i) of section 212 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (84 Stat. 1703), is amended by striking "two succeeding fiscal years." and inserting in lieu thereof "three succeeding fiscal years.".

(c) Section 316 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (84 Stat. 1709), is amended by striking "and $300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973." and inserting in lieu thereof ", $300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and $300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.".

Mr. STAGGERS (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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman from West Virginia if I am correct in my understanding that this authorization bill calls for $475 million?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And the committee is saying that there will be a requirement for approximately $150 million in the next fiscal year; is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. I believe that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the members of the Appropriations Committee, especially those who are on the House floor, will take due note of the fact that there is a requirement for $150 million and not be influenced in the least by the authorization which the House will approve this afternoon for $475 million.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. DORN, 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. 5445) to extend the Clean Air Act, as amended, for 1 year, pursuant to House Resolution 316, 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. WYDLER. 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 387, nays 1, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—387

Abdnor	Davis, S.C.	Holifield
Abzug	Davis, Wis.	Holt
Adams	de la Garza	Holtzman
Addabbo	Delaney	Horton
Alexander	Dellenback	Howard
Anderson, Calif.	Dellums	Huber
	Denholm	Hudnut
Anderson, Ill.	Dennis	Hungate
Andrews, N.C.	Dent	Hunt
Andrews, N. Dak.	Derwinski	Hutchinson
	Devine	Ichord
Annunzio	Dickinson	Jarman
Archer	Dingell	Johnson, Calif.
Arends	Donohue	Johnson, Colo.
Armstrong	Dorn	Johnson, Pa.
Ashbrook	Downing	Jones, Okla.
Ashley	Drinan	Jones, Tenn.
Bafalis	Dulski	Jordan
Baker	Duncan	Kastenmeier
Barrett	du Pont	Kazen
Beard	Eckhardt	Keating
Bennett	Edwards, Ala.	Kluczynski
Bevill	Edwards, Calif.	Koch
Biester	Eilberg	Kuykendall
Bingham	Erlenborn	Kyros
Blackburn	Esch	Landrum
Blatnik	Eshleman	Latta
Boland	Evans, Colo.	Leggett
Bolling	Evins, Tenn.	Lehman
Bowen	Fascell	Lent
Brademas	Findley	Long, La.
Brasco	Fish	Long, Md.
Bray	Fisher	Lott
Breckinridge	Flood	Lujan
Brinkley	Flowers	McClory
Brooks	Ford, Gerald R.	McCloskey
Broomfield	Forsythe	McCollister
Brotzman	Fountain	McCormack
Brown, Calif.	Fraser	McDade
Brown, Mich.	Frelinghuysen	McEwen
Brown, Ohio	Frenzel	McFall
Broyhill, N.C.	Froehlich	McKay
Broyhill, Va.	Fulton	McKinney
Buchanan	Fuqua	Macdonald
Burgener	Gaydos	Madden
Burke, Calif.	Gettys	Madigan
Burke, Fla.	Giaimo	Mahon
Burke, Mass.	Gibbons	Mailliard
Burleson, Tex.	Gilman	Mallary
Burlison, Mo.	Ginn	Mann
Burton	Goldwater	Maraziti
Butler	Gonzalez	Martin, Nebr.
Byron	Goodling	Martin, N.C.
Camp	Grasso	Mathias, Calif.
Carey, N.Y.	Green, Oreg.	Mathis, Ga.
Carter	Green, Pa.	Matsunaga
Casey, Tex.	Griffiths	Mayne
Cederberg	Gross	Mazzoli
Chamberlain	Grover	Meeds
Clancy	Gubser	Melcher
Clark	Gude	Metcalfe
Clausen, Don H.	Gunter	Mezvinsky
	Haley	Michel
Clawson, Del	Hamilton	Miller
Clay	Hammer-schmidt	Mills, Ark.
Cleveland		Mills, Md.
Cochran	Hanley	Minish
Cohen	Hanna	Mink
Collier	Hanrahan	Mitchell, Md.
Collins	Hansen, Idaho	Mitchell, N.Y.
Conable	Hansen, Wash.	Mizell
Conte	Harrington	Moakley
Corman	Harvey	Mollohan
Cotter	Hastings	Montgomery
Coughlin	Hawkins	Moorhead, Calif.
Crane	Hays	
Cronin	Hechler, W. Va.	Moorhead, Pa.
Culver	Heckler, Mass.	Morgan
Daniel, Dan	Heinz	Mosher
Daniel, Robert W., Jr.	Helstoski	Moss
	Henderson	Murphy, Ill.
Daniels, Dominick V.	Hicks	Murphy, N.Y.
	Hillis	Myers
Danielson	Hinshaw	Natcher
Davis, Ga.	Hogan	Nedzi

Nelsen	Ruppe	Thomson, Wis.
Nix	Ruth	Thone
Obey	Ryan	Thornton
O'Brien	St Germain	Tiernan
O'Hara	Sandman	Towell, Nev.
O'Neill	Sarasin	Treen
Parris	Sarbanes	Udall
Passman	Satterfield	Ullman
Patman	Saylor	Van Deerlin
Patten	Scherle	Vander Jagt
Pepper	Schneebeli	Vanik
Perkins	Schroeder	Veysey
Pettis	Sebelius	Vigorito
Peyser	Seiberling	Waggonner
Pickle	Shipley	Waldie
Pike	Shoup	Walsh
Podell	Shriver	Wampler
Powell, Ohio	Shuster	Ware
Preyer	Sikes	Whalen
Price, Ill.	Sisk	White
Pritchard	Skubitz	Whitehurst
Quillen	Slack	Whitten
Railsback	Smith, Iowa	Widnall
Randall	Smith, N.Y.	Wiggins
Rangel	Snyder	Williams
Rarick	Spence	Wilson, Bob
Rees	Staggers	Wilson, Charles H., Calif.
Regula	Stanton, J. William	
Reid	Stanton, James V.	Wilson, Charles, Tex.
Reuss	Steed	Winn
Rhodes	Steele	Wolff
Riegle	Steelman	Wright
Rinaldo	Steiger, Ariz.	Wyatt
Roberts	Steiger, Wis.	Wydler
Robinson, Va.	Stephens	Wylie
Robison, N.Y.	Stokes	Wyman
Rodino	Stratton	Yates
Roe	Stubblefield	Yatron
Rogers	Stuckey	Young, Alaska
Roncalio, Wyo.	Studds	Young, Fla.
Rose	Sullivan	Young, Ga.
Rosenthal	Symington	Young, S.C.
Rostenkowski	Symms	Young, Tex.
Roush	Taylor, N.C.	Zablocki
Rousselot	Teague, Calif.	Zion
Roy	Teague, Tex.	Zwach
Roybal		
Runnels		

NAYS—1

Landgrebe

NOT VOTING—44

Aspin	Frey	Nichols
Badillo	Gray	Owens
Bell	Guyer	Poage
Bergland	Harsha	Price, Tex.
Biaggi	Hébert	Quie
Breaux	Hosmer	Roncallo, N.Y.
Carney, Ohio	Jones, Ala.	Rooney, N.Y.
Chappell	Jones, N.C.	Rooney, Pa.
Chisholm	Karth	Stark
Conlan	Kemp	Talcott
Conyers	Ketchum	Taylor, Mo.
Diggs	King	Thompson, N.J.
Flynt	Litton	Young, Ill.
Foley	McSpadden	
Ford, William D.	Milford	
	Minshall, Ohio	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Flynt.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Breaux with Mr. King.

Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Litton.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Minshall of Ohio.

Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Kemp.

Mr. Bergland with Mr. Conlan.

Mr. Carney of Ohio with Mr. Ketchum.

Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Quie.

Mr. Owens with Mr. Price of Texas.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Roncallo of New York.

Mr. Chappell with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Foley.

Mr. Conyers with Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Jones of Alabama.

Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Taylor of Missouri.

Mr. Aspin with Mr. Young of Illinois.

Mr. Badillo with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Stark with Mr. Milford.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR THE WEEK OF MARCH 26, 1973

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL), the program for the rest of this week, if any, and the schedule for next week.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan, yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL).

Mr. O'NEILL. There will be no further business for today. Upon the announcement of the program for next week, I will ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday.

The program for the House of Representatives will be:

Monday is District day, and there are no bills.

For Tuesday: H.R. 3153, technical and conforming changes in Social Security Act, by unanimous consent.

For Wednesday: H.R. 5610, Foreign Service Building Act, subject to a rule being granted.

Thursday: H.R. 5293, Peace Corps Act Extension, subject to a rule being granted.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, there is a possibility, I cannot say a certainty, that sometime next week there may be a veto of one or more of the bills that have been sent from the Congress to the White House. For the protection, Mr. Speaker, of all Members I wonder if the distinguished majority leader could give me assurance or explain the circumstances if a veto comes to the House next week.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I presume the gentleman from Michigan is talking about the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. If there is a veto on that, and we do not anticipate one, but if there were to be one it would go to the Senate first. If the Senate overruled the President, then it would come to the desk here, and when it arrived at the desk it would be up to the will of the House to act forthwith or to do whatever it wants to do. In other words, if a motion were made to postpone to a date certain, a motion of that type would be in order. If the gentleman had that in mind, I am sure on this side of the aisle we would be willing to go along with a reasonable proposal.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear the majority leader will work for the protection of all Members, those on his side of the aisle and those on our side of the aisle, because this is as we know a very important measure. I would hope if it comes from the other body and goes to the Speaker's desk that we can cooperate in postponing consideration to a date certain.

Mr. O'NEILL. We will be happy to cooperate in protecting the membership of the House and at the same time trying to protect the millions who are covered by this bill.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, MARCH 26, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday of next week.

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

There was no objection.

THE CASE FOR THE ALASKAN PIPELINE

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, oil discovered in 1968 on Alaska's North Slope represents about 25 percent of the total present U.S. domestic proved reserve. After extensive study of all routes and methods for transportation to the lower 48 States, the Secretary of the Interior was prepared to issue a permit for a 48-inch trans-Alaska pipeline in June 1972.

The recent decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia brings all these plans to a complete halt and may add 2 more years to the delay in availability of Alaskan oil and gas unless quick remedial action is taken.

The early release of the North Slope oil becomes more essential as the present energy crisis grows and I urge Congress to take prompt action on legislation to amend the Minerals Leasing Act of 1920 to allow adequate right-of-way for the pipeline's construction.

In addition to the attack on the Mineral Leasing Act, the environmentalists have urged that the pipeline be built across Canada instead of Alaska. The Secretary of the Interior rejected this alternative on the grounds that: First, the Canadian route would delay the pipeline by 3 to 5 years or more; second, the Canadian Government insists on 51 percent control over a pipeline across Canada; and third, there would be adverse effects on U.S. balance of payments.

Mr. Speaker, I think the letter to the editor of the Washington Post written by Bill Martin, president of Phillips Petroleum Co., on March 21, is an excellent summary of the arguments for the trans-Alaska pipeline and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

THE PRESIDENT OF PHILLIPS PETROLEUM ON THE CASE OF THE ALASKA PIPELINE

Your Feb. 15 editorial entitled "No Clear Path for the Alaska Pipeline" states: "The issue in the Alaska pipeline controversy is not oil for Midwestern schools this winter or next, but the best way to meet a portion of the nation's energy needs in the 1980s and beyond."

This is exactly the type of reasoning that has led our nation to its present energy crisis.

In fact, oil from Alaska's North Slope is needed today. Moreover, it would be available today if construction of the Alaska pipeline had been allowed to begin on its original schedule.

It has been more than a year since the Interior Department's two-year study of this issue concluded that the proposed Alaska pipeline would provide the "earliest and most practicable" means of delivering North Slope reserves to market and "on balance create the fewest number of environmental problems of all alternate means considered."

But in failing to rule on the environmental aspects of this case, after they had been so thoroughly studied, the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has sidestepped this issue and further delayed this badly needed project. One of the three judges who dissented with the majority decision termed the refusal to decide the environmental issue "monstrous" and completely unjustified."

Your editorial observes: "Setting aside the question of timing, there is much to recommend use of a Canadian corridor for oil as well as natural gas." Secretary of the Interior Rogers Morton said last year that a Canadian pipeline "would involve substantial and unacceptable time delays" in bringing North Slope oil to market. With the nation facing a fuels shortage and oil imports climbing rapidly, I do not believe the question of timing should be set aside so easily.

Your editorial seems to overlook the point that Canada is a sovereign nation and, as such, could demand controlling interest in the pipeline and a share of the crude oil, or could impose other conditions on their approval to build the line across their country. The recent policy statement by the Canadian Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources that Canada will restrict oil exports to the United States to ensure meeting its own energy needs demonstrates that Canada probably would assert considerable authority over such a pipeline.

There are other problems which would be encountered in building the pipeline across Canada. Because such a pipeline would be so costly to build, an estimated $8 billion at 1971 prices, it would be extremely difficult for the oil companies and the Canadian interests to raise enough money to do the job. The higher transportation costs would have to be offset by higher prices to consumers. In addition, a Canadian pipeline would raise a completely different set of environmental problems, such as the need for 12 major river crossings of a half-mile or more in width. Undoubtedly there would be Canadian environmental roadblocks at least as severe as those already encountered by the Alaska line.

Your editorial also suggests that there is a greater need for Alaskan oil in the Midwest than on the West Coast. Certainly the Midwest does need additional crude oil supplies, but from both a time and cost standpoint it is more practical to supply these needs from the mid-continent oil producing states and, to the extent necessary, with imports brought up from the Gulf Coast, than from Alaska via a Canadian pipeline.

Production on the West Coast is declining, so additional supplies will be needed there in the years ahead. Therefore, this region provides the most logical market for Alaskan oil.

Regardless of where the Alaskan oil is used, the nation will be relying on imports to offset the imbalance between domestic supply and demand. Thus, for national security and balance of payments reasons, it is in the national interest to produce and market the Alaskan oil as soon as possible.

I believe that the entire energy issue must be faced with a sense of national purpose and urgency. As long as energy projects such as the Alaskan pipeline are subjected to years and years of delay, the nation's energy situation will continue to deteriorate.

W. F. MARTIN.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA.

THE UNITED STATES AND PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

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

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in the spring of 1971, I spoke before the United World Federalist in Baltimore, Md. In my presentation, I called for the development of a one China policy, urging that our Government achieve a rapprochement with the People's Republic of China. Some persons and groups excoriated me for issuing such a call, but subsequent events indicate that my thinking in this matter was correct.

Like millions of other citizens I am intrigued by current developments between America and the People's Republic of China. Will these developments lead to lasting peace? What will constitute the balance of power in Asia? Do the developments constitute a significant reversal of policy for the People's Republic of China? If so, what are the worldwide implications of that reversal?

Some answers to these, and other questions may be found in a cogent article by Dr. Richard Pfeffer, associate professor of political science at Johns Hopkins University.

Dr. Pfeffer visited China just prior to President Nixon's trip a year ago as a board member of the Committee for a New China Policy. At that time he met Premier Chou En-lai. He is also a former board member of the National Committee on United States-China Relations and a member of the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars.

I recommend that my colleagues study his penetrating analysis of the "normalization" of the relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China.

The analysis follows:

HAS MAO SOLD OUT? HAS NIXON WON?

(By Richard M. Pfeffer)

Two weeks ago in Peking, Henry Kissinger, the architect of American foreign policy, met with the man who is the architect of China's foreign policy, Mao Tse-tung. From that two-hour meeting and from earlier ones, some of which had directly involved President Nixon, has come the important agreement to establish something close to full diplomatic relations between the United States and China, in the form of permanent liaison offices in Washington and Peking.

But this tangible acceleration in normalizing relations between the U.S. and China is only part of a still more significant story, a story that generally has gone untold. As the world becomes increasingly complex, the mass media messages about it which we are fed by our rulers—whom we elect—seem daily more simple and obfuscating.

We must, of course, be grateful for the substantial improvement in American relations with China and even for the all-too-bloody withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam under the Nixon administration. But America's 20-year policy of isolating, encircling and containing China, inspired by our global ambitions and rationalized by virulent anti-communism, had clearly failed by 1971. We must admire the administration's capacity to fashion a public relations "victory" from the jaws of defeat. But we must not overdignify this return to sanity as brilliant statesmanship.

20 YEARS OF TRAGEDY

Similarly, nearly 20 years of tragic, overt U.S. involvement in Vietnam has produced millions of dead, wounded and refugees and a truce that is less attractive for American globalists than the 1954 Geneva accords, which John Foster Dulles, President Eisenhower's Secretary of State, refused to sign. Yet President Nixon describes this state of affairs as "peace with honor." And Americans believe him. And with the truce, our POW's return, exuding the joy we expect, as well as multiple blessings for America and—compliments no doubt of our Pentagon propagandists—for our "commander-in-chief" and for his war policies, including even the recent bombing of Hanoi.

No public sense on the POW's part, so far, of complexity, of lessons learned, of doubts or second thoughts. Just hard sell. No sense of decency on the government's part, as POW's continue to be abused for political purposes during the truce as they were during the war. And it is all part of a broader plan, we are told by our President—this "honorable peace," these trips to Moscow, to Hanoi, to Peking. It is all part of President Nixon's secret plan for "a generation of peace."

What in hell is going on in the world?

Has the U.S. really co-opted the last major holdout, China, into joining the "international establishment," so that traditional balance-of-power diplomacy, a la Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Nixon, can be employed to keep order throughout the world? Or do the Chinese—with their long-term historical perspective and with the accurate recognition of the limits of both sides' power and of the trend in the Third World toward greater instability—play a game for bigger historical stakes?

Has the U.S. really achieved a peace in Vietnam? An honorable peace? Or has it, for the moment at least, thankfully but none-too-elegantly bugged out, to the tune of a well-orchestrated symphony of propaganda played on willing, returning heroes, who appear to have learned nothing from Vietnam but still-blinder patriotism?

Is it a generation of peace that Richard Nixon seeks or a generation of repression of rambunctious social movements around the world in the parochial interest of the U.S., as defined by the President?

THE CENTRAL GAMBIT: TO END THE WAR, TO RULE THE WORLD

No one can conclusively answer these questions today. Future events will tell the tale. But we can begin to sketch the bets that Washington, Peking and Hanoi may be laying.

First, we must be clear on the central gambit, the Nixon-Kissinger opening. Its major purposes are twofold:

(1) To reduce to tolerable levels the costs of a war that never was in America's national interest—not to speak of the interests of the Vietnamese—thereby removing a major obstacle to normalizing relations with China and to further improving relations with the Soviet Union;

(2) To hold out sufficient incentives in the nature of trade, recognition of interests and so on to China and Russia to induce them to join the U.S. in ruling the world, in the American interest to the extent possible and in their interests to the extent necessary.

With a superior sense of gamesmanship and the lusty American belief that anyone can be bought for the right price, U.S. leaders have with consummate skill sallied forth to buy off the Russians and the Chinese. In the case of China, they finally recognized the obvious—not only that America's former policy of outlawing China had failed by 1971, but also that it had from the start prevented Peking from developing a stake in the international order. America's leaders have begun to recognize a legitimate Chinese role in international relations, the hoped-for exchange for China's effective acceptance of the international power as the U.S. has helped to mold and dominate it. Nothing less than the No. 3 spot in the international pecking order that relegates most of the rest of the world to poverty and subordination is being offered to China.

* * * * *

Again take the case of Vietnam, there, for example, doubts about China's support for indigenous revolution seem quite justified. In Vietnam it is clear that the Chinese could have done more to aid Hanoi and the Provisional Revolutionary Government (PRG) in the south. But it is not at all clear how effective such an additional aid would have been in changing the outcome to date. Nor is it clear today what the future holds for the south of Vietnam.

If one recognizes that for three decades Vietnam has been the scene of an uncompleted revolutionary war of national liberation, then the central issue is whether America's interventions have been so able to destroy the revolutionary nationalist forces in the south as to preclude their revival and victory in the foreseeable future. If so, and if one assumes that Peking could have substantially affected this result, then it is fair to say that China on this issue has "sold out." And, then, it is fair to predict that China is likely to continue to "sell out" on less-immediate issues than Vietnam, if the offer price is right—say, diplomatic recognition for Peking and withdrawal of recognition from Taipei.

BASICALLY THE SAME

But, on the other hand, Hanoi and Peking believe that the situation in the south, despite strengthening of Saigon's armed forces, remains basically the same: Saigon is no more just, no more representative and no more politically effective than it was in the early 1960's when the U.S. was compelled to move in with force to bolster Saigon. If they are correct, then they are probably also on firm ground in believing it is only a matter of time before the Thieu administration falls and domestic social forces in the south move Saigon toward a coalition government led by the left. If so, once it became clear that the revolutionary forces could not win so long as the U.S. maintained troops in the south, then the immediate goal was to force or to arrange withdrawal of the U.S. military on terms least disadvantageous to Hanoi and the PRG.

The deal struck by the four sides, hailed as "peace with honor" by our side and as a "tremendous victory" by the other, effectively reaffirms the core of the 1954 Geneva accords regarding Vietnam's essential unity and the provisional nature of the military dividing line at the 17th Parallel. To achieve agreement, the other side gave up its demand that Mr. Thieu be replaced and that a coalition government be established as part of the cease-fire. But in return for its restraint in trying to get political assurances of a share of legitimate power in the next Saigon government, the PRG and Hanoi retained most of the military leverage needed to support their political struggle. Under the "creative ambiguities" and lacunae of the truce agreements, Hanoi's troops remain in the south to help protect those interests that Washington was unwilling to legitimize at the conference table, the political goals for which nationalists in the south have fought first the French and then the U.S.

FURTHER CONFLICT

The situation is structured for further conflict. Even if the truce can be made to stick for a time, it seems highly unlikely that a political accommodation can be worked out between the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary forces in Vietnam. It is in the PRG's interest to move the conflict away from the military and into the political realm, where it is strongest. But it is in Mr. Thieu's interest to prevent such a shift, for the Thieu regime remains militarily powerful in the short run but politically bankrupt. Political ruses, like manipulated elections, are all the public politics Mr. Thieu can tolerate.

Thus, we are back to square one. It probably will be only a matter of time before the mixed political and military competition between two alternative governments and two alternative social systems will be reasserted in Vietnam. And if the past there is any guide to the future, one cannot expect Saigon to shine in such a competition. In which case, the central question for the future of Vietnam, as it was in the mid-60's, is how the U.S. will react to Saigon's disintegration.

UNITED STATES AND CHINA: IN THE SAME BED BUT DIFFERENT DREAMS

So, as the Vietnam case illustrates, China and the United States may appear to be sleeping in the same bed, but they may be dreaming different dreams. What will count in the future is whose dreams are closest to reality, for neither China nor the United States can shape the world in its image. If China is right, that there is an "irresistible trend" in world history—"that countries want independence, nations want liberation and the people want revolution"—then the competitive collusion of the superpowers aimed at a shared world hegemony, even if joined by China, is unlikely to be decisive.

Within this framework, which allows for peaceful coexistence, relations between the United States and China, however, are likely to continue to improve and agreements to be reached on specific issues, whether or not China refrains from becoming a ruling member of the international club. On the issue of Sino-American trade, for example, continuing expansion is very likely. But there are obvious noneconomic, as well as economic, limits to such expansion. A Maoist China that prizes self-reliance will certainly make every effort to avoid dependence on any single foreign power or group of powers. A Maoist China, moreover, will remain very judicious in importing foreign technology. The Chinese have learned by their painful experience with the Soviet Union in the 1950's that extensively importing foreign technology and foreign development models involves accepting the social implications of that technology. So, while the Chinese will surely wish to further upgrade their technological capacities, they probably will do so only at a pace and in a manner that allows them to adapt such imports to fit the Chinese road to socialism.

Within this framework, too, there is, as last week's communique illustrates, every reason to expect cultural, athletic, educational and mass media exchanges on the nonofficial, "people-to-people" level to continue to grow. And there is no reason, except Washington's remaining recalcitrance on the Taiwan issue, not to expect even full formal diplomatic relations at any time.

Will such developments, in themselves, prove that China has been co-opted, that she has given up her revolutionary commitment? Perhaps not. For Chairman Mao, who clearly is charting the main directions in China's foreign policy today, has always been a practical revolutionary, capable of adopting flexible policies when necessary to eventually overwhelm a more powerful foe. In the past, at least, he has consistently managed to keep his eye on his revolutionary goals, has generally managed to outmaneuver and outpolitic his enemies and has, for the most part, been strikingly successful.

To conclude that Chinese foreign policy is motivated now solely by its national interest, as we understand the term, and that it, therefore, can be gradually co-opted by bargaining about those interests is to prematurely write off Mao Tse-tung as a national pure and simple. That is a very risky proposition.

Only time and practice, not theories about the future, will tell whether China continues to pursue a revolutionary foreign policy, undoubtedly not without mistakes and at the moment by indirection. And if it does, only time and practice will tell what kind of ultimate confrontation will occur between it and the leader of the world's counter-revolutionary forces, the United States of America.

GUAM COMBAT PATROL BENEFITS

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

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a measure which would authorize the Federal Government to extend veterans' benefits to Guamanians who fought in guerrilla actions against Japanese forces during World War II.

Twenty-two years ago, our tiny island was suddenly invaded and shortly thereafter occupied by forces of the Japanese Imperial Army. For the next 3 years, the people of Guam were forced to endure considerable suffering at the hands of our captors.

Although there was little we could effectively do against an enemy that was numerous and well armed, nevertheless the people of Guam did resist—and resisted with all of our might. Despite the constant barrage of propaganda by the enemy in their efforts to convince us that American forces were defeated, a great many of our brave young men and women did their utmost to thwart the enemy at every turn.

Throughout the long years of occupation, the Guamanian people kept their faith in America. We knew that someday our ships would reappear offshore. And when that day finally came on July 21, 1944, our people met the returning U.S. Marines with hundreds of small American flags that we had kept hidden

through the years. We also provided our liberators with a more tangible welcome in the form of active and armed resistance against our common enemy.

Shortly after the return of American forces to our island, military officials organized a local security group composed of all Guamanians who were led by U.S. servicemen, wore U.S. military uniforms, and carried U.S. weapons. This group, which became known as the Guam Combat Patrol, was given the extremely dangerous task of ridding the island of Japanese stragglers.

During the months that followed, records show that several members of the Guam Combat Patrol died in battle with the enemy, and a number of others were wounded during combat operations. Their valor was officially recognized by the U.S. Government, which awarded some members of the Combat Patrol the Silver Star, Bronze Medals, and Purple Heart Medals.

Despite their outstanding record in battle and their being awarded some of the highest military decorations this country can bestow on its fighting men, I am sorry to say that the approximately 40 members of the Guam Combat Patrol are not recognized by the Federal Government and are not eligible for any veteran's benefits.

What the members of the Guam Combat Patrol did, of course, was in defense of their own American soil, since Guam had been a possession of the United States since 1898. While we were not yet honored to be American citizens, the loyalty of my people was firmly with this our adopted country. So much so, in fact, that not one Guamanian was ever found guilty of collaborating with the enemy, a record few occupied areas can claim.

Fifteen-hundred miles away, a similar action was being waged in a more publicized effort by a combined force of American and native troops in the Philippines. For their part in the war, the Filipino troops were granted official recognition by the U.S. Congress and even given certain veterans benefit rights.

The few remaining survivors of that long-ago campaign on Guam continue to wait and hope that their Government in Washington will remember them someday. Before that number dwindles even further, I ask my colleagues in Congress not to forsake their fellow Americans on Guam any longer and grant these men the benefits which they, and all American fighting men, fought so long and hard for.

Surely in view of the service which they and their children have rendered to this country, what we ask today would not be unjust or unfair.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE LYNDON B. JOHNSON

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly, President Lyndon B. Johnson will be treated more kindly by history than he was by some of his contemporaries. History will eventually recognize him as the singularly accomplished leader that I have always known him to be.

My own personal observation of him was that he was a man of great intellect, character, and integrity, far beyond that for which he was accredited by many Americans or by the journalists who were misled by his style. The accent of his Texas rearing misled those who equated his outward easy-going Texas demeanor and drawl with dawdling performance. His mind could assimilate complex and diverse facts into a plan of overt action.

Lyndon Johnson reserved intense loyalty for those who had served him or had proven their friendship to him. He also knew his detractors and made allowances for them on the chessboard of his career.

Few men in public office can boast the personal achievements and landmark legislation that is the legacy of President Johnson. His successes have been comprehensively cataloged in the many eulogies authored in his memory. In domestic affairs, his Presidency is unsurpassed—accomplished through the same relentless personal effort that characterized his famed tenure as Senate majority leader. In international affairs, I would stress that it was President Johnson who opened avenues to closer accord with those countries which were traditionally antagonistic. It was he who paved the way to future peace and successful foreign policy.

The accomplishments of his domestic and international efforts have been clouded by the sad involvement of our Nation in the Vietnam conflict.

It is perhaps for another era to judge whether he and other Presidents who followed the same course were right or not. Regardless of future judgment, he followed courageously the path he thought was best despite public criticism.

A number of us know why President Johnson chose not to run for his second term. It had nothing to do with a fear that he might be rejected, and few believe he could have been defeated. Having suffered the unhappy experience of knitting together a Nation whose President had died in office, Lyndon Johnson did not want to put this Nation, or a successor to himself, through the same traumatic situation for a second time in the same generation. He was well aware of his own health problems and he realized the chances of living through a second full term were not good.

Beside him throughout his adult life was one of the finest women who has ever accompanied her husband through the trials of public life. He and Ladybird Johnson formed a superb team to the lasting advantage of this country. She is a lady of great depth whose stature will also grow with developing history.

The accolades that have been extended to President Johnson and his family are genuine and well deserved. Of one thing I am also certain: No one will ever review his record and accomplishments without feeling the excitement and the movement which surrounded all he did. To him life was action and he lived.

DEATH PENALTY

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the administration's bill "To establish rational criteria for the mandatory imposition of the sentence of death, and for other purposes."

The recent Supreme Court case, *Furman* v. *Georgia*, 408 U.S. 238, decided June 29, 1972, called into question existing Federal statutes which allow the death penalty to be imposed at the discretion of the judge or jury, but left the possibility that a statute providing for the death penalty but removing the unchecked discretion would be upheld.

Several of my Republican colleagues on the Judiciary Committee have joined me in the cosponsorship of this bill, including the distinguished ranking Republican from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Many members support the rational use of the death penalty although they may not support the specifics contained in this bill. However, I believe that we should conduct a thorough study of the question of when the death penalty can be imposed, and that the Department of Justice bill provides us with a good framework for conducting that study. I hope that hearings on this legislation can be held soon because I believe as President Nixon has said, that the death penalty can be an effective deterrent to crime in certain circumstances.

The bill I introduce today has been drafted to provide narrow guidelines within which the death penalty could be imposed for the crimes of wartime treason or espionage or for murder if certain other factors are present. The death penalty could not be imposed in any event if any one of certain mitigating factors, such as youth of the offender or mental incapacity, were present. The death penalty could be imposed only if one of a number of aggravating factors were present.

For example, the death penalty would be imposed for the crime of wartime treason if the treason were found to have posed a grave risk to the national security. The death penalty would be imposed, for example, for the crime of murder if the murder occurred during an aircraft hijacking or kidnaping or if the person murdered was the President or a Member of Congress or if the defendant had previously been convicted of an offense for which the death penalty was imposable.

In his March 14 message to the Congress on crime, the President said:

> Federal crimes are rarely "crimes of passion." Airplane hijacking is not done in a blind rage; it has to be carefully planned. Using incendiary devices and bombs are not crimes of passion, nor is kidnapping; all these must be thought out in advance. At present those who plan these crimes do not have to include in their deliberations the possibility that they will be put to death for their deeds. I believe that in making their plans, they should have to consider the fact that if a

death results from their crime, they too may die.

It is for the reasons stated by the President that I support the reinstitution of the death penalty for the most serious offenses, such as aircraft hijacking and kidnaping where death results from the crime. I call on my colleagues to join with me in a thorough study of the legislation I introduce today in order to accomplish this purpose.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, there is a popular misconception that the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Furman against Georgia decided June 29, 1972 had the effect of rendering all death penalties unconstitutional in criminal cases. However, it should be pointed out that the death penalty continues to be valid and "constitutional" in all of those cases which were not specifically covered by the language of the Supreme Court in that case.

In order to clarify the situation, the administration has proposed legislation to mark the very limited kinds of cases in which the death penalty might appropriately be imposed by Federal courts or juries.

Mr. Speaker, I have been pleased to join with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), as a cosponsor of this legislation with the expectation that—serving as a pattern or outline—the measure which is being introduced today may enable our Judiciary Committee to recommend appropriate legislation to the Members of the House.

I concur entirely with the Supreme Court decision to the effect that the death penalty when imposed as a wholly discretionary decision by court or jury—and with highly discriminatory results such as were described in the Furman against Georgia case—is "cruel and unusual" and in violation of article VIII of the Federal Constitution.

However, it seems appropriate to recall the recent statement of President Nixon to the effect that hijackers, kidnapers, those who throw firebombs, convicts who attack prison guards and other types of assaults on officers of the law—all with the intent to take the life or lives of others—may well be the kind of offenses which should continue to be punishable by death. Even within this limited area, carefully defined parameters and procedures must be provided. The safeguards are contained in the bill which I am cosponsoring to the extent that full and ample protection is given in cases where extenuating circumstances exist, including the youth of the defendant, lack of capacity to appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct, and unusual and substantial duress.

Mr. Speaker, without going into further detail and without elaborating on the many reasons why I am cosponsoring this legislation I wish to indicate my general support of the administration proposal with the expectation that the House Judiciary Committee may, after a full hearing, report a bill to this House which can be both clarifying and fair, as well as consistent with the overall needs of the American people and entirely consistent with the U.S. Constitution.

EXPORT EXPANSION

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

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, America has an untapped resource overseas which could help to expand U.S. exports and cure this country's record balance-of-trade deficit. It is the billions of dollars owned and owed to us in the form of foreign currencies and debts.

I, along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) and many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, am today introducing legislation to put this money—what we already have in hand and what is due to us—to work on the job of boosting U.S. exports.

The idea is simply this—the money would be used to pay foreign import duties on American products, thus reducing their cost in world marketplaces and making them more competitive with European and Japanese goods. The payment would be limited to 10 percent.

If it sounds unusual, consider these two points:

First. Since 1954, the United States has lost more than $2 billion in the value of American-owned foreign currencies because of overseas inflation, devaluations, and exchange rate adjustments. In the process, the United States has not received one cent of benefit. The money has just gone down the drain.

Second. When an expansion of U.S. exports occurs, production increases, jobs are created or maintained, corporate profits go up, and stockholders receive higher dividends. Thus, it also means a greater flow of tax revenues to the Federal Government and State and local governments. The tax income by itself would be double the value of any foreign currency and debt repayment we spend or credit for the foreign import duties. So the plan would not cost the taxpayer a single penny in new appropriations.

No foreign country would be forced to participate in the program, but in most cases it would be to their advantage as well as ours. They would receive high-quality developmental goods, such as machinery and transport equipment from the United States and, at the same time, erase their debt obligations, a burden which is creating real troubles for many countries too deeply in debt. What foreign exchange they have is being spent for paying debts instead of buying needed American products.

The program also would develop a continuing need for replacement spare parts for follow-on business and in many cases establish trade relationships and contracts where perhaps none existed previously.

My argument is that America can do a lot to increase exports without erecting trade barriers which might bring retaliation of the same kind in countries where we sell many goods as well as buy. By destroying their market in America, we could destroy ours in their country. Walls keep out people but they also imprison those within.

Our bill, in short, would do the following:

First. Expand American exports by utilizing foreign currencies owned by the United States and debt repayments to pay foreign import duties not exceeding 10 percent. Luxury goods would not qualify.

Second. As U.S. exports expand, tax revenues from corporations, incomes, and stock dividends would be twice what the United States spends or credits for the payment of import duties on American products.

Third. Permit the United States to compete for business on a more realistic cost basis with Western European and Asian nations, some of which subsidize their exports in other ways. This would give U.S. business a strong incentive to get out there and sell.

Fourth. Give U.S. exports a 3-year breathing spell while the gap between the costs of United States and foreign labor and manufacturing narrows.

Fifth. Create a continuing need for replacement spare parts for the follow-on business and at the same time establish business relationships and contracts where perhaps none existed previously.

Sixth. Give the U.S. economy a shot in the arm by creating thousands of new jobs, boosting corporate profits, and increasing dividends to millions of shareholders.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 6061

A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to expand American exports by utilizing foreign currencies owned by the United States to pay foreign import duties on such exports, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 612 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2362), relating to the use of foreign currencies, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e)(1) Subject to the provisions of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, the President is authorized to negotiate and carry out agreements with any foreign country in which the United States owns foreign currencies to use such foreign currencies—

"(A) to pay duties imposed by such foreign country on the importation of commodities manufactured or grown in the United States and its possessions as an official Government obligation; and

"(B) to pay local costs incurred by any United States private enterprise under any personal service contract for the performance of services in such foreign country as an official Government obligation.

"(2) In any case in which a foreign country agrees to relieve the United States from liability to pay any amount otherwise payable under an agreement entered into under this subsection, the President is authorized to take such steps as may be necessary to grant such country a credit, in an amount equal to the aggregate amount of any payment from which the United States is relieved of liability, against any debt owed by such foreign country to the United States, excluding (A) any such debt arising out of a loan made by the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and (B) any such debt with respect to which repayments are covered into a revolving fund for use by an agency of the United States.

"(3) Each agreement entered into under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall—

"(A) provide that any reduction in the aggregate cost of any commodity imported into such foreign country from the United States resulting from any payment made by the United States under such agreement shall be passed on to the ultimate consumer;

"(B) prohibit any payment by the United States with respect to arms, ammunition, or implements of war, or with respect to any commodity imported into such foreign country from the United States at the expense of or on concessional terms by the United States or any agency thereof;

"(C) prohibit payment by the United States with respect to any commodity at a rate of duty which exceeds the cost of the commodity by more than ten per centum or in excess of the rate of duty in effect with respect to such commodity on January 1, 1973, whichever is lesser;

"(D) apply with respect to commodities imported into such foreign country from the United States under contracts or new orders entered into after March 22, 1973; and

"(E) prohibit payment by the United States of local costs incurred by any United States private enterprise under a personal service contract in an amount which exceeds 5 per centum of the total contract price for the services actually performed.

"(4) In carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the President shall give priority to the negotiation of agreements with foreign countries with respect to which the President determines that the foreign currencies owned by the United States are excess, or near-excess, to the needs of the United States.

"(5) For the purposes of this subsection, a commodity shall be deemed to have been manufactured or grown in the United States or its possessions if it is mined or produced in the United States or its possessions or if the end product is composed substantially of components mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States or its possessions and directly incorporated in such end product.

"(6) No agreement shall be entered into under paragraph (1) of this subsection after June 30, 1976.".

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last session, many Members of Congress joined the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD) and I in cosponsoring legislation to expand U.S. exports abroad through the use of U.S.-owned foreign currencies and debt repayments.

The need for this bipartisan congressional initiative is even greater than ever. Our trade deficit last year was $6.4 billion, the worst in U.S. history.

We are reintroducing this legislation today and have sought to make it even more viable by—

First. Limiting its applicability to U.S. manufactured goods and agricultural products where the foreign import duties do not exceed 10 percent. This effectively eliminates luxury goods with high tariff rates. However, it still covers machinery, transport equipment, tools, and other developmental-type items constituting most of our exports.

Second. Making eligible U.S. goods where the end product is composed substantially of components mined, produced or manufactured in the United States. Previously, it was 100 percent which eliminated many products with some foreign component even though most of the item was indeed of U.S. origin.

America has traditionally tried to attack the export problem at home rather than in the foreign marketplace. We seek your support in this endeavor to launch a bold new experiment to deal with one of our Nation's most pressing problems—the loss of trade and its attendant adverse effect on American employment, corporate earnings, and tax revenues vitally needed to meet domestic needs.

In brief, our bill also would—

First. Increase the use of American consultants by foreign governments and industry by funding 5 percent of total contract costs for local foreign currency expenses. American consultants can reasonably be expected to recommend the purchase of U.S. machinery and equipment.

Second. Permit foreign governments to reduce their debt-servicing problems, avoid delinquencies, and maintain good credit standings by paying import duties in their own currencies, thus freeing hard foreign exchange for the purchase of development-type imports from the United States.

Third. Give foreign consumers a break in the price of American goods by requiring import duty savings to be passed on to the ultimate buyer in the marketplace.

Fourth. Authorize bilateral agreements which can be tailor made to deal with any special problems existing between the economies of the participating nation and the United States, such as excluding any products which might damage domestic industries of the country affected.

Fifth. Help reverse the current record balance-of-trade deficit which amounted to $6.4 billion last year, the worst in U.S. history. The problem would be dealt with directly in the marketplace, rather than at home. But even so, other legislation, such as import adjustment assistance, would not conflict. In fact, if both approaches were adopted, a double-barreled attack could be mounted.

Sixth. Save the United States money. Since 1954, the value of U.S.-owned foreign currencies has dropped more than $2 billion, because of inflation, devaluations, and exchange rate adjustments without 1 cent of benefit to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this unique idea was conceived by Norman G. Cornish, a senior staff consultant to the House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee. Mr. Cornish is an acknowledged expert on the problems of U.S.-owned foreign currencies and delinquent international debts owed to the United States as well as trade matters dealing with the less developed countries. In fact, he played a key role in helping to initiate and achieve last year's United States-Soviet debt-trade agreement. I think he should be commended for his contributions.

AMERICA'S VOTINGEST SMALL CITY

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

Mr. FROEHLICH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution to designate the city of De Pere, Wis., as "America's Votingest Small City."

I am very pleased to be joined in this resolution by the entire Wisconsin delegation in the House, Messrs. ASPIN, KASTENMEIER, THOMSON, ZABLOCKI, REUSS, STEIGER, OBEY, and DAVIS.

An identical resolution is being introduced in the other body by Senator NELSON, with the cosponsorship of Senator PROXMIRE.

Let me promptly acknowledge my deep debt of gratitude to all these distinguished gentlemen for their generous and invaluable support of my effort to secure recognition for De Pere.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress takes special satisfaction when an individual, a group, or a community in his district accomplishes something so noteworthy that it deserves and requires national attention.

The city of De Pere is a case in point.

For a period of more than 20 years, the voters of De Pere, Wis., have been turning out at record percentages. Last November 7, more than 98 percent of the registered voters in the city exercised their franchise.

This phenomenal turnout is consistent with the city's voting history since 1952. De Pere's voting statistics for the Presidential election years of 1952, 1956, 1960, 1964, 1968, and 1972 are as follows:

Year	Registered voters	Votes cast	Percentage
1952	4,204	4,192	99.7
1956	4,355	4,179	95.9
1960	4,644	4,499	96.8
1964	4,716	4,679	99.2
1968	5,401	4,903	97.1
1972	6,479	6,353	98.05

In two of these elections, the turnout was better than 99 percent. In all of them, the turnout was better than 95 percent.

These statistics, in my judgment, represent an unparalleled civic achievement, fully deserving of national recognition.

It is important to note that De Pere's magnificent, sustained good citizenship comes at a time when, as one newspaper put it:

America is witnessing the deepest and most persistent decline in national voting since the early days of this century.

That is what gives De Pere's accomplishment such broad significance.

Why is it, when so many voters throughout the country are allegedly alienated from the electoral process, believing it to be meaningless, that 98 percent of the voters in De Pere should turn out to vote?

The answer lies in part in the extraordinary sense of "community" that exists in De Pere and in a brilliant organizational effort to get out the vote.

The citizens of De Pere know each other and know their government.

They know they can make their Government responsive.

They believe that when they work together as a community, they can usually accomplish any objective.

They are proud of their heritage and proud of their progressive achievements as a city.

For 20 years, the citizens of De Pere have set as one of their major goals a 100-percent vote in Presidential elections.

In 1972, this worthy crusade was headed by Carl F. Moenssens, chairman of the 100 Percent Vote Committee and a leading member of the Kiwanis Club. He and his organization were ably assisted by three other service clubs in De Pere—the Lions, the Rotary, and the Optimists. They worked closely with the city government, the local media, the schools, the churches, and the business community.

They acquired poll lists of all registered voters. Each service club took one of the city's four wards and made sure that every registered voter received a personal telephone call. Voters who were away from home, at school or in the service, were contacted and sent absentee ballots.

Disabled and elderly voters who could not come to the polls received absentee ballots. Voters who had difficulty in getting to the polls were given the opportunity for a free ride.

According to Carl Moenssens:

The flu, a broken arm, and a couple of newborn babies held us to 98.05 percent.

But he adds with pride that every registered voter under the age of 21 went to the polls on November 7.

Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin delegation believes that this exemplary display of citizenship merits official recognition by the Congress of the United States.

De Pere is America's votingest small city. We simply want to make it official.

This designation, of course, is not a title to be held in perpetuity. The citizens of De Pere would be the first to extend a friendly challenge to other cities of similar size and population. They will not be content to rest on their laurels. Consequently, I will agree to cosponsor a resolution in 1977 honoring any small city in the Nation that can produce a higher percentage of voters for the 1976 Presidential election than the city of De Pere.

Of course, I doubt that any city will.

In any event, De Pere has earned designation as "America's Votingest Small City," and I sincerely hope that the Judiciary Committee and the House will act speedily to approve my concurrent resolution.

GUARANTEEING RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE TO PLAN THEIR FAMILIES

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970 launched one of the most popular, successful, and significant health programs ever undertaken by the Federal Government. The aim of this program is to improve opportunities for future generations of children by enabling their parents to plan effectively size and spacing of families.

Federal support of family planning services first was called for by President Johnson in his 1966 special message to Congress on health and education. He said then:

We have a growing concern to foster the integrity of the family, and the opportunity for each child. It is essential that all families have access to information and services that will allow freedom to choose the number and spacing of their children within the dictates of individual conscience.

This freedom to choose can be guaranteed by providing American couples with access to safe and effective means of birth planning, regardless of their economic status.

In 1970, the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act passed with overwhelming congressional support, and sought to implement a national program of subsidized family planning services. Its key goal was—provision of services to the estimated 6.6 million low-income women and many men in the United States who want and need family health care, but who are unable to afford the cost of private physicians for such services. Furthermore, this legislation authorized a greatly expanded Federal program of scientific research for development of new contraceptive technology. Neither family planning services programs alone nor our existing, inadequate technology can meet the voluntary fertility control needs of all individuals of diverse beliefs and circumstances.

Today, approximately 2.6 million low-income women and many men are receiving voluntary and comprehensive family planning services through subsidized programs. The legislation authorizing these programs is scheduled to expire on June 30 this year. With approximately half of the women in need remaining unserved or without access to family planning services, it is apparent that a substantial task remains to be accomplished.

Furthermore, we must secure the continuation of voluntary family planning programs for those women presently receiving these preventive health care services.

If we do not insure continuation and expansion of programs authorized by this legislation, we shall condemn millions of individuals to suffering and dependency associated with unwanted childbearing. In addition, Federal support of scientific research efforts—even now far too limited, but still our major hope for new knowledge toward the development of safe and effective contraception—will come to a halt.

Our national family planning and sciences program has widespread support, and considerable progress has been made. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly aware of the need for Federal leadership and monitoring of programs that serve any minority group. I insert in the RECORD at this point the statement of the Family Planning in Minority Communities Workshop, recently held here in Washington for minority health professionals and consumers of family planning services, under the cosponsorship of the National Medical Association, Howard University Medical School, and Meharry Medical College:

STATEMENT OF THE FAMILY PLANNING IN MINORITY COMMUNITIES WORKSHOP

We deplore the deep cuts by the Administration on the social programs that most acutely affect low-income and minority individuals and families and believe that the policies of this Administration are a forthright attack on low-income and minority individuals and will lead to the abandonment of programs that lead to some hope for the betterment of life for those most in need. As a group of individuals gathered specifically to discuss the delivery of comprehensive family planning services to low-income and minority individuals, we are particularly aware of the basic inequalities which presently exist for the poor of this country, whose environment and health care are already at an unacceptable level.

As minority providers of family planning services in our own communities, we are deeply aware of the effects of unwanted pregnancy and childbearing on the economic and social lives of the members of our communities. Unwanted pregnancy and childbearing contribute to the high infant and maternal death and morbidity rates in the United States, and these mortality and morbidity rates are highest among low-income and minorities. Unwanted pregnancy and childbearing can cause economic crises for individuals and for families and can lead to the deterioration and destruction of families and to dependency of individuals. The human distress and suffering resulting from unwanted pregnancy and childbearing can be averted by the provision of adequate, comprehensive family planning services.

We believe that all persons must be guaranteed freedom of choice with regard to determination of family size and spacing of children so that the well-being of all parents and children may be secured and improved. We believe it is the duty of the government to guarantee such freedom of choice through the provision of comprehensive family planning services to all people who desire them. Such comprehensive family planning services are now provided through programs under the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act which expires June 30, 1973, which at that time will have reached only about half of the 6.6 million women and the many men in the United States who want and need such preventive health services. Low-income and minority individuals have the least access to medical services in general and to voluntary comprehensive family planning services in particular. If this law is allowed to expire, the responsibility for the provision of family planning services would rest with local and state governments. We, and the members of our communities, have no reason to assume that local and state governments will be either willing or able to commit the resources necessary to provide these services nor do we have reason to believe that local and state governments will preserve national standards for quality of care. We furthermore believe that the development, financing, and monitoring of these programs must come from the federal government in order to insure that local programs are accountable at the national level and that such programs will continue to be both comprehensive and voluntary.

We therefore call upon the President of the United States, members of the Black Caucus, and our elected representatives to take whatever action is necessary to insure renewal and expansion of the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970 as a means toward improving the health and well-being of all individuals and

toward the elimination of poverty and institutional racism from our national life.

Today, along with my distinguished colleagues, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT), and 33 other concerned Members, I am reintroducing legislation to continue and expand this vitally needed national program.

This measure does three things: First, it extends programs which provide family planning services to those Americans who want them, but cannot afford them. It also extends programs designed to benefit all the people in this country by supporting development of safer, more effective, more aceptable means of birth planning. Finally, it proposes strengthening administration of both programs by creating within HEW a National Population Sciences and Family Planning Administration to carry sole administrative responsibility for these programs. This national administration will be comprised of a National Center for Family Planning Services and a National Institute for Population Sciences. The funding amounts proposed in this bill are for a 5-year period; they are based on the recommendations of two national commissions, the HEW 5-year plan, and other expert studies.

In addition, of major importance is the fact that this legislation insures that these programs will continue to be both comprehensive and voluntary. I am certain that I do not speak only for myself when I state that this legislation represents a commitment to the people of the United States that we in the Congress seek to assure the basic human right of all men and women to choose whether or not to bear or beget a child.

THE CLEAN AIR ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor to speak on the Clean Air Act of 1970.

As we know, the auto industry has requested a 1-year delay in the 1975 auto exhaust standards. The issues they raise are serious and require careful consideration.

The auto industry is the largest single industry in the United States today—employing hundred's of thousands of people and paying billions of dollars in taxes. At the consumer level, the price and performance of automobiles effects virtually every citizen.

At the present time the Environment Protection Administration and the American auto industry are at an impasse with respect to the 1975 emission standards, and it is clear to me that the Congress must act to resolve this impasse this year.

Today we are only being asked to extend the funding for the Clean Air Act of 1970, but we should note that we must ultimately modify this law so that industry and Government can arrive at a satisfactory accommodation.

The control of auto pollutants is a technological problem requiring major scientific breakthroughs. By specifying the absolute standards to be met in the future, the existing law does nothing to resolve these technical questions and difficulties. Government and industry must work together on this problem. It should be noted that this is one of the few laws passed by the Congress that does not give the administering agency any flexibility or discretion in carrying out the legislation's intent.

Consequently, if a 1-year delay in the 1975 standards should be provided as requested, it would only be a partial solution and we would soon have to deal with the 1976 emission standards prescribed by law which are even more stringent.

Technical reports submitted to EPA by the auto manufacturers show that substantial progress has been made in controlling pollutants; I believe there is a good-faith effort underway by the industry to solve this problem.

I believe that we can enhance this progress and fully maintain the intent and spirit of the law by giving the administering agency more leeway to set reasonable and sound standards—standards geared to fully protect the public interest.

In summary, this act as presently written lacks adequate flexibility and thus is increasingly impractical to administer. It neither considers nor addresses the related problems of customer cost, national employment, mileage vis-a-vis fuel consumption, drivability, safety, and our international balance of payments—all important factors which must be carefully weighed together before we can reach a sound and workable public policy standard.

A Federal appeals court recently noted the EPA has "theoretical authority to shut down the auto industry." I do not believe it was ever the intent of Congress to establish such authority—and we must modify this situation.

INTRODUCTION OF IMPOUNDMENT BILL

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the concern of the Members of Congress regarding the Presidential practice of impounding funds appropriated by Congress is demonstrated by the introduction of 45 bills relating to this subject in the 93d Congress. Over 140 Members of the House have cosponsored legislation to limit Presidential impoundment. The Rules Committee will begin hearings on these important bills on Wednesday, March 28, 1973.

Presidential impoundment is one of the most complex issues to face the Congress. It involves substantial constitutional and political implications. The foremost consideration and deliberation must be given to any legislation authorizing Presidential impoundment of funds. For these reasons these hearings may be the most important held by the Rules Committee during this session of Congress.

Today I am introducing a bill on impoundment in time for consideration during these hearings. It is my hope that this bill will stimulate discussion about some of the important constitutional implications of any legislation authorizing impoundment.

Any consideration of impoundment should begin from the premise that there is no provision in the Constitution for this practice by the President. Under the Constitution, Congress is clearly given control of the Federal purse. In my judgment, it would be a grave mistake for Congress to unnecessarily concede its prerogatives in this matter.

Therefore, the bill I have introduced places the burden on the President to establish legitimate need for impoundment before the actual impoundment takes effect. Under the bill, a simple resolution passed by either House will prevent Presidential impoundment before it occurs. The power remains with Congress to determine if an impoundment is justified.

This bill may be distinguished from the other major bills on this subject in the following respects:

The President is required to notify Congress of any proposed impoundment prior to any actual execution of impoundment of funds. Thus, Presidential impounding is not permitted even during the 60 days in which Congress is considering the impoundment. This is consistent with the Constitution as no impoundment would be permitted without implied or expressed congressional consent.

The Congress may approve the proposed impoundment by passage of a concurrent resolution or the lapse of a 60-day period. However, either the House or the Senate may disapprove the proposed impoundment by passage of a simple resolution within 60 days.

The Comptroller General is required to investigate the facts pertinent to the impoundment and advise Congress on whether it is consistent with permission previously granted by Congress. The resources and expertise of the Comptroller will help to provide the reliable data necessary for an informed consideration of the proposal by Congress.

The congressional committee which considers the impoundment proposal will be the standing committee which also has jurisdiction over the subject matter. This should result in a more expeditious review of the proposal by a committee which has familiarity with the programs involved.

An explicit proviso in this bill will prevent legislative action from prejudicing a decision by the Supreme Court on the constitutionality of past impoundment actions.

Any legislation which authorizes the President to impound funds will confer a power upon the office not now specified by the Constitution. Congress must be on guard against any bill which concedes more power to the President than the Constitution warrants. The bill I have introduced seeks to prevent Presidential impoundment for any period of time without the consent of Congress.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we should take every precaution to ensure that in tail-

oring our response to meet the immediate political challenge by the President that we do not concede away fundamental constitutional principles and congressional prerogatives. The appropriate remedy lies not in the forfeiture of constitutional power by the legislative branch to the executive but in the strengthening of our own constitutional capacity to meet our independent and coequal responsibilities concerning the problem of our national budget problems and priorities.

EATEN OUT OF HOUSE AND HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House, and as the mother of three healthy schoolchildren with very healthy appetites, I could probably turn a phrase here about being "eaten out of House and home." But I refuse to make light of an extremely serious problem.

I went over my grocery bills last night, and they are running about 23 percent more right now than they were in December. I suspect the same holds true in the kitchens of my colleagues. And I am sure that every Member of the Congress has received mail on the subject of food prices. A lot of mail.

Perhaps your mail is like mine. I haven't been getting what you might call pressure letters—or threatening letters. For the most part they are not even indignant letters. They are sad letters.

And they are personal letters—all different. I have yet to receive one form letter on the subject of food prices. Rather, my constituents have turned to me in a way that indicates they do not know where else to turn. I hestitate to use the word "despair," but I honestly feel we are far too close to the brink of resignation. I want to share a few excerpts from my mail with the House this afternoon.

One housewife wrote:

It's at the point where I've had to use my rent money and oil money just to feed my family; we may have to decide whether to eat 3 meals a day and live on the street, or cut back to one good meal a day and keep our home.

Another one said:

I feel a sense of shame when the people who built the richest nation in the world, people who work and have dollars in their pockets, feel like children pressing their noses against the candy store window because they have only a few pennies in their pockets.

I have a letter from a retired couple, living on a fixed income, and while they certainly feel the pinch of rising prices—the main concern in their letter is—and I quote—

Those young couples with growing children . . . what happens to them if this is happening to us?

One of my constituents told me that—

Even the butchers are complaining about weekly increases; they are ashamed to charge us these prices that keep going up and up with no relief in sight.

These are not poor people, Mr. Speaker. They do not want handouts. They are hard workers, they try to budget for their families' needs, they want very much to be responsible citizens. They earn what used to be called a living wage—but they are afraid. They are afraid that the concept of a living wage has become distorted. They tell me what I already know very well from personal experience—that "everything has risen out of proportion, but we should at least be able to feed our families without the food bill eating up a good half of our paychecks."

It is not just the prices that are shocking, it is the proportion of the dollar that now ends up for food. And I am talking about food, pure and simple. I can no longer accept the argument that many other household items happen to come from the food store, and that food itself is not rising that much. I will quote another letter in greater detail. Listen—

$1.29 a pound for stew meat is ridiculous. We can live without steak, and I stopped buying fresh fruits and vegetables a long time ago—59¢ for a head of lettuce isn't worth it. The powdered milk I buy has jumped from $1.99 to $2.55 since December. We have three boys to feed, and I worry about the lack of protein and vegetables in their diet.

And then she concludes by admitting—and again I quote—

I'm very discouraged with our country. Not the "freedom" part, just the fact that it seems *almost* useless to work hard and try to take care of your own. It's "almost" impossible for the average family to get ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I am gratified that she used the word "almost"—but I am deeply concerned with the tone of her letter and the mood of all the people.

I think my colleagues are at least somewhat acquainted with my district. I have Boston suburbs, with a sizable number of professionals, yet I also have mill towns, with a tradition of craftsmanship and skill. I have modern manufacturing plants, yet until 2 years ago I even had a sawmill with a waterwheel for power. I have Ph. D.'s, and I have immigrants who are just learning the very basics of citizenship. I have jetports and superhighways—and I have the Penn Central Railroad. I have fishermen and farmers, but most of all I have factory workers and foremen. They know that if you give a dollar's worth of work you get a dollar's worth of pay. And they know that with good management of the family budget, the American paycheck can be the bedrock of the American dream.

These are people who respect the American ethic—people who can and should take credit for loving this country; for being respectable and responsible; for being compassionate and understanding.

But they do not understand what is wrong with the American market basket, and they are turning to us for help.

And I insist that we owe them that help, that we extend to them that help. They want leadership, determination, and a solid followthrough in an effort to correct this very critical situation.

They know—as all my colleagues know—that the food-price crisis is extremely complicated. But they want us to tackle the problem. They will not let us put it off. They have to know that someone is ready to find out what is wrong.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am not only delighted—I am obligated—to join with my colleagues, Mr. ROSENTHAL and Mr. MATSUNAGA, in cosponsoring a House resolution to establish a Select Committee on the Cost and Availability of Food.

I am convinced that there is a permanent solution to the food-price dilemma which will result—at one and the same time—in an abundant food supply at reasonable prices to consumers and a fair rate of return on invested capital to farmers.

THE SANTA MONICA MOUNTAIN AND SEASHORE NATIONAL URBAN PARK

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

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to establish the Santa Monica Mountain and Seashore National Urban Park. The bill, cosponsored by my colleague Congressman JAMES CORMAN, would create a major national park along the beaches of Santa Monica Bay and the mountains and valleys of the Santa Monica Mountains in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties in California. An identical bill was introduced in the Senate by Senator JOHN V. TUNNEY.

Initially, the concepts embodied in this bill were introduced by me in the first session of the 92d Congress. While progress has been made toward the realization of this much needed park and conservation facility, the Federal Government has been delinquent in its responsibility to the citizens of southern California in insuring that the currently undeveloped Santa Monica Mountain and seashore area will be preserved for the enjoyment of this and future generations.

No one can seriously doubt that there exists a great need throughout the entire country and, in particular, in southern California, for additional recreational and park facilities. Each year thousands of individuals are precluded from enjoying the unmatched pleasures of the outdoors because of the overcrowded conditions that prevail in the few parks that do exist. This legislation, while it focuses its attention on the serious needs of California, will represent, if implemented, an increased awareness of the Federal Government of the needs of urban dwellers to experience nature in its most unblemished form.

I am firmly convinced that the Santa Monica Mountain and Seashore National Urban Park, as envisioned by this legislation, will become a reality. I am able to say this because of the enthusiasm that the residents of the Greater Los Angeles area have displayed in support of this idea. They and I will need your help, however, to hasten the implementation of this park.

Those of you who have visited south-

ern California know of the natural beauty that abounds in that area. It would be an unpardonable sin to permit, by inaction or delay, even the partial destruction of the coastline or the partial development of the mountain area.

I urge each of you to seriously examine the contents of this bill and support its passage.

WELCOME TO THE NEW BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF BUFFALO

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, March 19, the Most Reverend Edward Dennis Head, D.D., was installed as the 11th bishop of the Roman Catholic diocese of Buffalo which encompasses eight counties and 6,350 square miles of western New York.

Bishop Head is an able and dedicated spiritual leader who has committed himself to an ecumenical awareness of the contributions of every religion—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—to community life. He is well known for his devoted work among the needy.

In a moving statement after formally becoming bishop of the diocese of Buffalo, Bishop Head remarked:

I have a heart filled with hope—hope for and in the life we begin together today as members of the family of God in the diocese of Buffalo.

I hope to be a source of some strength and some service to our family. I hope my joining you will make our family healthier and happier and even more secure.

I have a heart filled with faith—faith in God and faith in you and faith in our future days together. I have faith that God is with us and I know that together with Him our family, our community, our diocese will proceed, prosper and flourish.

I know that Bishop Head will prove to be a worthy successor to our beloved Bishop James A. McNulty who served our diocese so faithfully and well until his recent death. Bishop Head can be sure that the prayers of western New Yorkers of every religion will be with him as he takes up the responsibilities of his new bishopric.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this time, for the information of my colleagues, articles from the Buffalo Evening News and the Buffalo Courier Express concerning Bishop Head's welcome to western New York:

[From the Buffalo Evening News, Mar. 19, 1973]

CARDINAL COOKE INSTALLS BISHOP HEAD AS LEADER OF THE BUFFALO DIOCESE

(By Dick Burke)

Like many a man of Irish heritage before him, Bishop Edward D. Head entered snow-laden Buffalo—and his new diocese—late Sunday afternoon by way of Canada.

Shortly after crossing the Peace Bridge he met the diocesan board of consultors in the dining room of the Chancery at 35 Lincoln Pkwy. and presented his letter of appointment to Bishop Bernard J. McLaughlin, interim administrator.

In so doing he took canonical possession of the Catholic Diocese of Buffalo. His first formal act was the reappointment of all diocesan appointments which, he said, "I do with great happiness."

This continues in office all diocesan officials.

Bishop Pius A. Benincasa and Bishop McLaughlin remain as auxiliary bishops. These papal appointments, requested by Bishop Head immediately after his appointment here, have been confirmed by Rome.

Buffalo's new bishop was welcomed by Bishop McLaughlin who presided at the consultors' session and introduced him.

After presenting his documents Bishop Head remarked: "I am now formally Bishop of Buffalo. Thank God and thank you."

As he was initially ushered into the room he remarked with good humor: "I believe everything now I've heard about your weather!"

The press was present for the proceedings for the first time in the 125-year history of the diocese.

In a statement to the media Bishop Head said: "I have a heart filled with gratitude for your warm welcome here this afternoon . . . I have a heart filled with hope—hope for and in the life we begin together today as members of the family of God in the diocese of Buffalo.

"I hope to be a source of some strength and some service to our family. I hope my joining you will make our family healthier and happier and even more secure.

"I have a heart filled with faith—faith in God and faith in you and faith in our future days together. I have faith that God is with us and I know that together with Him our family, our community, our diocese will proceed, prosper and flourish."

A raging mid-March storm which clouted much of the Great Lakes area shunted the bishop's flight from New York to Toronto. He was scheduled to deplane at 2:37 PM from American Airlines Flight 457 at Greater Buffalo International Airport.

Instead, American rerouted the plane—because of strong runway crosswinds—to Malton International Airport, Toronto. Bishop Head and his party left Toronto by car at 4:20 PM and arrived at the Peace Bridge at 6:20 PM.

At Toronto the bishop's group was met by Bishop Benincasa, Bishop McLaughlin, Msgr. Bernard D. McCarthy, diocesan chancellor, and three prominent Catholic laymen, Walter J. Steffan, Eugene F. McCarthy and Richard J. Wehle, all papal knights.

The entourage was driven to Buffalo where, at the Peace Bridge, a foreshortened motorcade met them and drove directly to the Chancery.

The prolonged, blustery snow storm canceled a considerable Buffalo airport welcome for Bishop Head which had been planned by churchmen, laymen and civic officials.

A reception was held for him in the Chancery.

FAMILY MEMBERS JOIN IN JOYFUL OCCASION

"It's a grand day for singing," said Msgr. Henry S. Kawalec, as he led the congregation in the opening hymn during the installation of Bishop Edward D. Head in St. Joseph's Cathedral.

Holding prayer books and singing along in the front center row of the cathedral was the prelate's family.

His step-mother, Mrs. Gwen Head, arrived on an early-morning flight from New York, accompanied by the bishop's brother and sister-in-law Daniel G. Head of Harrington Park, N.J., and their five children—Patti, 14; Moira, 13; Danny, 12; Charles, 10 and Eileen, 8.

It was the first trip to Buffalo for all except Mr. Head, who worked here briefly as adviser to a construction project about 17 years ago.

Patti Head, speaking for her brothers and sisters, said they hoped to come back to visit their uncle this summer.

Bishop Head's brother, Charles William Head, and wife Helen, drove here from San Antonio, Tex. They spent a few days traveling in Canada and Western New York last week.

"I'm sorry our children can't be with us," Mrs. Head said. "But our four children are grown and just couldn't get away from their work."

BISHOP WELCOMES FELLOW CLERGY OF OTHER FAITHS

(By Mary Ann Lauricella)

Minutes after Bishop Edward D. Head gave a homily saying "each man is a link in a chain, a bong of connection between persons," he left the altar and greeted Protestant and Jewish clergy seated at the front of St. Joseph's Cathedral.

Among them was Bishop Harold B. Robinson, head of the Episcopal Diocese of Western New York, whose own installation ceremonies were held in the same cathedral on Feb. 24, 1968.

"Today brings back many happy memories," said Bishop Robinson. "I hope that the fact we've shared the same church for our installations is a symbol of the close relationship Bishop Head and I will have in the years to come."

Bishop Head shook hands with Bishop Robinson and told him that his stepmother, Mrs. Gwen Head of New York, is an Episcopalian.

Two pews in the first two rows of the church were decorated with gold ribbons and reserved for the ecumenical group.

Seated there were:

Dr. Martin L. Goldberg, rabbi of Temple Beth Zion.

The Very Rev. Elton O. Smith Jr., dean of St. Paul's Cathedral.

The Rev. Carl F Burke, executive director of the Buffalo Council of Churches.

The Rev. Ralph E. Ahlberg of the United Church of Christ.

The Rev. Charles F Lamb, Disciples of Christ.

The Very Rev. Matthew J. Kubik of the Polish National Catholic Church.

The Rev. Donald S. Brown, acting interim secretary of the Presbytery of Western New York.

The Rev. Dr. Ralph W. Loew, pastor of Holy Trinity Lutheran Church.

The Rev. L. T. Boyce of the Western Baptist Association.

The Rev. Herman R. Frincke, Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

The Rev. Robert M. Ireland, St. John Lutheran Church.

The Rev. Chrysostom Maniudakis of Annunciation Hellenic Orthodox Church.

[From the Buffalo Courier Express, Mar. 20, 1973]

BISHOP HEAD INSTALLED IN SOLEMN RITES HERE—CARDINAL COOKE LEADS CEREMONY

(By Jim McAvey)

The Most Rev. Edward Dennis Head, DD, 53, was installed as the 11th bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Buffalo on Monday by Terence Cardinal Cooke in a solemn, deeply moving ceremony before 1,500 persons in St. Joseph's New Cathedral, Delaware and Utica.

During the Solemn Pontifical Mass following the installation, Bishop Head said the main function of the church in Buffalo "is simply to serve."

"Structures, institutions, facilities, schools, and hospitals, homes and orphanages are not the church in Buffalo," he said. "They are the outward signs and channels of the inner life of love that has impelled the church in Buffalo to teach, to heal, to form, to

strengthen and to serve. This is the church. It is a servant church."

The bishop noted the Buffalo Diocese encompasses the eight counties of Western New York, 6,350 square miles, 1,750,000 people of whom 931,000 are Catholics.

"That huge family is served by countless thousands of laity in all of the apostolates and in a special way by three bishops, 1,200 priests, 2,800 sisters and 100 religious brothers," he said.

THEME OF SERVICE

He said Monday, the Feast of St. Joseph, patron of the diocese, was "a most propitious day to begin our lives together."

"Joseph was a model of selfless giving, not counting costs and not expecting returns," Bishop Head said. "He served because he was impelled by love to serve. May our motives be the same."

He said each person in the diocese has "a responsibility to fulfill if we are to cooperate with God in bringing to strength and perfection the family of the church of Buffalo."

"God needs each of us today," he said. "He somehow depends on each of us and we are richly blessed indeed if only we recognize how deeply we need God and how confidently we must depend on one another."

He said he had received hundreds of letters from people in the Diocese since being appointed Bishop by Pope Paul VI on Jan. 23, 1973.

"All were warm with welcome," Bishop Head said. "Today, with great joy in my heart, I receive your warm welcome as your 11th bishop."

Cardinal Cooke, archbishop of New York, was the presiding prelate at the 2½-hour ceremony which began at 10:45 a.m.

In installing the bishop, he said, "His loving, pastoral care will reach out to touch all your lives and I have no doubt that the clergy and religious and faithful people of this church of Buffalo will grow in wisdom and grace and strength with his help and under his guidance."

BISHOP APPLAUDED

Five archbishops and 36 bishops were concelebrants of the Mass. Hundreds of clergymen and nuns, uniformed Catholic War Veterans, Knights of St. Gregory, Knights and Ladies of the Holy Sepulchre, Knights of Malta, Knights of St. John and Knights of Columbus were among the 1,500 in the Cathedral.

In the actual ceremony of installation, Cardinal Cooke placed the pastoral staff or crozier, the symbol of episcopal authority, in the bishop's hands and the bishop was seated on the canopy-covered episcopal throne. As the cardinal shook hands with the bishop the 1,500 persons in the congregation joined with the concelebrants in a rousing round of applause.

The new bishop of Buffalo wiped a tear from an eye as he rose to give his first blessing to his flock.

After the ceremony at the Cathedral, Bishop Head was honored by 2,200 persons at a banquet in Hotel Statler Hilton.

There Cardinal Cooke said the bishop was "a man who has tremendous pastoral concern."

"This is a happy day for the church in Buffalo," he said. "We have given you one of our priests whom we love very much. He has a great heart. He is a mighty wonderful bishop."

Given a standing ovation, Bishop Head expressed his gratitude "to all who have made this possible."

He said he had received over 600 personal letters over the past seven weeks from those who wished him well.

"I will remember this throughout my lifetime," Bishop Head said. "God bless you."

Bishop Head succeeds Bishop James A. McNulty who died Sept. 4, 1972.

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, the informational needs of Congress were recently discussed at the Time, Inc.-sponsored symposium on the "Role of Congress," by several authorities in and out of Congress. I introduce their comments in the RECORD and particulrly call your attention to the debate between Neil MacNeil and Senator WILLIAM SAXBE, of Ohio, moderated by Mr. Henry Grunwald.

Mr. MACNEIL. Senator, you make it sound impossible for the Congress ever to act responsibility in the tax area. It is also, as I understand it, acting irresponsibly in the appropriations area, where it never really considers the budget and there is no means for Congress to consider the budget.

Do you see no hope at all of putting the budget and the appropriations process on an intelligent basis, and in such a form that Congress will pass adequate legislation with respect to Government spending?

Senator SAXBE. I am on the Armed Services Committee, and it is our job to approve the budget for the Department of Defense. Now, this, as you know, amounts to some $87 billion; I think it was $78 and the new one is $87 billion. Now, we have a staff consisting of a total of 15 people in the Senate Armed Services Committee that is supposed to examine this. Now, it takes more money to put together the budget in the Department of Defense, and more manpower and people, than the whole cost of running the Congress of the U.S.

We have 15 people and we are supposed to take that budget apart and analyze it. I might add that most of these people are patronage people of members of the Committee, and they also have to spend a lot of their time campaigning for those members. They fetch and carry, run their offices, haul their wives around. Thus, they are not available to me as a member of that Committee.

There is one Republican staff man to whom I can go and he can point in the general direction, but that is all the help that I get as a member of the Armed Services Committee. We have this tremendous giant, the Department of Defense, spending $87 billion, coming back to the Congress where we have 15 staff members and 17 Senators, and then we are supposed to pick this budget apart. It's like trying to pick out a rate-increase request for the Bell Telephone Company. It's in there but you can't find it.

I do not see how we can do a responsible job on the budget in that way.

Now, as to the Appropriations Committee, I am not on the Appropriations Committee, but I know how they operate. They handle the entire budget. They have a staff dominated by some pros and they tell me that you have to be on there four years before you can even see the curve on the ball, because it is all handled by the staff.

Frankly, the lobbyists in Washington, as I am sure many of you know, never talk to the Senators or Representatives. People think that we are carried around on a chit all the time, and that they are wining and dining and influencing us; but they are talking to our staffs. They are talking to the staffs of these committees. This is where the work is done.

All we can do is to pick apart the more flagrant attitudes that they adopt on the policy issues and make general decisions on that, unless you count the rather breezy treatment that the budgets get on the floor. You have been there, Neil, and have seen it when appropriations bills just breezed through with not more than one or two people raising any question at all on the floor.

Sure, the picture I paint is over-emphasized, but I do this because it is impossible to give the budget the treatment that it should have today. It is impossible because, first, the Senators will not hire the staff, and there are two reasons for it. They will not put up the money to hire the staff because they are afraid it will be reflected back home; and secondly, they are afraid that they can't control it if they do put it together.

Mr. MACNEIL. I would like to pick you up on the question of the staff, and this goes to what you said earlier, and to what Charlie Jones said about the press. I find in Congress a deep distaste even to adding a single staff man to a committee, or to a Senator's or Congressman's staff, primarily because they are afraid, as you have already suggested, of what will be said about it in the press. Just last week I was faced by a group of senior congressional staff people to whom I was talking on the role of the press, and how newsmen pounce on Congress and say, what a terrible thing it is, adding a single man to a Senator's staff.

The answer for me is very simple. The problem is that when the House or the Senate does add a staff man to each member's staff, they try to sneak it through. The reporters in the gallery are long trained to this business and they do jump on Congress with respect to that but it seems to me that this is where the heart of the problem is. Congress has a staff now, I believe, of about 32,000 men and women all told, who are supposed to be riding herd on the executive staff in various departments numbering literally in the several millions. I would like to turn this back to Charlie.

Why can't case be made, open and forthright, by the Congress, that it is inadequately equipped, both in personnel and tools like computers, and to make a case that they have this enormous job to do, and come out with it forthrightly and go ahead and do it? I think with that kind of forthright approach, it would be supported by the press, certainly by the responsible press.

Dr. JONES. I think that case has to be made. I have followed this somewhat, and my impression is that the Congress has the computer capability, roughly, of the First National Bank in Kadoka, S.D. One way to increase your analytical capability without increasing the staff or matching the Executive in staff is through improving this computer facility. My impression also is, and I would like to hear from the Senator on this, that there is great resistance to that because obviously a computer-based information system is in itself a source of power, or it affects power. Certain committee chairmen and others prefer to control information.

Secondly, the Congress needs people trained to analyze these kinds of data and the kinds of material coming from the Executive. Most staff people, I think, are lawyers or journalists and not trained in analysis of quantitative data. This needs to be improved considerably.

Now, I understand that the Office of Technological Assessment will improve this somewhat, and I would like to hear the Senator on that point.

Senator SAXBE. First, on the computer attitude, you have to be able to handle information. In other words, information supplied to me as a member of a committee without staff people to handle it is not very valuable.

I have to take a curbstone opinion from somebody rather than to come up with hard facts. I notice this about people who can't afford staffs, and there are some—I know Senators, and I am sure you do, too, who employ as many as 25 additional people in their offices. These are out of their own pocket. They can afford it. They are wealthy members, members of wealthy families. They have

personal fortunes, and they can hire these people. Over the years I have observed that they are much better informed, and when they get up and talk, they know what they are talking about. They are not just curbstoning it and flying by the seat of their pants. They have hard facts that have been put together by specialists. Where I have one man on my staff who covers the Armed Services Committee, maybe they will have a half a dozen or a dozen people, and when they talk, you listen, because you know they have information.

Unless you can have something like this, a computer capability is not going to be too valuable.

Second, the membership of the staff is controlled by patronage. The other major committee I serve on is Government Operations, the McClellan committee. For years, Karl Mundt was the Senior member on that Committee. He controlled the patronage. There were two staff people who represented the minority. These were both captives of Karl Mundt. In other words, they worked in his office for him and they did not work for the membership of the Committee.

Now, you talk about adding people to the staff. I know Congressmen—to name one, Bill McCulloch, who is just retiring—who ran an office with one or two people plus his wife, who was unpaid. He worked 12 hours a day trying to keep abreast of congressional matters simply because he liked to go back home and brag that he did not spend any money. He was a tremendous Congressman and did great work, but think what he could have done if he had had adequate staff.

So you have this pressure. You also will notice the campaign issue so often used: "How many roll calls did you attend?" Well, we have a dozen roll calls a day, and most of them don't amount to a damn in the Senate. The votes are 75 to nothing. We had 400 and some roll calls last session. That's a ridiculous number of roll calls. But you made that information, indicating that you are right on the ball, you are sitting there listening—well, what it really means is that you are sleeping in the cloak room until the bell rings, and then you run out there like a fireman and vote.

Mr. GRUNWALD. Senator, I wonder whether I could bring up one point?

Moving away for a moment from the question of research facilities, I wonder whether Professor Jones would like to talk a little bit about some of the other proposals listed in his paper for making Congress more responsive and more efficient? I think you had a list of six. Don't feel compelled to go over all of them, but perhaps just one or two of the more interesting ones.

Dr. JONES. The notion behind these proposals is really to give party leaders somewhat more authority, and review what it is they do during a session.

I think particularly important is my suggestion that there be an end-of-session review. Now, I know what the response will be: "At the end of the session we want to get home." Particularly in an election year, the campaign is coming close, and the Senator is absolutely right, of course, and he should know. There's lots of time spent on campaigning, so you are anxious to get home. Indeed, the members themselves should discuss the legislative record of the party.

I happen to believe very strongly in political parties as the way to bring about some kind of accountability. If we do not do that, I cannot think of another form which it might take. As a citizen, it is impossible for me to follow 35 to 37 committees in the two Houses, if that is where the leadership is, and see what is going on. So this end-of-session review, it seems to me, would be a useful thing.

Mr. MACNEIL. The leaders of Congress right now, and for many years, have made a form of report to the membership.

Dr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MACNEIL. It is one of these self-congratulatory things.

Dr. JONES. Right.

Mr. MACNEIL. It is published as a document by the Senate and the House and mailed out under the franking privilege. That is not the sort of thing I think you are suggesting.

Dr. JONES. That is not the basis for debate.

Mr. MACNEIL. But could it be the basis of debate, this sort of a required report, which they can make now anyway, and bring it up in terms of a debate in the Senate, for example?

Dr. JONES. Well, that is what I envisage.

Mr. MACNEIL. Would you see this in the Senate or in the party caucus?

Dr. JONES. I would like to see it within the party, as a party thing, and with the press and the public available so it could be an open meeting and so as to focus attention on legislative parties, leaders and what they see as an accomplishment during the year.

Mr. MACNEIL. Senator, can I get some reaction from you on that?

Senator SAXBE. The difficulty there is, are you going to have Fritz Mondale and Sam Ervin put together a report? I mean, what is a victory for Fritz is a defeat for Sam.

We have so much disparity within the parties today, this is the reason that we can't elect a strong leader in either party, because he has to be a middle-of-the-roader who can accommodate everyone. This makes it almost impossible to do this.

Now, I think we have to hatch strong leaders, and this has to be done outside Congress. I think it is significant that the only congressional leader who has ever been a presidential candidate was Lyndon Johnson, and then he evolved as a vice-presidential candidate. Hubert Humphrey and Richard Nixon came out of the Congress, but they were not leaders in the Congress, and George McGovern, an obscure Senator, who I am sure will return to his obscurity. I think it is significant because leaders do accommodate.

Mr. MACNEIL. Leaders also, as I have experienced them, Charlie, have always hated the party caucus.

Dr. JONES. Oh, I know, especially the Democrats. Bring the Democrats together and they are likely to divide rather than unite.

Mr. MACNEIL. I know of one leader who wanted one caucus for Congress, and that was to nominate the leaders, and nothing further, because to him a party caucus was, as the Senator suggested, an invitation to tear the party apart. This was because of the divergence of views within the party. It is true in both parties.

Dr. JONES. But it is less true now than it used to be. There is more nationalization of both of the parties. There are Republicans in Congress from the South and now there are more Democrats from the Midwest in the Senate than Republicans.

There is more nationalization and I think it is possible for them to—my God, if they can't find out what each other is doing and have no interest in pulling themselves together, then, of course, it is a sad commentary, and that may be the case. It may be that Congress is on that slide down a hundred-foot razor blade, and there is no way they can pull themselves back.

Wherever you begin, some discussion should get underway in Congress. I think myself it is an outrage, as nice a man as Mike Mansfield is, he is a scholar, a marvelous man, very bright and able in many ways, but it is an outrage that we do not have public discussion and attention to the fact that he will now go in to be re-elected for what will be fourteen years, the longest that any floor leader has held that position.

It has nothing to do with his personal attributes. He is a swell guy, but there are people, Hubert Humphrey for one, who have many more leadership qualities than Mike Mansfield to pull that party together and do something with it. It is particularly critical when you have a person from the other party in the White House.

Mr. MACNEIL. My observation has been that Congress not only needs leadership, but also the leadership needs follower-ship. Could you go on with some of the other suggestions?

Dr. JONES. All right. Commission a study of the efficiency and effectiveness of the existing party structures in each house directed by an independent agent, perhaps the Brookings Institution, but including members of both parties in both houses. I do not think the members themselves many times know what either exists or potentially exists, so here would be a way of focusing attention. The idea is to begin discussion and to begin an examination. What I am proposing more than anything else is a strategy of reform rather than reform itself. Among these suggestions are:

Expansion of the Congressional Research Service and the Office of Legislative Counsel, and expanding particularly their ability to analyze data with the computer.

Establish perhaps an Office of Congressional Committee Organization and Administration to centralize just the setting up of hearings, rather than having that duplicated within each committee.

Review the existing research capabilities for congressional political parties, and possibly increase staff available for that purpose.

Make party leaders directly responsible for the use of research staff and require periodic reporting by party leaders in caucus.

Now I know all the responses as to why that should not be done. I would like to hear some discussion, if those suggestions are not useful, as to what might be done.

Senator SAXBE. I would just like to say on that, that is all quite true, but the road to hell is paved with commissions. The type of individual whom we are trying to get to put the guts into the leadership is not going to evolve from a commission. It has to be by some kind of divine guidance, or it has to emerge.

Maybe the guy has been elected this year and we do not know him yet. Perhaps he is up there now and just waiting for an opportunity to blossom.

We do need in Congress leaders who can inspire people to go along with them. Now, as you said, Mike Mansfield is a fine gentleman, but he will accommodate to everybody and he has the old-school attitude that a Senator can have his way. If a Senator wants to have two weeks delay, if he wants anything done, if he wants to hold up the appointment of a Cabinet Member or a Supreme Court Justice, he has every opportunity.

In fact, we debated the Haynsworth thing for three months and there wasn't a vote changed, I don't think. There wasn't a vote of things that delay the sessions and make them so ponderous. It is because we wish to accommodate everybody. Now, people have to be hurt sometimes, but you have to lay out a program. I think the greatest weakness is that when we start out, we don't know where we are going.

Mr. MACNEILL. Senator, I would like to pick you up on something you once said to me. I believe you were referring at that time to Senator Kennedy on the floor. Senator Kennedy is noted for the excellence of his staff, and you felt that in combating him on the floor you were fighting with sticks. This relates to something that Charlie has just suggested, which is increasing the capabilities of the Legislative Research Service.

One of the most interesting things to me going on now, and which has been going on for a long time, is the comparison of the American Congress with the British Parliament. This started back in the book Charlie refered to, Woodrow Wilson's *Congressional Government*. He was a great admirer of the British System and he wanted to develop the American Congress into a British Parliament.

The reasons why that is simply impossible

are too many to go into here, but among others there is no independence allowed the British M.P.

It seems to me, however, that there are things to be learned on both sides here. I think it is fascinating that a book has been published this year, written not by an American but by two Englishmen, both Deputy Clerks of the House of Commons. It is a clinical comparison between the American Congress and the British Parliament. The English are exceptionally interested in the strengths of the American Congress, in some of the techniques, primarily the American standing committee system, a system which provides a body of informed knowledge in specified jurisdictions. They are thinking in terms of adopting something like that for the use of Parliament. But on their side, I think anyone who has ever visited Parliament during question period sees the brilliance of the British parliamentary system at its best. They do not often know that what has happened. When the question is put to the Minister, it has been laid down a couple of days in advance and his brilliant reply has been prepared, not by the brilliant Minister, but by a brilliant staff of the Parliament's Civil Service.

Why can't we in America develop such a professional competence, professional competence for a staff for the American Congress, so you won't have to fight with sticks?

THE $1 CHECKOFF

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) and 39 other cosponsors in introducing legislation requiring the Internal Revenue Service to place the $1 tax checkoff for the Presidential election campaign fund on the front page of the individual taxpayer's tax return form. Our bill would also require the IRS to publicize extensively this new procedure for financing Presidential election campaigns.

A companion measure, introduced by my colleague from Minnesota, Senator WALTER MONDALE, and 21 cosponsors, is pending in the Senate.

When Congress authorized the checkoff in 1971, we intended it to be placed on the front of each tax return. But last year we discovered that IRS had prepared a separate form, known as form 4875, which was included in the packet of tax material mailed to taxpayers in January.

Those people who received their forms in the mail may have found Form 4875 buried in their packets. But those who must obtain their tax materials from banks and post offices are having difficulty locating the new form. A spot check of eight tax forms dispensing sites in the Washington area, for example, showed that it was not available at any of the eight locations. A member of my staff was able to obtain the form only at the main headquarters of the Internal Revenue Service on 12th and Constitution NW.

Because the $1 checkoff has been all but ignored by the IRS, it is understandable that only about 4 percent of taxpayers filing returns this year have made use of it. Unless the rate of response improves, the new law will fail to achieve its purpose. Ten to fifteen percent of all taxpayers will have to use the checkoff every year up to 1976 in order to provide each major party with the $20 to $22 million it is authorized to receive under the 1971 act.

By now it is clear that the Nixon administration would just as soon see the whole system fail. President Nixon said as much when he signed the checkoff bill into law.

Despite the opposition from the administration, we must enable the checkoff to succeed. It represents one of the most important political reforms of the last 50 years and it could very well democratize the entire campaign spending process. The checkoff means that for the first time political parties can raise the money they need from average citizens. No longer will they have to rely on the special interests as they have done in the past.

Hopefully, our bill will be one small but significant way of helping to insure that the checkoff will be successful.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 6030

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the designation of payments to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund be made on the front page of the taxpayer's income tax return form, and for other purposes

SEC. 1. (a) section 6096 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the manner and time of designation) is amended by inserting after "any taxable year" the following: "on the first page of an individual's income tax return form."

(b) the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall give extensive publicity to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund from January 1 to April 15 of each year, including prominent notice in explanatory material sent to individuals, posters, and the use of radio, television, newspapers, and other media. This publicity shall emphasize that the designation provided for in section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 does not increase an individual's tax liability.

(b) Subsection (a) shall take effect upon the date of enactment of this Act.

The list of cosponsors include JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, FRANK J. BRASCO, GEORGE E. BROWN, BILL D. BURLISON, PHILLIP BURTON, CHARLES J. CARNEY, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, JOHN CONYERS, JR., JOHN CULVER, RONALD V. DELLUMS, RON DE LUGO, JOHN DENT, ROBERT F. DRINAN, DON EDWARDS, JOSHUA EILBERG, DONALD FRASER, ROBERT N. GIAIMO, HENRY HELSTOSKI, ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, WILLIAM LEHMAN, PAUL N. MCCLOSKEY, RAY J. MADDEN, JOE MOAKLEY, ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, JOHN E. MOSS, WAYNE OWENS, CLAUDE PEPPER, J. J. PICKLE, BERTRAM L. PODELL, RICHARDSON PREYER, THOMAS M. REES, DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, PAUL S. SARBANES, B. F. SISK, JAMES W. SYMINGTON, FRANK THOMPSON, JR., CHARLES H. WILSON, LESTER L. WOLFF, ANTONIO BORJA WON PAT.

PUBLICITY FOR $1 CHECKOFF

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to sponsor a bill which will require the Internal Revenue Service to publicize the $1 checkoff for the Presidential election campaign fund and to place the checkoff on the front page of the individual taxpayer's return.

Recognizing the dangers to democracy of large private campaign contributions, the Congress voted in 1971 to allow every taxpayer voluntarily to designate $1 of his income tax to a Presidential election campaign fund.

The 1971 act authorized $20 to $21 million to each major party, subject to the use of the checkoff by a sufficient number of taxpayers. Given the widespread public awareness of the unhealthy influence of special interests in our Government today, there is no doubt in my mind that the citizens will broadly support this method of public financing of political campaigns. Yet initial returns filed this year indicate that only about 4 percent of the taxpayers are using the checkoff.

I believe that much of the difference between expectation and performance is attributable to the unnecessary concealment of the checkoff. It is not prominently displayed on the front of the Form 1040, as was clearly intended, nor has it been adequately publicized. Rather, it is a separate form—Form 4875—enclosed at the back of the package sent to some taxpayers and not available at all to others.

The tax checkoff for political campaigns is one of the most far-reaching electoral reforms that has been adopted in many years. To the extent that public financing of campaigns replaces private contributions, the public will be heard at the highest levels of our Government. In the words of the senior Senator from Minnesota, who is introducing this bill in the Senate,

The check-off system will effectively divorce presidential politics from the corrosive influence of big money and special interests.

Mr. Speaker, this should not be a partisan issue. Responsible Members of both parties are aware of the conflicts of interest which have been caused by relying on private gifts to finance political campaigns. Both parties, and above all the public, stand to gain from the elimination of this distortion of the democratic process.

The bill we are introducing requires that, starting next year, the $1 checkoff appear on the front page of each taxpayer's return. In addition, it requires the Internal Revenue Service to give extensive publicity to the provision, with due emphasis on the fact that a dollar contributed to the Presidential election campaign fund does not cost the taxpayer anything extra.

STATEMENTS OF POW'S

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr.

Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that the press, in covering the return of American prisoners of war, has focused on what some people regard as superpatriotic statements being made by some of our POW's as they step off the planes returning them to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I do not find these statements at all surprising, and I feel that the press does us a disservice when reporters give these statements such intensive and repeated coverage.

I would ask those who have attached great significance to these statements to remember that most of these POW's left this country during a period when public sentiment about American policy in Southeast Asia was substantially different from the views which have developed on a large scale within the last few years. These men were not exposed to the 1968 Presidential campaigns of Eugene McCarthy and Robert Kennedy. They did not see and hear Walter Cronkite and other highly respected American news reporters telling them about the My Lai massacre. They have not been through the experience, as we have, of finding out through the New York Times and Washington Post excerpts from the Pentagon Papers that top U.S. Government officials lied to the American people consistently during the course of our deepening involvement in Indochina in the 1960's. And so, quite naturally, their views on our policy in that part of the world reflect the views which predominated during that earlier period of limited public awareness.

Anyone analyzing the statements of these POW's must also take into account the atmosphere in which those statements were made. Stop to imagine for a moment the emotions which these men must feel as they step off those planes to freedom. They have been kept in what most Americans would regard as primitive, dirty conditions for years, away from their wives, parents and children. Suddenly, the U.S. military forces appear and remove them from captivity, giving these men clean clothes, their favorite American foods, and total red-carpet treatment. Upon arriving in the United States, during the euphoria that surrounds their reunification with their loved ones, a reporter approaches them with a microphone and asks how they feel to be back in the United States.

Under such circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it would be highly unlikely that anyone would respond with a statement critical of either the military or the administration, both of whom would be perceived as responsible for this homecoming. I do not believe we should interpret proadministration or promilitary statements at the airports as deep intellectual expressions of political positions, but rather as deep emotional expressions of joy and gratitude. I am sure that all of us would be just as enthusiastic under similar circumstances.

As the euphoria evaporates, however, and these men adjust to being home, I believe that many of them will make political statements. I believe that these statements will reflect the broad diversity of opinions which we find among the public as a whole today about our policies in Southeast Asia. A very few such statements have already begun to appear, and I would like to share with our colleagues an article from the Los Angeles Times of March 8 which reveals what we may find to be a view held by a significant number of our returned men. This article, written by the Sacramento staff of United Press International, reports the viewpoints of Maj. Hubert K. Flesher, a career Air Force fighter pilot shot down in 1966. I commend UPI's reporters for taking the trouble to write about this side of the story as well as the more commonly reported side, and I recommend the article to every Member of this body. The article follows:

UNITED STATES FAILED TO WIN VIET GOALS, EX-POW AVERS—SAYS AMERICA BUTTED INTO CIVIL WAR AND ACCEPTED TERMS OFFERED 4 YEARS AGO

SACRAMENTO.—A career Air Force officer, who was a captive of the North Vietnamese, said Wednesday the United States butted its "nose into somebody else's business," wound up settling for what the Communists offered four years ago and did not win the war.

In fact, he said, America may have lost the war.

"It was a conflict between the Vietnamese people and whether you like it or not it should have been theirs to decide. I think more and more people came to realize this," said Maj. Hubert K. Flesher, 40, a fighter pilot who was a prisoner of war more than six years.

"Many of us came to believe that possibly we had asserted our noses into somebody else's business."

OPINIONS CLASH

Flesher, a 20-year Air Force veteran who intends to remain in the military, expressed a view different from those of former POWs who have agreed with President Nixon that the United States won a "peace with honor."

"I don't think we really won the war at all," he told newsmen.

"If we expected a South Vietnam that essentially belonged to us, that was in our camp, then we certainly lost the war."

He added: "It wasn't ours to win in the first place."

Flesher said, "Anyone who has looked at the peace terms" can see that the Communists obtained "exactly what they asked for" in 1969, Mr. Nixon's first year in office.

"They asked for complete, total withdrawal of U.S. forces, a complete halt of air activity over all of Vietnam, the stopping of support of the government of South Vietnam and for elections. Christ Almighty, in looking at the peace terms and everything, that's exactly what they got."

The major said there were "a lot of arguments with a lot of the guys" in prison about the war.

"There was a split," he said. "There were the superpatriots who felt we should be in there killing them by the thousands, as opposed to another faction that felt, generally speaking, that the bombing and that sort of thing was not doing any good."

Asked about amnesty, Flesher said; "I'm not opposed to it. There were a lot of young men who were honestly opposed to this war and were not able or willing to have themselves involved in a situation where possibly they would be killing other people for a cause they didn't believe in."

"I'm not bitter about these people," he added. "It certainly would not make me angry to see these people back home and fitted back into American society."

Flesher was not happy about the prospect of spending huge sums to rebuild North Vietnam.

"If those are the terms of the agreement, I suppose we should live up to them, but we have so much to do right here," he said. "The big thing now that this war is over, instead of squandering our money someplace else, is to start spending it on our truly essential problems."

Flesher, who was shot down in December, 1966, also said without elaboration that "there would be some action" by a few prisoners against fellow POWs because of the activities in confinement.

And he said "there were a great number of people (POWs) who had the opportunity to come home early" with peace groups but declined. He did not elaborate.

Flesher was in the first group of prisoners to be released from North Vietnam. He now is back with his wife of 19 years in their home in Rancho Cordova, a Sacramento suburb.

Flesher said "generally the motivations involved in this conflict were honest. However, we got ourselves involved in a revolutionary war similar to what this country went through in 1776."

He said many people liked to compare the Vietnam war with World War II. "But they are entirely different," he said, "Adolf Hitler was invading countries with foreign troops. There were no foreign troops in Vietnam except Americans and the people who were in our camp."

TIGER CAGES RESTRICT PEACE POSSIBILITY

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of civilian political prisoners in South Vietnam has existed for as long as the war itself. However, what is happening at present with these civilian detainees is almost beyond comprehension.

It is becoming quite apparent that the Thieu regime is not only continuing its longstanding policies of torture against its political prisoners, but it is also now trying to deny their existence. All evidence coming out of South Vietnam demonstrates that political prisoners are now being detained on phony criminal charges so they will not have to be released in accordance with the terms of the peace agreement. In addition to being unlawfully detained, these prisoners are still being subjected to the same type of barbarous treatment that was publicized in 1970 during the discovery of the tiger cages on Con Son Island.

The estimates of the number of these political prisoners range from 50,000 to 200,000. Yet the Thieu regime recently stated that they hold "no political prisoners, only common criminals and Communist criminals." The making of such a statement is an act of complete hypocrisy. It is now evident that Saigon is reclassifying as criminals those people whose only crime has been opposing the leadership of President Thieu.

My reason for discussing this present practice of the Saigon government is not simply moral, although all decent men should be outraged at this perversion of justice. But there is a practical reason as well—the desire for peace.

According to the peace agreement, the question of detained Vietnamese civilian personnel is to be resolved by the Vietcong and South Vietnam within 90 days. Unless the Thieu regime immediately retreats from its cruel and deceptive policy, the cease-fire will surely fail. To expect the Vietcong to tolerate Saigon's practices on this crucial issue would be extremely naive.

At present, the Nixon administration is giving its tacit consent to this policy of brutality and repression, and, in doing so, it too is jeopardizing the slim chances for peace in Southeast Asia.

The U.S. Government is directly responsible for the implementation of President Thieu's repressive policies. Our public safety program, which is ending on March 28, has supplied over $50 million worth of aid to the two South Vietnamese agencies that have been responsible for capturing and holding political prisoners: the police force and the prison systems.

The facilities that are now used to detain these innocent civilians were built and financed by American labor and money. It hurts me deeply to remind this body that the tiger cages that are presently on Con Son Island, cages that were installed after the discovery of the original cages in June 1970, were built by an American company under a Department of the Navy contract.

Just as the United States has been responsible for the initiation and continuation of Thieu's policy of political repression, it should also be responsible for ending it.

President Nixon feels that he is justified in warning Hanoi about possible cease-fire violations concerning movement of troops and material. I call upon the President to tell Saigon to stop these hideous practices of brutality and repression towards its political prisoners, and enter into negotiations with the Vietcong in good faith. The interests of not only these thousands of unfortunate Vietnamese are at stake, but also the chances for a successful cease-fire and a lasting peace.

ASSINIBOINE AND SIOUX NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PROGRAM IN MONTANA RATED TOP IN THE NATION

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Department of Labor has contracted with Systems Research, Inc., to survey the most successful of the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs for development of a how-to-do-it manual. This survey identified the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribe NYC at Poplar, Mont., as the top program in the Nation and its know-how will contribute significantly to the development of this manual.

I am proud of the outstanding achievements of this program. Therefore, I am dismayed that the President's 1974 budget calls for phasing out NYC as we know it. NYC apparently will be folded into a special manpower revenue sharing program without the advice or approval of Congress. What becomes of NYC at Poplar and in other localities of the country is now in doubt. Surely, the good results of NYC should not be shrugged off and shelved.

I would like to share the letter sent to the Assiniboine-Sioux NYC program director, Lanny Frantzick, advising him of their program's placement as the top in the Nation.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION,
Denver, Colo., Feb. 26, 1973.

Mr. LANNY G. FRANTZICK,
Assiniboine & Sioux Tribe,
Poplar, Mt.

DEAR MR. FRANTZICK: A recent survey of all Neighborhood Youth Corps In-School programs was conducted by Systems Research, Incorporated, under contract to the U.S. Department of Labor.

The purpose of the survey was to identify the most successful and innovative programs in the nation which could contribute useful information towards the development of a "how-to-do-it" manual.

The analysis of the information received placed the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribe NYC Program as the top program in the nation. As a result of this, a staff member of Systems Research Incorporated will be contacting you to arrange for an on-site visit in March which will last about two days and will generally require the participation of the project director.

I congratulate you and your staff on this outstanding accomplishment. It is a direct reflection on the quality of your program.

FRANK A. POTTER,
Regional Manpower Administrator.

U.S. CANAL ZONE AND PANAMA CANAL: UNAUTHORIZED COMMITMENTS FOR SURRENDER MUST BE DISAVOWED BY THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, news from Panama City, Republic of Panama, published today is to the effect that U.S. Ambassador John A. Scali at the U.N. Security Council on March 20, 1973, announced without congressional authorization the readiness of the United States to cede substantial parts of the U.S. Canal Zone to the Republic of Panama and to make other U.S. commitments to that country in relation to the future of the Panama Canal. This official, acting on behalf of the executive branch of our Government, has exceeded the limits of that agency's authority as regards the disposal of U.S. territory and property, which power is vested in the Congress—article IV, section 3, clause 2, U.S. Constitution.

The Congress in 1902 authorized the President to acquire by treaty in perpetuity what is now the U.S. Canal Zone and to construct, maintain, and operate the Panama Canal. It has not authorized the disposal of this part of our sovereign domain and the people of our country are overwhelmingly opposed to any territorial or other surrender of our sovereign rights, power, or authority over the zone territory.

As I have stated on other occasions, the United Nations has no authority to intervene in the domestic affairs of the United States. The indicated actions of Ambassador Scali reveal that the strategy of certain executive officials is to commit the United States to a policy of surrender at the present U.N. Security Council sessions to such an extent that the United States could not retract lest our Government look ridiculous in so-called world opinion. Such strategy would serve to give the United Nations jurisdiction over U.S. Panama Canal policy. In its effect, such action is extremely harmful and will be so recognized by growing numbers of our citizens from various parts of the Nation.

To alert the President with the gravity of the situation, on March 21 I sent him the following telegram:

MARCH 21, 1973.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

Press reports this date stated Ambassador John A. Scali, without the authority of the Congress, announced to the U.N. Security Council in Panama the readiness of our Government to make substantial surrenders of the U.S.-owned Canal Zone territory and Panama Canal and other concessions to Panama. The power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States is vested in the Congress and this agency, which is the ultimate authority in canal policy, has never authorized such concessions, which commitments are beyond the limits of Executive authority.

As a student of Panama Canal history over many years and close observer of interoceanic canal problems, I cannot stress too strongly the imperative necessity for retention of U.S. undiluted sovereignty over the Canal Zone and urge you to promptly disavow the indicated actions of Ambassador Scali, which are a direct challenge to congressional authority in Isthmian policy matters.

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

SUPREME COURT WRONG ON SCHOOL FINANCING

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court yesterday handed down a most unfortunate decision. The Court ruled that the traditional method of financing public schools—the local property tax—did not violate the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

The Court has recently produced a number of fine opinions which were both legally and socially desirable, most notably those involving abortion and capital punishment. But the five members who voted in the majority yesterday apparently share the Nixon administration's laissez faire attitude toward matters regarding wealth and poverty. This attitude can be summed up in a single sentence: "If you're poor, it's your own fault, and you'll just have to suffer the consequences." The Court seems willing to apply the equal protection clause to most other types of discrimination—but not

to distinctions based on a person's wealth.

There can be no doubt that financing education through local property taxes is an invidious discrimination in violation of the Constitution. In Baldwin Park, a lower-class suburb of Los Angeles, this method can raise only $700 per child, while in Beverly Hills, a few miles away, the town spends $1,800 on each student—and this revenue is raised on a tax rate only half that of Baldwin Park's. Obviously, then, wealthy cities are going to have better schools than poorer communities. This system is totally incompatible with the traditional American belief in equal opportunity for all people, regardless of wealth.

The majority held that education is not a fundamental right under the Constitution, and that any change in school financing systems would have to come from the legislative branch. We have heard this "cop out" all too often. One of America's most distinguished jurists, Justice Mathew Tobriner of the California Supreme Court, recently wrote:

The suggestion that those who seek to change conditions in modern America ought to turn to legislative bodies, rather than to the courts, necessarily rests on the notion that the reforms sought by the young today can be achieved only by the adoption of new, revolutionary legislative programs. But a major part of this dissatisfaction stems not so much from a disagreement with the basic principles of our institutions, but rather with the failure of the society uninformly to adhere to those principles, a failure to afford existing legal rights uniformly to all members of society. . . .

Mr. Speaker, in view of yesterday's decision, the Congress should move at once to study the entire crucial issue of financing education in this country. At the same time, however, I wish to express my own view that the courts should not shrink from their responsibility to insure that all types of discrimination—including discrimination based on wealth—shall be eliminated. I would like at this point to include the article by Justice Tobriner, which was published in the California State Bar Journal for June–July 1972:

THROUGH THE COURTS?*

(By Mathew O. Tobriner)

To realize that the law reflects the society which it governs and that the society, in turn, reflects its law, one need only to glance briefly at the course of history. The societies of the past have left architectural monuments that are grand evidence of the integration of society and law. Only a few weeks ago I looked from my hotel window at Athens across the flatroofed city to the balanced columns of the Parthenon and the Erectheum. They surely spoke the balance that was the essence of ancient Greek society—a society that rested upon status, a society in which each person, slave and freeman, was born into, and assigned for life, a special place.

Perhaps the buttresses and finespun intricacy of a Notre Dame or Westminster, coordinating into the Gothic harmony and unity of the whole structure, typify the unifying and dominant role of the feudal church. And, perhaps too, the jagged skyline of New York symbolizes the dynamism, as well as the confusion, of American society. I submit that the monuments declare that the architecture, art, culture, expressions and law of a society interrelate, affect each other, and, in a subtle way, form and create each other.

POLITICS—OR LAW?

How strange it is, then, to hear it said that young lawyers should not expect to bring about improvement in our society through the practice of law but that they should go "into politics" rather than "into law."[1] How questionable is the criticism that courts have overreached themselves in responding to social need; that courts should be "passive," not "active" in ruling upon crucial questions.

In my view such criticism and advice, however well intentioned, is ill-conceived; law, as an instrument of social control, must, by necessity, respond to the emerging pressures for change within our society, and, if the legal system is to remain viable in the face of today's rapidly shifting mores, we acutely need the advocates of change.

SPIRIT OF THE TIMES

History has demonstrated that the effective court is the one that correctly interprets the spirit of its time. In this regard, the common characterization of courts as either "passive" or "active" is naively misleading; no matter which way a court rules on a particular issue, its decision inevitably affects the contemporary society.

The vice of the United States Supreme Court of the 1920's and early '30's was not that it was either too active or too passive, but that it failed to understand the spirit of its time and retreated into doctrinal rigidity, a rigidity which prohibited all realistic attempts to solve the debilitating problems of that day. The legal profession as a whole, and particularly the young lawyers who are most directly in touch with the emerging needs of society, bear a heavy responsibility to ensure that the legal system does not similarly falter today—or tomorrow.

The suggestion that those who seek to change conditions in modern America ought to turn to legislative bodies, rather than to the courts, necessarily rests on the notion that the reforms sought by the young today can be achieved only by the adoption of new, revolutionary legislative programs. But a major part of this dissatisfaction stems not so much from a disagreement with the basic principles of our institutions, but rather with the failure of the society uniformly to adhere to those principles, a failure to afford existing legal rights equally to all members of society—poor, as well as rich, black, brown and yellow, as well as white, female as well as male, the individual consumer as well as the corporate producer.

OUTRAGED SOCIETY

Like the current disaffection with American foreign policy in Vietnam, much of the outrage with the realities of our domestic society derives not from a rejection of the stated goals of current leadership—who among us disagrees with the stated aim of "a generation of peace" or of "equal educational opportunity for all"—but from a realization that in practical terms we pay only lip service to these high-sounding ideals, that the action taken by our society speaks louder than its idealistic claims.

For all too long, legal principles of theoretically general application have in practice been reserved only to those whose wealth, or political power, or acumen, secured effective legal representation. Today, with the emergence of local legal aid and public defender offices, and various public interest law firms, to represent both distinct minority groups and the public interest, these general legal principles are fortunately becoming available for the first time to large segments of our people.

Perhaps the most visible evidence of the efficacy of this movement to date are the successful legal actions which have been prosecuted by local poverty lawyers against a broad range of federal and state agencies, requiring a multitude of welfare agencies, housing authorities, highway commissions and the like, to comply with applicable constitutional, statutory or regulatory provisions. Such litigation, in requiring recalcitrant agencies to follow through—in practical, day-to-day terms—with the promises of reform legislation, is essential to the translation of statutory enactment into radical change in the actual operation of government.

PLIANT SOCIETY

Indeed, those who would negate the role of the courts in altering society overlook significant legal trends in diverse fields. The society in which courts now function is in the throes of accommodating itself on the industrial side to the computer and the conglomerate, to mechanized production and monopoly management; our society, in the social and political spheres, is tearing away obsolete cultural patterns and attempting to design new democratic procedures for the poor, the minorities and the neglected. The combination of the demand for fair treatment for minority segments and the need to preserve the individual rights of all, has led in the face of an expanding mass technology, to deep changes in the law of today and portends even more radical changes that will come with the law of tomorrow.

LISTENING TO ALL

In specific areas of the law the courts have recognized that the principles of equal protection of the law and due process of law have in the past shed their light largely upon the mansions of the established and not upon the squalid quarters of the poor. The principle that significant rights should not be annulled without the chance of the deprived at least to be heard has now been applied to the economically disinherited. First, the United States Supreme Court extended that right to the worker whose wages were attached, then to the procedure of claim and delivery and to the attachment of necessities. Recently the United States Supreme Court has said that the loss of a driver's license works a crucial denial in a day when a car may be necessary for access to a job; the high court held that the drivers involved in an accident must be heard before the license is cancelled.

But beyond this area there are those where the light of due process has fallen only in part and where large expanses still lie in darkness. The student of the public university gets the right to be heard before he is expelled, but what of the student of the private university? May the tenant of the public housing project be ejected without a hearing? May the public employee otherwise fit for the job be arbitrarily suspended or discharged? And, turning to the most forlorn and forgotten class of all—the prisoner—does he get the right of due process before his parole is revoked or before he is condemned to the torture of the isolation cell?

* I am indebted to Harold Cohen of the California Bar for invaluable help in preparing this paper.

[1] See, e.g., Interview with Chief Justice Warren Burger, N.Y. Times, July 4, 1971, § 1, pp. 1, 20: "Young people who decide to go into the law primarily on the theory that they can change the world by litigation in the courts I think may be in for some disappointments. It is not the right way to make the decision to go into the law, and that is not the route by which basic changes in a country like ours should be made. That is a legislative and policy process, part of the political process. And there is a very limited role for the courts in this respect."

JOB AND SHELTER

And far beyond the areas where the grey light of due process partially reaches, lie the lands of total night: the private tenant, the individual employee of the huge corporation; does he have the right to be heard before he loses his shelter or his job?

And so the light of due process, as a realistic protection of the economically weak reaches only so far and awaits the possible extension of the future.

Let me submit another illustrative field: the readjustment of the relationship between the consumer and the producer. We have taken the giant step of ruling that the producer is strictly liable to the consumer for injuries caused by the defective product. We have taken another step: that the consumer class in the field of insurance should have the right to that kind of insurance that the carrier has led him reasonably to expect. We are experimenting with class actions to provide a realistic access to the process of the law for the individual consumer. This emerging right of consumer protection awaits further articulation by the courts.

SOCIAL READJUSTMENT

Yet the examples given above—few as compared to the number available—show the courts are capable of creative judicial response to pressures for readjustment of societal relationships, and that reform of society need not be confined to legislative halls. In recent years the judicial system has proven itself capable of grasping the significant movements that have changed the complexion of our culture, and of shaping legal relationships to accommodate new social patterns and to preserve cherished freedoms. In the near future there will be, if anything, an increasing need that the demands for social reform—and even for social "revolution"—be pressed in the judicial sphere and framed in the context of legal relationships.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACH

In sum, I must completely disagree with those who would encourage all reformers of society to abandon the legal profession and "to stick to politics." It is true, of course, that given the widespread deficiencies of our present society many of the future solutions to our problems should come in the form of new imaginative legislative programs. But the genius of our judicial system lies in its capacity to function as an alternative, complementary institution in reformulating the framework of society's rules to achieve newly-embraced values and goals. To close this path now, when the call for reform is ever rising and when the need for change is increasingly clear, would place an intolerable strain upon our current governmental system. Those who would steer reformers away from the courts may be unwittingly condemning the disadvantaged and disaffected in our society—groups largely unrepresented in the political process—to "take to the streets" as the only viable solution to their problems.

Thus the Parthenons of the law are yet to be built; the spires on the legal Notre Dames and Westminsters will yet pierce the skies of America. There is so much to be done; so many searing problems to be solved. The Cassandras that cry that our society is beyond hope of further achievement and that revolution must level the structure, ignore the fact that ours is a dynamic, not a decadent country. No iron shadow of dictator or colonel falls across our pathway to tomorrow.

Young lawyers will probe, question and challenge the legal rules and the mores of the day. They will challenge outmoded doctrines; they will bring to light the need of legal adjustment of socially intolerable conditions; they will press for the acceptance of new social values.

AMNESTY AND CONFLICTS IN LOYALTIES

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the news media have recently and often reported various comments on the idea of amnesty for those who escaped military service when called upon to render such service in the Vietnam war. Some well-known people have been quoted in favor of amnesty for all such persons, while the vast majority of Americans, according to every poll that I have seen, are opposed to the idea.

Since it is obvious that amnesty, if applied to all such persons, would be treating alike people who have done very different things, it is clear to me that any such broad amnesty would be an act of thoughtless injustice. Among those involved there might be some who are guilty of treason, as well as others who have committed no great crime. The truth of the matter is that there are adequate laws on the books today to provide for justice for all according to what each individual did or did not do. These laws existed at the time when the acts were committed. There is no reason to think that these laws would be unmercifully or thoughtlessly imposed on any individual.

One often hears from those who advocate amnesty that many young people found the Vietnam war so abhorrent that for them military service in it was in conflict with their loyalty to the principles upon which they had based their lives. So with them this loyalty was in conflict with their loyalty to their country, or so it has been said.

I am reminded from my experiences, years ago as an infantry platoon leader in World War II in the South Pacific, that it became my judgment from that experience that the two qualities of character, loyalty and honesty, were more important to seek in new replacements who came to the platoon than any specific knowledge which those replacements might have in the use of the bayonet, the grenade, or the rifle. Those matters of knowledge could be acquired in a short period of time, but those qualities of character could not.

Think with me for a few minutes about what men give loyalty to. There is, of course, a loyalty to things. In a child this may express itself in loyalty to a doll, a baseball bat, or something of that sort. For older people it may be money, antiques, animal pets, or a variety of other things. These loyalties are surely less noble than loyalty to people.

When I think of loyalty to people, I immediately think of Andrew Jackson for whom my hometown was named, Jacksonville, Fla. I recall that it is said that when he was elected to the Presidency there were many unkind things spoken about his wife Rachel. And I remember having read that his strong and vigorous support of her, and his complete loyalty to her, put to shame all of these detractors.

Loyalty to people was one of the finest qualities of the late President Harry S Truman, who was elected to the Presidency in the same election in which I was first elected to Congress. I well remember his comment when his beloved mother was ill in Missouri and he left Washington to be at her bedside for some considerable length of time. This was despite the disapproval of a number of people who publicly commented upon it. President Truman said at that time of his mother:

> She sat up with me many times when I needed her, and I want to reciprocate when she needs me. Whenever she wakes up she wants to talk to me. I want to be there.

Hopefully, most of us are loyal to our friends. Sometimes there have been illustrations of loyalty to people even where there was no close association or friendship. I am reminded of Sir Walter Scott's loyalty to his creditors when he amassed a staggering financial obligation and instead of taking bankruptcy proceeded to apply himself with Herculean diligence in his work as a writer. Some of his greatest classics were thus produced—a good example of serendipity.

A third type of loyalty, loyalty to country, is perhaps what most people think about when they think about the term "loyalty." My favorite statue in Washington, D.C., is a simple and unpretentious statue, but one which never fails to inspire me. It is that of Nathan Hale. There he stands on Constitution Avenue with his head lifted in the sun, his hands tied behind him, and his noble remark as he approached his execution carved there for all today to read: his regret that he had but one life to give for his country.

Some of our heroes, such as George Washington, showed loyalty to country by years of combat in arms. And in the War Between the States a loyalty to the Union was thus ably demonstrated by Gen. U. S. Grant; and correspondingly a loyalty to the Confederacy and to Virginia was ably demonstrated by Gen. Robert E. Lee.

Even in the beginning days of our country loyalty to the country had illustrations in other things than combat. Thomas Jefferson showed it when he insisted that the Bill of Rights be put into the Constitution, when the Constitutional Convention had omitted those basic principles. Benjamin Franklin showed it in the Constitutional Convention, when he offered a prayer of conciliation at a time when it looked as if a meeting of the minds among the various colonies was improbable.

All countries have their heroes who have well demonstrated loyalty to those countries in diverse ways. For examples: Joan of Arc of France, Rizal of the Phillipines, Bruce of Scotland, Victoria and Churchill of England.

We have discussed loyalty to things, to people, and to country and yet there is another level of loyalty, loyalty to principles. Immediately, there comes to mind the childhood legend of George Washing-

ton and the cherry tree and his insistence upon complete honesty, the most important quality of public life.

Years ago I knew a fine woman, Jane Addams, who became famous as the founder of Hull House in Chicago; and she became famous because she turned her back upon the wealth and the prominence that she could have selfishly enjoyed and instead dedicated herself to the service of those in need. I am reminded also of the principle of cleanliness in all things as it was personified and utilized in the achievements of Florence Nightingale and Dr. Joseph Priestly.

Admittedly, the highest loyalty of all is the fifth loyalty which I will mention: loyalty to God. Deep in my mind is the picture of George Washington kneeling in prayer at Valley Forge; and the memory of Lincoln's words about how he often found himself kneeling in prayer for guidance in the troubled times of our Nation in its bloody Civil War. He said:

> Many times I have been driven to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go.

Along with these historic scenes I remember from my young manhood the first house party that I ever participated in and, particularly, the event which made it memorable. That was when one of the young men on that house party kneeled at his bed to say his prayers as we went to sleep. That took courage then; and it would today as well. It showed a real loyalty to God.

It may be well to think for a while about how we experience loyalty today in this country.

Our loyalty to things in this country is outstanding. We produce more things than any other country in the world. In the last 150 years, we in the United States have produced more things than the rest of the world has done in 1,000 years. We even export more foods, when only 2 percent of our population are farmers. Ninety percent of foods sent abroad in relief measures come from the United States.

In the United States we have the largest buildings, the most millionaires, the biggest yachts, the most automobiles, the most trains, the most telephones, and the largest incinerators. One hundred years ago we had a 70-hour workweek. It is now down to 40 and going lower. The 5-day workweek has even now decreased in many areas to 4 days. Yet we produce three times as much per worker—by aid of machines—as we did a century ago. The computer will escalate this even more.

Yes, we have shown a great loyalty to things in America. But there is room for improvement even in this area. We need to improve the quality of our craftsmanship and to be sure of the utility of our products and to improve the level of individual productivity on the part of every worker.

How are we with regard to our loyalty to people? We do surely have our heroes, present and past, in athletics, entertainment, politics, and in a variety of other human endeavors. But our domestic loyalty has not always earned a good rating, for instance when one of every three of our marriages today ends up in divorce and many existing marriages are not what they should be. Our loyalty in business relationships could be improved. There are too many bankruptcies. And there is not enough loyalty from employee to employer or from employer to employee in too many areas of production and business.

As to loyalty to country, the average American is characteristically loyal, perhaps even intensely loyal. Yet the trials, strains, and stresses of an unpopular war such as the Vietnam war have surfaced disloyalty among more people than we like to admit.

In many quarters it is considered clever or intelligent to say that our country was selfishly pursuing the war in South Vietnam, when any thoughtful person can hardly escape the fact that our country had no avarice, but only sought to protect a small nation from aggression when we were called by that small nation to assist them in accordance with a treaty we had duly signed.

I would be the first to concede that many political mistakes were made in the conduct of that war, but I cannot concede that the United States had motives as a nation which were other than honorable in the sacrifices that were made by our country and its people in this war.

There are other ways besides fighting a war to show loyalty to one's country, as important as it may be to fight the war for one's country when asked to do so. Ways to serve our country are to help to bring about a higher level of education, greater job oportunities, and to fight against poverty and deprivation, and discrimination wherever unjustly imposed.

The average man or woman may not find a Federal program to use for all these lofty objectives, but every person can seek to fulfill on a higher level of performance his individual responsibilities in his home, business, or community. To do so aids his country and shows loyalty to his country. Then there is the fulfilling of his or her responsibilities as a voter, as a supporter of political candidates, and as a worker in civic opportunities. These all can be ways to show loyalty to one's country.

We can best show loyalty to principles by the integrity of our personal lives. Our standards, our principles, our total lives, should be truly ours. Ralph Waldo Emerson said in his essay on self-reliance:

> Do your thing, and I shall know you. Do your work, and you shall reinforce yourself. A man must consider what a blind man's-buff is this game of conformity. It is easy in the world to live after the worlds opinion; it is easy in solitude to live after our own; but the great man is he who in the midst of the crowd keeps with perfect sweetness the independence of solitude.

Jack Anderson, the columnist, has scared many a man out of a sin of commission. The real test of the integrity of one's principles is what one does when nobody is looking, when no one can find out.

There can be the principle of service to our fellow man in whatever we do, depending upon our motivations in the act. Merely, upholding the basic American concepts of freedom and opportunity for all is a manifestation of loyalty to principles.

Finally, how do we show our loyalty to God? Church membership, attendance, and participation are important ways. Living by the concepts of the scriptures, particularly, the golden rule, is most important. As Emerson says:

> When a man lives with God, his voice shall be as sweet as the murmur of the brook and the rustle of the corn.

Truly, the solutions for problems of this day lie in choices between loyalties. Count Leo Tolstoy once observed that it is so much easier to alter circumstances than to alter our own characters that it is no surprise that this is what we usually try to do. Yet we make little meaningful progress unless we do alter for the better our own individual characters. This can only be done by the proper choice of loyalties in our lives.

In the amnesty debate we must know that each case is different in the choice of loyalties that has been made. Any general amnesty applied across the board to all of those who failed to fight for their country when their country asked it would be manifestly unfair as between those persons and when we also consider the acts of others who fought and died for their country in this same war. No man acts in a vacuum but is surrounded by the actions of his contemporaries.

These times of soul-searching will have permanent impact upon all Americans and all mankind. We should each resolve to see to it that we individually, and as a country as well, attempt to put the most important loyalties in their proper places.

CUB SCOUTS OF ABILENE, TEX., EXPRESS APPRECIATION TO RETURNING PRISONERS OF WAR

(Mr. BURLESON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Cub Scouts of Abilene, Tex., regarding the military men and women who have served in the Vietnam conflict, is of special and commendable interest.

I am proud to have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter dated March 12, 1973, directed to the President, expressing the feeling of this group of fine young men:

ABILENE, TEX., *March 12, 1973.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of each Cub Scout, the Webelos, Wolf & Bears of Pack 35 at Robert E. Lee Elementary School, Abilene, Texas, we would like for you, our President to pass on to each returning prisoner of war, to the families of the missing in action and to all the military men and women that have served in this war to help achieve a lasting peace the following message:

"It is our sincere appreciation for their loyalty to our country, the courage to withstand all known and unknown types of punishment, that we the average American will never know or face and most of all, for helping to maintain a lasting peace in our world, so that we may continue to achieve an education and have the freedom that all mankind so dearly wants.

"We love each and everyone of you and someday, we hope to meet you. May each one and his family have the peace, love, happiness and freedom that he has worked so hard to get. Thank you all and there is no way to repay you."

Respectfully yours,

S/Sgt. RICHARD G. LEIFRIED,
Cub Scout Leader.

The Webelos of Pack 35:
Brian Ricketts, Richard Leifried, Ronald Modesty, Eddie Guillen, Mike Pennell, Phillip James, Jerry Johnson, Alan Smith, Douglas O'Connor, Kelly Duncan.

CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY OVER INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, House Joint Resolution 455, which is aimed at reasserting the constitutional power of Congress to participate in the making of international agreements to which the United States is a party. This proposal would require that all international agreements entered into by the President or any member of the executive branch shall be subject to congressional disapproval—unless, of course, submitted as a treaty and ratified by the Senate.

Legislation similar to this has been introduced in the Senate by the distinguished constitutional scholar from North Carolina, Senator ERVIN—S. 3475, 92d Congress. His colleagues in the Senate, Senator CASE of New Jersey and Senator SYMINGTON of Missouri, have also been in the forefront of Senate efforts to curb the excessive Presidential arrogation of power to bind our Nation through bilateral and multilateral international agreements and commitments without the consent of Congress. In the 92d Congress, Senator CASE introduced an amendment to the Military Assistance Act which required all future executive agreements which establish U.S. military installations abroad or extend existing foreign base agreements to be submitted to the Senate for its approval. This amendment was passed with overwhelming support in the Senate, but was rejected by the House conferees—with the result that no foreign aid authorization bill was passed last year.

Action was taken in the 92d Congress, Public Law 92–403, in this area, but it was limited to requiring the President to transmit to Congress all future international agreements which are entered into by the executive branch within 60 days after they come into force.

My bill would require the President to submit all proposed executive agreements to Congress before they come into force. Then, if the Congress did not approve of an agreement, it could prevent it from coming into force by means of a concurrent resolution passed by both Houses within 60 days. Just as Public Law 92–403 did, my proposal contains a provision for the maintenance of secrecy by the Congress when it is required for security purposes.

If the President wanted to avoid the 60-day procedure, he could, of course, submit the agreement to the Senate as a treaty, requiring a two-thirds vote for approval; or he could ask both Houses for approval by majority vote. What is important is that a Congressional review of all proposed international agreements and commitments will be effected.

The executive agreement has a long history, but it is only in recent years that its use has become common, far outstripping the use of treaties.

The Constitution of the United States, article II, section 2, clause 2 provides that the President—

shall have power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

This unequivocally grants to one body of the Congress the prerogative of approving, or vetoing, international agreements proposed by the President. It is interesting to note that the plan which the Committee of Detail reported to the Federal Constitutional Convention on August 6, 1787, provided that—

the Senate of the United States shall have power to make treaties.

Not until September 7, 1787, just 10 days before the Convention adjourned, was the proposal rewritten to make the President even a participant in the treatymaking process.

Nowhere in the Constitution do the words "executive agreement" appear, and nowhere in that document can language be found which allocates to the President the express authority to enter into international agreements without the approval of the Senate. Nevertheless, American Presidents early began to experiment with the idea of entering into international accords without Senate approval.

In 1817, President James Monroe bound the United States to an agreement with England which limited naval weaponry on the Great Lakes. A year later, Monroe was troubled by second thoughts as to the constitutionality of his action, and he submitted the agreement to the Senate with the inquiry as to whether he could conclude such agreements on his own, or whether the advice and consent of the Senate were required. The Senate approved the agreement by a two-thirds vote.

From that humble beginning executive agreements in vital areas of international commitment blossomed and expanded in scope and number. By 1930, executive agreements, without prior congressional approval, had been used for multiple purposes. The following are some examples:

Texas and Hawaii were annexed by executive agreement. Mexico and the United States entered into agreements in 1882 and 1896 to pursue Indians across common borders. The Spanish American War of 1898 and the First World War in 1918 were ended by armistice agreements entered into by the President. The "open door" policy in China was formalized by President McKinley's Secretary of State, John Hay, through agreements with Great Britain, Germany, Russia, France, Italy, and Japan. In 1905 the secret Taft-Katsura agreement between the United States and Japan provided for Japanese hegemony over Korea in return for Japanese recognition of U.S. control over the Philippines. In 1917, by the Lansing-Ishii agreement, concluded during Wilson's Presidency, the United States recognized Japan's "special interests" in China. When Secretary of State Lansing was asked by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee whether the Lansing-Ishii agreement had any binding force on the United States, his response, interestingly, was that the agreement was merely a declaration of American foreign policy which the President could choose to terminate at will.

As of 1930, 25 treaties and 9 executive agreements were in force. After that, the ratio of executive agreements to treaties changed radically. By 1940, executive agreements outnumbered treaties by 3 to 2. Between 1940 and 1955, the United States concluded 139 treaties and entered into 1,950 published executive agreements. In 1940 President Roosevelt transferred 50 destroyers to Great Britain in exchange for the right to set up military bases for a century in Newfoundland, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Antigua, Trinidad, St. Lucia, and British Guiana. Winston Churchill later called that—

A decidedly unneutral act by the United States which would have justified the German Government in declaring war on the United States.

Among the executive agreements of World War II were the agreements at Yalta and Potsdam which have so profoundly affected modern history. Executive agreements entered into during the 85th Congress—1957–58—outnumbered treaties by a ratio of 45 to 1. By 1969, 909 treaties and 3,973 executive agreements were in force; by last year, that figure had risen to 947 treaties and 4,359 publicly acknowledged executive agreements.

Today, the span of subject areas covered by executive agreements is staggering. Affiliation with international organizations, establishment of military missions abroad, military occupation and status of forces, commercial aviation, communication satellites, collective security matters, lend-lease, private investments, atomic energy, stationing of nuclear weaponry, and arms reduction have all fallen into the spectrum of executive agreements. More than 25 percent of all executive agreements since World War II have involved foreign economic and military assistance. American military bases all over the globe have been established by executive agreement.

In effect, the many-headed hydra of the executive agreement has overrun the domain of American international commitments.

On what constitutional grounds have successive Presidents of both parties relied in their heavy use of executive agreements and neglect of the treatymaking process? Presidents have claimed their authority to be grounded on two bases. The claim is made that the overwhelming number of executive agreements are concluded by the executive branch in an administrative capacity, pursuant or subject to congressional authorization by legislation or treaty. Beyond this, Presidents have asserted that the Chief Executive has inherent authority to enter into binding executive agreements, implied in his powers as Commander in Chief in his traditional role as the person responsible for the conduct of this Nation's foreign relations.

To substantiate this latter claim, presidential apologists have cited the long usage of executive agreements as authority for recognition of this power. In refutation of this theory Senator ERVIN has stated that—

> The legal basis for the use of executive agreements is unclear at best, and most frequently has been grounded on the argument of usage—a legal justification that is not entirely satisfactory. As I have often noted in various other contexts, murder and rape have been with us since the dawn of human history, but that fact does not make rape legal or murder meritorious. In effect, reliance on usage in this instance grounds concepts of constitutionality on acquiescence rather than on the written document, and is, to my mind, wholly acceptable. It always has been my view that the Constitution means what it says. Moreover, I am not impressed with the recitation of so-called precedents to support de facto constitutional amendments. Even 200 years cannot make constitutional what the Constitution declares is unconstitutional.

The former distinguished Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, the Honorable Arthur Goldberg, has also said that—

> (The President) has implied powers derived from language of the Constitution, but the concept of inherent powers for the President is entirely at variance with our constitutional scheme.

An absurdity emerges from the Presidential claim that he can make executive agreements based upon "inherent" powers, for, if the question is raised "What can the President do by executive agreement and what must be submitted to Congress?" The answer, based upon the claim of inherent powers, would be that the President has complete discretion in the matter. Clearly, the Founding Fathers did not intend that such unchecked authority should rest in the Presidency.

As Senator CASE has eloquently warned:

> Under the last six Presidents, the executive agreement has gradually but steadily replaced the treaty as the principal means of making agreements with foreign governments. Lend-lease and destroyers-for-bases have led to Korean mercenaries for Vietnam, secret military bases in Morocco, and even a secret war in Laos.
>
> It was to avoid just such unilateral entanglements that the Founding Fathers wrote into the Constitution the requirement for Senate advice and consent to treaties.
>
> The Executive Agreement is nowhere even mentioned in the Constitution, and I cannot conceive that the Founding Fathers would not have included arrangements for foreign military bases in their definition of a treaty.

The battle against Presidential assumption of the treatymaking power is not a new one. During World War II, Senator McCarran pressed for legislation to subject executive agreements to such legislative action as the Congress "in the exercise of its constitutional powers" deemed necessary or desirable. After the war, Senators Bricker of Ohio, Ferguson of Michigan, and Knowland of California all led efforts to curb the unchecked use of executive agreements by the President.

Up until last year, the use of secret executive agreements concealed American military commitments from the Congress, commitments fraught with the peril of involvement of U.S. forces in foreign wars. In 1960, for example, a secret executive agreement committed $147 million in military aid to Ethiopia, and it contained a U.S. pledge to commit American forces to maintain Ethiopia's territorial integrity. Congress first learned about this 10 years later, Mr. Speaker, in 1970. This appalling "cloak of secrecy," a total insult to the authority and capability of Congress, was lifted by law in 1972, but the spirit of unilateral Presidential action still thrives.

The President announced agreements with Portugal for continuing the U.S. airbase in the Azores in exchange for a variety of U.S. assistance, and with Bahrain for naval facilities in the Persian Gulf, causing a full-scale revolt in the Senate. That body demanded that the agreements be submitted to it as treaties, and refused to make explicit appropriation of funds to carry out those agreements until they were approved as treaties.

During the Senate's deliberations on this issue, Senator SPARKMAN, of Alabama, stated that—

> Not only mutual defense agreements should be submitted to the Senate as treaties but also any agreement which assumes a vital importance in the security of another country. This is especially true if it involves the stationing of American military personnel abroad.

Mr. Speaker, the sorry and dangerous state of affairs which has evolved during the last century, permitting the President to assume the prerogative of bypassing congressional scrutiny by simply calling a pact with a foreign government an executive agreement, is the fault of Congress.

Congress has repeatedly failed to assert its authority in the area of foreign affairs, and consequently President after President has appropriated ever-increasing powers to bind this Nation by international agreement. In the Steel Seizure Case of 1952, Justice Robert Jackson of the Supreme Court stated that—

> When the President acts in absence of either a Congressional grant or denial of authority, he can only rely upon his own independent powers, but there is a zone of twilight in which he and Congress may have concurrent authority, or in which its distribution is uncertain. Therefore, Congressional inertia, indifference or quiescence may sometimes, at least as a practical matter, enable, if not invite, measures on independent presidential responsibility.
>
> When the President takes measures incompatible with the expressed or implied will of Congress, his power is at its lowest ebb, for then he can rely only upon his own constitutional powers minus any constitutional powers of Congress over the matter.

It is time that Congress asserted itself in the "twilight area" of executive agreements. The Senate has already declared that it will no longer tolerate the erosion of congressional authority in the fields of foreign policy and treatymaking. This House of Representatives must also meet the challenge of the thorny issue of executive agreements. Until we move to establish our authority in this "zone of twilight," Presidents will be free to point to the absence of mention of executive agreements in the Constitution and congressional inertia on the subject as justification for perpetuation of a device which threatens America's proper role in world affairs.

Congress alone has the power to raise and fund armies, Mr. Speaker, but unless we bring a halt to the uncontrolled use of executive agreements, the President alone will have the power to determine when and where they will be stationed abroad and to entangle the United States in perilous foreign comitments.

The Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on U.S. Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad has pointed out that—

> Overseas bases, the presence of elements of United States Armed Forces, joint planning, joint exercises, or extensive military assistance programs represent to host governments more valid assurances of United States commitment than any treaty or agreement. Furthermore, any or all of the above instances of United States military presence all but guarantee some involvement by the United States in the internal affairs of the host government.

American military forces are currently stationed in at least 24 foreign countries. If Congress does not assert control over the disposition of those forces and the alliances and commitments made with foreign nations, we may soon find ourselves again headed on the road to another international disaster such as we suffered in Indochina.

It is generally recognized in customary international law that an executive agreement binds our country with the same force as a treaty. The Senate is well aware of the dangers inherent in this rule of law, and as a result, it is delaying approval of the Vienna Convention which would formalize and codify that tenet of international jurisprudence. But delay or rejection of the Vienna Convention will not change the fact that we, as a Congress, have by inaction permitted the President to fully bind our Nation to international agreements without congressional approval.

In my view, forceful action by the House and Senate is needed to bring this practice to an end. But whether or not legislation such as I have proposed is the right answer, the subject of executive agreements is one of enormous and growing importance, and I hope that my bill will serve as a useful vehicle for hearings

to be held on this vital question by the Foreign Affairs Committee. The resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 455

Joint resolution concerning the power of Congress in foreign affairs to participate in the making of international agreements

Whereas, the Congress finds that its powers in foreign relations have been substantially eroded by the use of executive agreements by the executive branch of the United States Government, and

Whereas, the Constitution of the United States establishes a system of shared powers in the making of international agreements between the legislative and executive branches of the United States Government,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That

SECTION 1. (a) Any executive agreement made on or after the date of enactment of this Act shall be transmitted to the Secretary of State, who shall then transmit that agreement (bearing an identification number) to the Congress. However, any such agreement the immediate disclosure of which would, in the opinion of the President, be prejudicial to the security of the United States shall instead be transmitted by the Secretary to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives under an appropriate written injunction of secrecy to be removed only upon due notice from the President. Each committee shall personally notify the members of its House that the Secretary has transmitted such an agreement with an injunction of secrecy, and such agreement shall thereafter be available for inspection only by such members.

(b) Except as otherwise provided under subsection (d) of this section, any such executive agreement shall come into force with respect to the United States at the end of the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of Congress after the date on which the executive agreement is transmitted to Congress or such committees, as the case may be, unless, between the date of transmittal and the end of the 60-day period, both Houses pass a concurrent resolution stating in substance that both Houses do not approve the executive agreement.

(c) For the purpose of subsection (b) of this section—

(1) continuity of session is broken only by an adjournment of Congress sine die; and

(2) the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain are excluded in the computation of the 60-day period.

(d) Under provisions contained in an executive agreement, the agreement may come into force at a time later than the date on which the agreement comes into force under subsections (b) and (c) of this section.

SEC. 2. For purposes of this Act, the term "executive agreement" means any bilateral or multilateral international agreement or commitment, other than a treaty, which is binding upon the United States, and which is made by the President or any officer, employee or representative of the executive branch of the United States Government.

NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE CELEBRATES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. LANDRUM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest military schools in the United States and one of Georgia's finest liberal arts colleges, North Georgia College of Dahlonega, will celebrate its 100th anniversary during the week of May 6 through May 12, 1973.

This institution has furnished America some of its finest Army officers and today incorporates in its academic activities one of America's very finest ROTC units.

The Governor of Georgia has taken note of this coming birthday and has issued an appropriate proclamation which I ask unanimous consent to be considered as part of my remarks and published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE CENTENNIAL

By the Governor:

Whereas: North Carolina College, the second oldest unit of the University System of Georgia, opened its doors for class in 1873, one hundred years ago; and

Whereas: North Georgia College, inviting "Whoever will, may come," was Georgia's first state-supported coeducational college, and is today the State's only coeducational, military, liberal arts college; and

Whereas: North Georgia College has contributed significantly to educations in Georgia, and through her alumni to the integrity and dignity of the State, the armed forces and the nation at large; and

Whereas: North Georgia College stands on the site of the Old United States Gold Mint at Dahlonega, in Lumpkin County, the heart of one of Georgia's most historically important and colorful areas, the center of America's First Gold Rush; and

Whereas: The Faculty, Staff, Students, and Alumni of North Georgia College and the people of Dahlonega and of Northeast Georgia, who have supported the college and whom the college serves in turn, will commemorate the centennial anniversary of the founding of the college during the week of May 6 through 12; Now,

Therefore: I, Jimmy Carter, Governor of the State of Georgia, do hereby proclaim the week of May 6 to May 12, 1973, as North Georgia College Week in Georgia, and urge all the citizens of our State to join in celebrating this historic occasion.

MODEL SOCIAL SERVICES REGULATIONS

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee will, I am sure, move swiftly to comply with the request of the Democratic caucus that it report House Joint Resolution 434, which I am pleased to sponsor with Congressman REID and many others, to prescribe model regulations governing implementation of the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to the administration of social service programs.

I know that there are many Government agencies and groups throughout the country who are vitally interested in these regulations, which would supplant the outrageously restrictive regulations proposed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and published in the Federal Register. So that they may see what we are proposing. I insert the text of House Joint Resolution 434 in the RECORD at this point. I am advised that this exceeds the normal space limitation for insertions in the RECORD and I have attached an estimate of the cost as required by the rules. I am confident that the value of this information to those who have access to the RECORD fully justifies the $765 cost of publication:

H.J. RES. 434

Joint resolution prescribing model regulations governing implementation of the provisions of the Social Security Act relating to the administration of social service programs

Whereas over a decade ago Congress recognized the need for a vigorous program of social services in combating the multiple problems of poverty, drug addiction, alcoholism, mental illness, child development, child abuse, population growth, broken families, and lack of economic opportunity; and

Whereas as recently as October 1972 Congress reaffirmed its belief in the necessity of these programs and expressed its intent not to reduce their prior expenditure levels; and

Whereas the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in implementing these programs, has always encouraged maximum flexibility for allocation of social services funds by State and local officials closest to the recipients, in the manner determined by such officials to be most efficacious; and

Whereas in implementing the social services program the Department has previously advanced the principles of the New Federalism, which aims to enhance the authority and responsibility of State and local government and to reduce the concentration of power and responsibility in Washington; and

Whereas the social services program, as implemented by the Department's regulations, has contributed significantly toward the goals of limiting the numbers of recipients on the welfare rolls and contributing to the betterment of the lives of countless Americans; and

Whereas the Department's recently proposed amendments to the social services regulations are, in many respects, squarely contrary to its established interpretation of the authorizing statute; are in other respects violative of specific statutory provisions and of expressed congressional intent; and are in important respects arbitrary, capricious, and antithetical to the principles of the New Federalism and of sound administrative policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That upon the date of enactment of this joint resolution, there shall be adopted regulations governing the implementation of titles I, IV–A, IV–B, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act which shall be consistent in every respect with the following model regulations. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to proscribe the adoption of additional regulations from time to time, as may be necessary and appropriate: *Provided,* That no such additional regulation shall be inconsistent with the provisions of the model regulations set forth herein, except as may be required by law.

MODEL REGULATIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR FAMILIES AND CHILDREN AND FOR AGED, BLIND, OR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS: TITLES I, IV–A, IV–B, X, XIV, AND XVI OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

SECTION 1. SCOPE OF PROGRAMS.—

(a) Federal financial participation is available for expenditures under the State plan approved under title I, IV–A, IV–B, X, XIV, or XVI of the Act with respect to the administration of service programs under the State plan. The service programs under these titles are hereinafter referred to as: Family Service (title IV–A), WIN Support Service (title IV–A), Child Welfare Services (title IV–B), and Adult Services (titles I, X, XIV, and XVI). Expenditures subject to Federal

financial participation are those made for services provided to families, children, and individuals who have been determined to be eligible, and for related expenditures, which are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan.

(b) The basic rate of Federal financial participation for family services and adult services under this part is 75 percent provided that the State plan meets all the applicable requirements of this part and is approved by the Social and Rehabilitation Service. Under title IV–A, effective July 1, 1972, the rates are 50 percent for emergency assistance in the form of services, and 90 percent for WIN support services, and effective January 1, 1973, the rate is 90 percent for the offering, arranging, and furnishing, directly or on a contract basis, of family planning services and supplies.

(c) Total Federal financial participation for family services and adult services provided by the 50 States and the District of Columbia may not exceed $2,500 million for any fiscal year, allotted to the States on the basis of their population.

(d) Rates and amounts of Federal financial participation for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands are subject to different rules.

Subpart A—Requirements for Service Programs

SEC. 2. GENERAL.—The State plan with respect to programs of family services, WIN support services, child welfare services, and adult services must contain provisions committing the State to meet the requirements of this subpart.

SEC. 3. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION.—

(a) SINGLE ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT.—(1) There must be a single organizational unit, within the single State agency, at the State level and also at the local level, which is responsible for the furnishing of services by agency staff under title IV, parts A and B. Responsibility for furnishing specific services also furnished to clients under other public assistance plans (for example, homemaker service) may be located elsewhere within the agency: *Provided*, That this does not tend to create differences in the quality of services of AFDC and CWS cases. (This requirement does not apply to States where the title IV–A and title IV–B programs were administered by separate agencies on January 2, 1968).

(2) Such unit must be under the direction of its chief officer who, at the State level, is not the head of the State agency.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—(1) An advisory committee on social service programs must be established at the State level and at local levels where the programs are locally administered, except that in local jurisdictions with small caseloads alternate procedures for securing similar participation may be established. The State plan must show that the advisory committee will:

(i) Advise the principal policy setting and administrative officials of the agency and have adequate opportunity for meaningful participation in policy development and program administration, including the furtherance of recipient participation in the program of the agency.

(ii) Include representatives of other State agencies concerned with services, representatives of professional, civic or other public or private organizations, private citizens interested and experienced in service programs, and recipients of assistance or services or their representatives who shall constitute at least one-third of the membership. Such recipients or their representatives must be selected in a manner that will assure the participation of the recipients in the selection process and that they are representative of recipients of assistance or services.

(iii) Be provided such staff assistance from within the agency and such independent technical assistance as are needed to enable it to make effective recommendations.

(iv) Be provided with financial arrangements, where necessary, to make possible the participation of recipients in the work of the committee structure.

(2) An advisory committee on day care services must be established at the State level, either as a separate committee, or all or a part of the advisory committee on social service programs may be assigned this function. In either event, the committee must have at least one-third of its membership drawn from recipients or their representatives; and include representatives of agencies and groups concerned with day care or related services, that is, other State agencies, professional or civic or other public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations or groups.

(3) The State plan must also show the structure and functions of the State and local committees for social service programs and for day care services; their relationship to other boards and committees associated with the State and local agencies; the system for selecting recipients or their representatives; and assure that the State committee for social service programs will be established no later than 90 days after plan approval.

(c) APPEALS, FAIR HEARINGS, AND GRIEVANCE.—(1) There must be provision for a fair hearing, under which applicants and recipients may appeal denial of or exclusion from a service program, failure to take account of recipient choice of service or a determination that the individuals must participate in the service program. The results of appeals must be formally recorded and made available to the State advisory committee and all applicants and recipients must be advised of their right to appeal and the procedures for such appeal.

(2) There must be a system through which recipients may present grievances about the operation of the service program.

(3) The State plan must also describe the system for appeals and grievances and the methods of informing recipients of their right to appeal.

(d) PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.—The State plan must provide for State level service staff to carry responsibility for:

(1) Planning the content of the service programs, and establishing and interpreting service policies;

(2) Program supervision of local agencies to assure that they are meeting plan requirements and State policies, and that funds are being appropriately and effectively used; and

(3) Monitoring and evaluation of the services programs.

(e) PROVISION OF SERVICES.—The State plan must specify how the services will be provided and, in the case of provision by other public agencies, identify the agency and the service to be provided.

SEC. 4. RELATIONSHIP TO AND USE OF OTHER AGENCIES.—There must be maximum utilization of and coordination with other public and voluntary agencies providing similar or related services which are available without additional cost.

SEC. 5. FREEDOM TO ACCEPT SERVICES.—Families and individuals must be free to accept or reject services. Acceptance of a service shall not be a prerequisite for the receipt of any other services or aid under the plan, except for the conditions related to the Work Incentive Program or other work program under a State plan approved by the service.

SEC. 6. STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS FOR SERVICES.—

(a) In order to carry out the statutory requirements under the Act with respect to Family Services and Adult Services programs, and in order to be eligible for 75 percent Federal financial participation in the costs of providing services, including the determination of eligibility for services, the State must, under the Family Services program, provide to each appropriate member of the AFDC assistance unit the mandatory services and those optional services the State elects to include in the State plan, and must under the Adult Services program, provide to each appropriate applicant for or recipient of financial assistance under the State plan at least one of the defined services which the State elects to include in the State plan.

(b)(1) For the Family Services program, the mandatory services are family planning services, foster-care services for children, protective services for children, and child care services which are employment- or training-related. The optional services are community planning, child care services which are not employment- or training-related, educational services, employment services (non-WIN), health and mental health services, homemaker services, home management and other functional educational services, housing improvement services, legal services, protective services for children, and transportation services.

(2) For the Adult Services program, the defined services are chore services, day-care services for adults, educational services, employment services, family planning services, foster-care services for adults, health-related services, home delivered or congregate meals, homemaker services, home management and other functional educational services, housing improvement services, protective services for adults, special services for the blind, legal services, and transportation services.

(c) Additional services not listed herein may be included in the State plan if accompanied by written justification as to the necessity of such service and the particular needs of recipients which would be met by such service. Such additional service will be subject to the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 7. SERVICES TO ADDITIONAL FAMILIES AND INDIVIDUALS.—

(a) If a State elects to provide services for additional groups of families or individuals, the State plan must identify such groups and specify the services to be made available to each group.

(b) If a service or an element of service is not included for recipients of financial assistance under the State plan, it may not be included for any other group.

(c) The State agency may elect to provide services to all or to reasonably classified subgroups of the following:

(1) Families and children who are current applicants for financial assistance.

(2) Families and children who are former applicants or recipients of financial assistance.

(3) Families and children who are likely to become applicants for or recipients of financial assistances is, those who—

(i) Are eligible for medical assistance, as medically needy persons, under the State's title XIX plan.

(ii) Would be eligible for financial assistance if the earnings exemption granted to recipients applied to them.

(iii) Are likely, within 5 years, to become recipients of financial assistance.

(iv) Are at or near dependency level, including those in low-income neighborhoods and among other groups that might otherwise include more AFDC cases, where services are provided on a group basis.

(4) All other families and children for information and referral service only.

(5) Aged, blind, or disabled persons who are former applicants for or recipients of financial assistance who request services or on whose behalf services are requested.

(5) Aged, blind, or disabled persons who request services, or on whose behalf services are requested, and who are likely to become applicants for or recipients of financial assistance; that is, those who—

(i) Are not money payment recipients but are eligible for medical assistance under the State's title XIX plan.

(ii) Are likely, within 5 years, to become recipients of financial assistance.

(iii) Are at or near dependency level, including those in low-income neighborhoods and among other groups that might be expected to include more aged, blind, or disabled assistance cases than other low-income groups, where the services are provided on a group basis.

(d) All families, children, aged, blind, or disabled persons in the above groups, or a selected reasonable classification of such persons with common problems or common service needs, may be included.

SEC. 8. DETERMINATION AND REDETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR SERVICES.—

(a) The State agency must make, or cause to be made, a determination that each family and individual is eligible for Family Services or Adult Services prior to the provision of services (other than services rendered on an emergency basis) under the State plan.

(b) The State agency must make, or cause to be made, a periodic (but not less frequent than annual) redetermination of eligibility of each family and individual receiving services.

SEC. 9. INDIVIDUAL SERVICE PLAN.—

(a) An individual service plan must be developed and maintained on a current basis by agency staff for each family and individual receiving service under the State's title I, IV–A, X, XIV, or XVI plan. No service, other than emergency assistance in the form of services under the title IV–A plan, may be provided under the State plan until it has been incorporated in the individual service plan and a service may be provided only to the extent and for the duration specified in the service plan. The service plan must relate all services provided to the goals to be achieved by the service program. It must also indicate the target dates for goal achievement and the extent and duration of the provision of each service. For the purposes of this part, the goals include, but are not limited to—

(1) Self-support goal.—To achieve and maintain the feasible level of employment and economic self-sufficiency. (Not applicable to the aged under the Adult Services program.)

(2) Self-care or family-care goal.—To achieve and maintain maximum personal independence, self-determination, and security in the home, including, for children, the achievement of potential for eventual independent living.

(3) Community-based care goal.—To secure and maintain community-based care which approximates a home environment, when living at home is not feasible and institutional care is inappropriate.

(4) Institutional care goal.—To secure appropriate institutional care when other forms of care are not feasible.

(b) Services to individuals must be in accord with plans developed in cooperation with the individual, or the person applying on his behalf, be responsive to the needs of the individual applicant, and be related to one or more specific goals and objectives as described in this section.

(c) Each service plan must be reviewed as often as necessary to assure that it is practically related to the individual's current needs and is being effectively implemented, and that the goals and objectives are being achieved. Each service plan, with the specific goals and objectives, the services made available, and their results, must be recorded.

SEC. 10. DEFINITION OF SERVICES.—

(a) This section contains definitions of all mandatory and optional services under the Family-Services program and the defined services under the Adult Services program.

(b)(1) Chore services.—This means the performance of household tasks, essential shopping, simple household repairs, and other light work necessary to enable an individual to remain in his own home when, because of frailty or other conditions, he is unable to perform such tasks himself and they do not require the services of a trained homemaker or other specialist.

(2) Day care services for adults.—This means personal care during the day in a protective setting approved by the State or local agency.

(3) Child care services.—This means care of a child in his own home by a responsible person, or outside his home in a family day care home, group day care home, or day care center. Child care services, including in-home and out-of-home services, must be available or provided for the purpose of enabling the caretaker relatives to participate in employment, training, or receipt of needed services, where no other member of the child's family is able to provide adequate care and supervision. Such care must be suitable for the individual child; and the caretaker relatives must be involved in the selection of the child care source to be used if there is more than one source available. The child care services must be maintained until the caretaker relatives are reasonably able to make other satisfactory child care arrangements.

(i) Progress must be made in developing varied child care resources with the aim of affording parents a choice in the care of their children.

(ii) All child care services must meet the following standards:

(A) In-home care. (I) Homemaker service under agency auspices must meet the standards established by the State agency which must be reasonably in accord with the recommended standards of related national standard setting organizations, such as the Child Welfare League of America and the National Council for Homemaker Services.

(II) Child care provided by relatives, friends, or neighbors must meet standards established by the State agency that, as a minimum, cover age, physical and emotional health, capacity and time of the caretaker to provide adequate care; hours of care; maximum number of children to be cared for; feeding and health care of the children.

(B) Out-of-home care.—Day care facilities, used for the care of children, must be licensed by the State or approved as meeting the standards for such licensing, and day care facilities and services must comply with the standards of the Federal inter-agency day care requirements and the requirements of section 422(a)(1) of the Social Security Act.

(iii) Both in-home and out-of-home child care provided for persons referred to the WIN program must be a service cost rather than an assistance cost.

(4) Educational services.—This means helping individuals to secure educational training most appropriate to their capacities from available community resources.

(5) Employment services (non-WIN under title IV–A and for the blind or disabled).—This means enabling appropriate individuals to secure paid employment or training leading to such employment, through vocational, educational, social, and psychological diagnostic assessments to determine potential for job training or employment; and through helping them to obtain vocational education or training.

(6) Family planning services.—(i) For Family Services this means social, educational, and medical services to enable appropriate individuals (including minors who can be considered to be sexually active) to limit voluntarily the family size or space the children, and to prevent or reduce the incidence of births out of wedlock. Such services include printed materials, group discussions and individual interviews which provide information about and discussion of family planning; medical contraceptive services and supplies; and help in utilizing medical and educational resources available in the community. Such services must be offered and be provided promptly (directly or under arrangements with others) to all individuals voluntarily requesting them.

(ii) For Adult Services this means social and educational services, and help in securing medical services, to enable individuals to limit voluntarily the family size or space the children, and to prevent or reduce the incidence of births out of wedlock. Such services include printed materials, group discussions, and individual interviews which provide information about and discussion of family planning; and help in utilizing medical and educational resources available in the community.

(7) Foster care services for adults.—This means services to eligible persons to assure placement in settings approved by the appropriate State and/or local authority and suitable to the needs of each individual; assure that the person receives proper care in such placement; and to determine continued appropriateness of and need for placement through periodic reviews, at least annually.

(8) Foster care services for children.—This means services provided for children receiving aid in the form of foster care under title IV—part A, which must:

(i) Assure placement appropriate to the needs of each child.

(ii) Assure that the child receives proper care in such placement.

(iii) Determine continued appropriateness of and need for placement through periodic review, at least annually.

(iv) Improve the conditions in the home from which the child was removed, so that the child may be returned to his own home, or otherwise plan for the placement of the child in the home of other relatives, adoptive home or continued foster care, as appropriate.

(v) Work with other public agencies that have responsibility for the placement and care of any such children to assure that these agencies carry out their responsibilities in accordance with their agreement with the State agency administering or supervising the administration of AFDC.

(9) Services to meet health needs.—Services to meet health needs mean services provided for the purpose of assisting eligible persons to attain and retain as favorable a condition of health as possible by helping them to identify and understand their health needs and to secure and utilize necessary medical treatment as well as preventive and health maintenance services including services in medical emergencies.

(10) Home delivered or congregate meals.—This means the preparation and delivery of hot meals to an individual in his home or in a central dining facility as necessary to prevent institutionalization or malnutrition.

(11) Homemaker services.—(i) For Family Services this means care of individuals in their own homes, and helping individual caretaker relatives to achieve adequate household and family management, through the services of a trained and supervised homemaker.

(ii) For Adult Services this means care of individuals in their own homes, and helping individuals in maintaining, strengthening, and safeguarding their functioning in the home through the services of a trained and supervised homemaker.

(12) Home management and other functional educational services.—This means formal or informal instruction and training in management of household budgets, maintenance and care of the home, preparation of food, nutrition, consumer education, child rearing, and health maintenance.

(13) Housing improvement services.—This means helping families and individuals to obtain or retain adequate housing. Housing and relocation costs, including construction, renovation or repair, moving of families or individuals, rent, deposits, and home purchase, may not be claimed as service costs.

(14) Legal services.—This means the services of lawyers with respect to civil legal problems.

(15) Community planning.—This means activities of the staff of the agency, at the State and local levels, in providing leadership in the planning, development, extension, and improvement of the broad range of services, facilities, and opportunities required to prevent dependency for low income adults and to meet the current and anticipated service needs of all aged, blind, or disabled applicants and recipients. Staff activities include work with other agencies, organizations, and interested citizens' groups, including State and local commissions on aging and the blind, in stimulating community support and action on behalf of all the aged, blind, or disabled so that in developing and extending community services to the total group, applicants and recipients will also benefit.

(16) Protective services for adults.—This means identifying and helping to correct hazardous living conditions or situations of an individual who is unable to protect or care for himself.

(17) Protective services for children.—This means responding to instances, and substantiating the evidence, of neglect, abuse, or exploitation of a child; helping parents recognize the causes thereof and strengthening (through arrangement of one or more of the services included in the State plan) parental ability to provide acceptable care; or, if that is not possible, bringing the situation to the attention of appropriate courts or law enforcement agencies, and furnishing relevant data.

(18) Special services for the blind.—This means helping to alleviate the handicapping effects of blindness through: training in mobility, personal care, home management, and communication skills; special aids and appliances; special counseling for caretakers of blind children and adults; and help in securing talking book machines.

(19) Transportation services.—This means making it possible for an individual to travel to and from community facilities and resources, as part of a service plan.

SEC. 11. PURCHASE OF SERVICES.—

(a) A State plan under title I, IV–A, X, XIV, or XVI of the Act, which authorizes the provision of services by purchase from other State or local public agencies, from nonprofit or proprietary private agencies or organizations, or from individuals, must with respect to services which are purchased:

(1) Include a description of the scope and types of services which may be purchased under the State plan;

(2) Provide that the State or local agency will negotiate a written purchase of services agreement with each public or private agency or organization in accordance with requirements prescribed by SRS.

(3) Provide that purchase of services from individuals will be documented as to type, cost, and quantity. If an individual acts as an agent for other providers, he must enter into a formal purchase of services agreement with the State or local agency in accordance with paragraph (a)(2) of this section;

(4) Provide that the State or local agency will determine the eligibility of individuals for services and will authorize the types of services to be provided to each individual and specify the duration of the provision of such services to each individual;

(5) Assure that the sources from which services are purchased are licensed or otherwise meet State and Federal standards;

(6)(i) Provide for the establishment of rates of payment for such services which do not exceed the amounts reasonable and necessary to assure quality of service, and in the case of services purchased from other public agencies, are in accordance with the cost reasonably assignable to such services;

(ii) Describe the methods used in establishing and maintaining such rates; and

(iii) Indicate that information to support such rates of payment will be maintained in accessible form; and

(7) Provide that, where payment for services is made to the recipient for payment to the vendor, the State or local agency will specify to the recipient the type, cost, quantity, and the vendor of the service, and the agency will establish procedures to insure proper delivery of the service to, and payment by, the recipient.

(b) In the case of services provided, by purchase, as emergency assistance to needy families with children under title IV–A, the State plan may provide for an exception from the requirements in paragraphs (a) (2), (3), (5), and (6) of this section, but only to the extent and for the period necessary to deal with the emergency situation.

(c) All other requirements governing the State plan are applicable to the purchase of services, including:

(1) General provisions such as those relating to single State agency, grievances, safeguarding of information, civil rights, and financial control and reporting requirements; and

(2) Specific provisions as to the programs of services such as those on required services, statewideness, maximum utilization of other agencies providing services, and relating services to defined goals.

Subpart B—Federal Financial Participation
Titles I, IV–A, X, XIV, and XVI

SEC. 12. GENERAL.—Federal financial participation is available for expenditures under the State plan which are:

(a) Found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan;

(b)(1) For services under the State plan provided in accordance with the individual service plan to families and individuals included under the State plan who have been determined (and redetermined) to be eligible pursuant to the provisions of this part;

(2) For other activities which are essential to the management and support of such services;

(3) For emergency assistance in the form of services to needy families with children; and

(c) Identified and allocated in accordance with SRS instructions and OMB circular A–87.

SEC. 13. PROVISIONS GOVERNING COSTS OF CERTAIN SERVICES.—

(a) MEDICAL AND ASSISTANCE COSTS.—Federal financial participation will not be available under this subpart in expenditures for subsistence and other assistance items or for medical or remedial care or services, except:

(1) For subsistence and medical care when they are provided as essential components of a comprehensive service program a facility and their costs are not separately identifiable, such as, in a rehabilitation center, day care facility, or neighborhood service center;

(2) For medical and remedial care and services as part of family planning services;

(3) For medical diagnosis and consultation when necessary to carry out service responsibilities; for example, for recipients under consideration for referral to training and employment programs.

(b) VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES.—Federal financial participation is not available in the costs of providing vocational rehabilitation services for handicapped individuals as defined in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act except pursuant to an agreement with the State agency administering the rehabilitation program. This applies to provision of services by staff of the agency and purchase.

(c) SERVICES RELATED TO ADULT FOSTER CARE.—Federal financial participation is available in the costs of staff in providing services related to adult foster care, that is, recruitment, study, and approval of foster family homes (except staff primarily engaged in the issuances of licenses or in the enforcement of standards); services to adults in foster care, and work with foster families and staff of institutions caring for adults, such as homes for the aged. Payments for the foster care itself are assistance payments and are, therefore, not subject to the service rate of Federal financial participation.

(d) SERVICES PROVIDED IN BEHALF OF AGED, BLIND, OR DISABLED PERSONS.—Federal financial participation is available for services provided in behalf of aged, blind, or disabled persons, for example, community planning; assuring accessibility to resources to which the person is entitled; and studies of service needs and results.

SEC. 14. EXPENDITURES FOR WHICH FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION IS AVAILABLE.—Federal financial participation is available in expenditures for:

(a) Salary, fringe benefits, and travel costs of staff engaged in carrying out service work or service-related work;

(b) Costs of related expenses, such as equipment, furniture, supplies, communications, and office space;

(c) Costs of services purchased in accordance with this part;

(d) Costs of State advisory committees on day care services for children, including expenses of members in attending meetings, supportive staff, and other technical assistance;

(e) Costs of agency staff attendance at meetings pertinent to the development or implementation of Federal and State service policies and programs;

(f) Cost to the agency for the use of volunteers;

(g) Costs of operation of agency facilities used solely for the provision of services, except that appropriate distribution of costs is necessary when other agencies also use such facilities in carrying out their functions, as might be the case in comprehensive neighborhood service centers;

(h) Costs of administrative support activities furnished by other public agencies or other units within the single State agency which are allocated to the service programs in accordance with an approved cost allocation plan or an approved indirect cost rate as provided in OMB Circular A–87;

(i) With prior approval by SRS, costs of technical assistance, surveys, and studies, performed by other public agencies, private organizations, or individuals to assist the agency in developing, planning, monitoring, and evaluating the services program when such assistance is not available without cost;

(j) Costs of advice and consultation furnished by experts for the purpose of assisting staff in diagnosis and in developing individual service plans;

(k) Costs of emergency assistance in the form of services under title IV–A;

(l) Costs incurred on behalf of an individual under title I, X, XIV or XVI for securing guardianship or commitment (for example, court costs, attorney's fees, and guardianship or other costs attendant on securing professional services);

(m) Costs of public liability and other insurance protection; and

(n) Other costs, upon approval by SRS.

SEC. 15. RATES AND AMOUNTS OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION.—

(a) FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION AT THE 75 PERCENT RATE.—(1) For States with

a State plan approved as meeting the requirements of subpart A of this part, and that have in operation an approved separated service system in accordance with the provisions of section 205.102 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Federal financial participation at the rate of 75 percent is available for all matchable direct costs of the separated service system, plus all indirect costs which have been allocated in accordance with an approved cost allocation plan and with the requirements of OMB Circular A–87.

(2) For States with a State plan approved as meeting the requirements of subpart A of this part, but that do not have in operation an approved separated service system in accordance with the provisions of section 205.102 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the rate of Federal financial participation is governed by the regulations in parts 220 and 222 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations as in effect on January 1, 1972, for all matchable direct costs of the services program, plus all indirect costs which have been allocated in accordance with an approved cost allocation plan and with the requirements of OMB Circular A–87.

(b) FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION FOR PURCHASED SERVICES.—(1) Federal financial participation is available in expenditures for purchase of service under the State plan to the extent that payment for purchased services is in accordance with rates of payment established by the State which do not exceed the amounts reasonable and necessary to assure quality of service and, in the case of services purchased from other public agencies, the cost reasonably assignable to such services, provided the services are purchased in accordance with the requirements of this part.

(2) Services which may be purchased with Federal financial participation are those for which Federal financial participation is otherwise available under title I, IV–A, X, XIV, or XVI of the Act and which are included under the approved State plan.

SEC. 16. LIMITATIONS ON TOTAL AMOUNT OF FEDERAL FUNDS PAYABLE TO STATES FOR SERVICES.—

(a) The amount of Federal funds payable to the 50 States and the District of Columbia under titles I, IV–A, X, XIV, and XVI for any fiscal year (commencing with the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972) with respect to expenditures made after June 30, 1972 (see paragraph (b) of this section), for services (other than WIN Support Services, and emergency assistance in the form of services, under title IV–A) is subject to the following limitation:

The total amount of Federal funds paid to the State under all of the titles for any fiscal year with respect to expenditures made for such services shall not exceed the State's allotment, as determined under paragraph (c) of this section.

Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section, a State's allotment for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1972, shall consist of the sum of:

(1) An amount not to exceed $50,000,000 payable to the State with respect to the total expenditures incurred, for the calendar quarter beginning July 1, 1972, for matchable costs of services of the type to which the allotment provisions apply, and

(2) An amount equal to three-fourths of the State's allotment as determined in accordance with paragraph (c)(1) of this section.

However, no State's allotment for such fiscal year shall be less than it would otherwise be under the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section.

(b) For purposes of this section, expenditures for services are ordinarily considered to be incurred on the date on which the cash transactions occur or the date to which allocated in accordance with OMB Circular A–87 and cost allocation procedures prescribed by SRS. In the case of local administration, the date of expenditure by the local agency governs. In the case of purchase of services from another public agency, the date of expenditure by such other public agency governs. Different rules may be applied with respect to a State, either generally or for particular classes of expenditures, only upon justification by the State to the Administrator and approval by him, in reviewing State requests for approval, the Administrator will consider generally applicable State law, consistency of State practice, particularly in relation to periods prior to July 1, 1972, and other factors relevant to the purposes of this section.

(c)(1) For each fiscal year (commencing with the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972) each State shall be allotted an amount which bears the same ratio to $2,500,000,000 as the population of such State bears to the population of all the States.

(2) The allotment for each State will be promulgated for each fiscal year by the Secretary between July 1 and August 31 of the calendar year immediately preceding such fiscal year on the basis of the population of each State and of all of the States as determined from the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce at such time.

SEC. 17. RATES AND AMOUNTS OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION FOR PUERTO RICO, THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, AND GUAM.—

(a) For Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, the basic rate for Federal financial participation for Family Services and WIN Support Services under title IV–A is 60 percent. However, effective July 1, 1972, the rate is 50 percent for emergency assistance in the form of services.

(b) For family planning services and for WIN Support Services, the total amount of Federal funds that may be paid for any fiscal year shall not exceed $2,000,000 for Puerto Rico, $65,000 for the Virgin Islands, and $90,000 for Guam. Other services are subject to the overall payment limitations for financial assistance and services under titles I, IV–A, X, XIV, and XVI, as specified in section 1108(a) of the Social Security Act.

(c) The rates and amounts of Federal financial participation set forth in section 15 (a) and (b) herein apply to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, except that the 60-percent rate of Federal financial participation is substituted as may be appropriate. The limitation in Federal payments in section 16 herein does not apply.

SEC. 18. PUBLIC SOURCES OF STATE'S SHARE.—

(a) Public funds, other than those derived from private resources, used by the State or local agency for its services programs may be considered as the State's share in claiming Federal reimbursement where such funds are:

(1) Appropriated directly to the State or local agency; or

(2) Funds of another public agency which are:

(i) Transferred to the State or local agency and are under its administrative control; or

(ii) Certified by the contributing public agency as representing current expenditures for services to persons eligible under the State agency's services programs, subject to all other limitations of this part.

Funds from another public agency may be used to purchase services from the contributing public agency, in accordance with the regulation in this part on purchase of services.

SEC. 19. DONATED PRIVATE FUNDS.—

(a) Donated private funds for services may be considered as State funds in claiming Federal reimbursement where such funds are:

(1) Transferred to the State or local agency and under its administrative control; and

(2) Donated on an unrestricted basis (except that funds donated to support a particular kind of activity, for example, homemaker services, or to support a particular kind of activity in a named community, are acceptable provided the donating organization is not the sponsor or operator of the activity being funded).

(b) Donated private funds for services may not be considered as State funds in claiming Federal reimbursement where such funds are:

(1) Contributed funds which revert to the donor's facility or use.

(2) Donated funds which are earmarked for a particular individual or for members of a particular organization.

IN MEMORIAM: DR. GRANT FURLONG

(Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of Dr. Grant Furlong, a former Member of the House of Representatives, who died at the age of 87 on March 19 at his home in Donora, Pa.

A public official for more than half a century, Dr. Furlong, a physician, served one term during the 78th Congress, 1943–45, and was my immediate predecessor.

A veteran of World War I, he served as a lieutenant in the Cavalry Ambulance Corps and returned to be elected burgess of Donora in 1922. He was a personal friend of President Franklin Roosevelt who appointed him postmaster of Donora in 1933, a post he held until 1938.

Following his congressional term, he returned to Donora, resumed the practice of medicine, and was elected to five 4-year terms as sheriff of Washington County, Pa. He left that office and retired from his medical practice in 1965.

Few men in the history of Pennsylvania have served the people so long and with such distinction as Dr. Furlong. That he successfully combined the careers of public servant and medical doctor is adequate testament to his dynamism and dedication.

A lifelong Democrat, Dr. Furlong made innumerable contributions to the civic life of Donora and Washington County which are well-remembered by residents. With his passing, our community and our State has lost a distinguished citizen.

My wife joins me in expressing our deep sympathy to his widow, Joyce, and to his family for this great loss from their lives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to the following Members:

Mr. GUYER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. KARTH (at the request of Mr. FRASER), until further notice, on account of illness.

Mr. RANGEL, for Thursday, March 22, on account of congressional business.

Mr. McSPADDEN (at the request of Mr. McFALL), for today, on account of illness in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COCHRAN) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes today.

Mr. BELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SEBELIUS, for 1 hour, on March 28.

Mr. KEMP, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Oklahoma) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McFALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRASER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CULVER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of California, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RANGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MELCHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PODELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DINGELL, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BROOMFIELD to extend his remarks following those of Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, today.

Mr. DULSKI, immediately preceding the passage of House Joint Resolution 5 today.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, to revise and extend his remarks at the end of Mr. ICHORD's statement.

Mr. DENHOLM, to revise and extend his remarks at the end of Mr. ICHORD's statement.

Mr. ICHORD, and to include extraneous matter immediately following his remarks in the Committee on the Whole on the funding resolution for the Committee on Internal Security.

Mr. ICHORD in two instances.

Mr. McCLORY, in the body of the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. PEPPER, to extend his remarks in the body of the RECORD, including extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $765.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COCHRAN) and to revise and extend their remarks:)

Mr. LANDGREBE in 10 instances.

Mr. RONCALLO of New York.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. QUILLEN in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HUBER.

Mr. CLEVELAND.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. SHOUP.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. BURGENER.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. KEMP in three instances.

Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. SANDMAN.

Mr. FROEHLICH.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. STEELE.

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. COLLIER in five instances.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Oklahoma) and to revise and extend their remarks:)

Mr. McKAY.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in 10 instances.

Mr. SARBANES in five instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. RANGEL in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in 10 instances.

Mr. MAHON.

Mr. PODELL.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. FULTON.

Mr. STUCKEY in two instances.

Mr. ROYBAL in two instances.

Mr. SYMINGTON.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 7. An act to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and revise the authorization of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services, to authorize grants for rehabilitation services to those with severe disabilities, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 26, 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:

637. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed transfer provision for the fiscal year 1973 for the Department of Defense—Military (H. Doc. No. 93–66); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

638. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

639. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authorization of appropriations for certain programs for the education of the handicapped, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

640. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer franchise fees received from certain concession operations at Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, in the States of Arizona and Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

641. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

642. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of publications entitled "Sales of Firm Electric Power for Resale, 1967–1971," and "Sales by Producers of Natural Gas to Interstate Pipeline Companies, 1971"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

643. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission on Marihuana and Drug Abuse, transmitting the second and final report of the Commission, pursuant to section 601 of Public Law 91–513; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

644. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reform, revise, and codify the substantive criminal law of the United States; to make conforming amendments to title 18 and other titles of the United States Code; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

645. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a request that the Conventon Center-Sports Arena project proposed to be built in the Mt. Vernon Square area of Washington, D.C., be dropped from the public buildings projects currently under consideration by the House and Senate Committees on Public Works; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 6008. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, to direct the President to stabilize rentals and carrying charges; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 6009. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that the rentals and carrying charges charged for accommodations in federally assisted housing may not exceed certain previous levels; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina:

H.R. 6010. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37 of the United States Code in order to provide to members of the armed forces who were in a missing status for any period during the Vietnam conflict double credit for such period for retirement purposes and certain additional benefits and to provide such members certain medical benefits; to provide double retirement credit to Federal employees in such status during such conflict; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BELL (for himself and Mr. CORMAN):

H.R. 6011. A bill to establish in the State of California the Santa Monica Mountain and Seashore National Urban Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 6012. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 for the purpose of determining the causes and means of preventing shoreline erosion; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6013. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 for the purpose of making clear that disaster assistance is available to those communities affected by extraordinary shoreline erosion damage; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6014. A bill to amend section 426 of title 33, United States Code for the purpose of authorizing the Army Corps of Engineers to undertake emergency erosion control projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 6015. A bill to amend section 426 of title 33, United States Code, for the purpose of providing the right of reimbursement to local interests for undertaking repair of shore damages attributable to Federal navigation works pursuant to section 4261; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mrs. MINK, Mr. QUIE, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. PEYSER, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BADILLO, and Mr. LEHMAN):

H.R. 6016. A bill to extend the Education of the Handicapped Act for 3 years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 6017. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services Administration to contract for the construction of certain parking facilities on federally owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6018. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 of compensation paid to law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 6019. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to make a comprehensive study of the wolf for the purpose of developing adequate conservation measures; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CULVER:

H.R. 6020. A bill to insure the separation of Federal powers and to protect the legislative function by requiring the President to notify the Congress whenever he proposes to impound funds, or to authorize the impounding of funds, and to provide a procedure under which the House of Representatives and the Senate may disapprove the President's proposed action; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DELLUMS (for himself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. ECKHARDT, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DE LUGGO, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HICKS, Miss JORDAN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. METCALFE, Ms. MINK, Mr. NIX, Mr. REES, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 6021. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding and improving the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 6022. A bill to repeal the Gun Control Act of 1968, to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, to make the use of a firearm to commit certain felonies a Federal crime where that use violates State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 6023. A bill to insure that a national cemetery is established in each State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 6024. A bill to assist elementary and secondary schools, community agencies and other public and nonprofit private agencies to prevent juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6025. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rates prescribed by that act, to expand employment opportunities for youths, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6026. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code with respect to the observance of Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HARVEY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. STEELE, Mr. THONE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. WYDLER):

H.R. 6027. A bill to allow a credit against Federal income tax 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. GERALD R. FORD (for himself, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. LOTT, and Mr. MOORHEAD of California):

H.R. 6028. A bill to establish rational criteria for the mandatory imposition of the sentence of death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 6029. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for a system of children's allowances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. CULVER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. BURTON, Mr. CARNEY of Ohio, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DENT, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. MOLLOHAN):

H.R. 6030. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the designation of payments to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund be made on the front page of the taxpayer's income tax return form, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. CULVER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PREYER, Mr. REES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SISK, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WON PAT, and Mr. PEPPER):

H.R. 6031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the designation of payments to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund be made on the front page of the taxpayer's income tax return form, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 6032. A bill to amend the act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 568, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 577h) to make additional funds available to carry out the provisions of said act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6033. 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. 6034. A bill to provide a procedure for the exercise of congressional and executive powers over the use of any Armed Forces of the United States in military hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 6035. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit rescue squads to obtain surplus property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 6036. A bill to establish annual import quotas on certain textile and footwear articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 6037. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969 (50 App. U.S.C. 2401–2413), as amended, to control the export of timber from the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 6038. A bill to establish a national program for research, development, and demonstration in fuels and energy and for the coordination and financial supplementation of Federal energy research and development; to establish development corporations to demonstrate technologies for shale oil development, coal gasification development, advanced power cycle development, geothermal steam development, and coal liquefaction development; to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to make mineral resources of the public lands available for said development corporations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUNTER:

H.R. 6039. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to promote public confidence in the legislative branch of the Government of the United States by requiring the disclosure by Members of Congress and certain employees of the Congress of certain financial interests; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 6040. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969, to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and commodities and to reduce the serious inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. ADAMS, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachu-

setts, Mr. GINN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DENHOLM, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 6041. A bill to extend through fiscal year 1974 the expiring appropriations authorizations in the Public Health Service Act, the Community Mental Health Centers Act, and the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. FISH, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BENITEZ, Mr. LENT, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. FULTON, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. FRASER, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 6042. A bill to extend through fiscal year 1974 the expiring appropriations authorizations in the Public Health Service Act, the Community Mental Health Centers Act, and the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOSMER (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. BURGENER, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CONLAN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. FISH, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. HUNT):

H.R. 6043. 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. HOSMER (for himself, Mr. HUDNUT, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MYERS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. REES, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. STARK, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THONE, Mr. TOWELL, of Nevada, and Mr. WARE):

H.R. 6044. 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. HOSMER (for himself, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WYATT, Mr. YATRON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ZION, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.R. 6045. A bill to 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. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. FISH, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. FROEHLICH, and Mr. MOORHEAD of California):

H.R. 6046. A bill to reform, revise, and codify the substantive criminal law of the United States; to make conforming amendments to title 18 and other titles of the United States Code; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself and Mr. MYERS):

H.R. 6047. A bill to amend section 4 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Internal Security.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 6048. A bill to extinguish Federal court jursidiction to require attendance at a particular school of any student because of race, color, creed, or sex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANDGREBE (for himself, Mr. HUBER, and Mr. SYMMS):

H.R. 6049. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for certain programs for the education of the handicapped, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 6050. A bill to reestablish and extend the prorgam whereby payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6051. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committeee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6052. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 each year of an individual's civil service retirement annuity (or other Federal retirement annuity) shall be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 6053. A bill to provide for balanced and efficient protection and development of the national forest system and privately owned forest lands through establishment of a forest lands planning and investment fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 6054. A bill to amend section 5a of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 6055. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MELCHER (for himself, Mr. CULVER, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. REUSS, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 6056. 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. MEZVINSKY:

H.R. 6057. A bill to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, as amended, to increase the U.S. share of allowable project costs under such act, to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 6058. A bill to provide for the adoption of "The Perpetual Calendar"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 6059. A bill to repeal the bread tax on 1973 wheat crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6060. A bill to limit the authority of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to impose, by regulations certain additional restrictions upon the availability and use of Federal funds authorized for social services under the public assistance programs established by the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. REID, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SIKES, Mr. THONE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 6061. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to expand American exports by utilizing foreign currencies owned by the United States to pay foreign import duties on such exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6062. A bill to amend titles 37 and 38, United States Code, to encourage persons to join and remain in the Reserves and National Guard by providing full-time coverage under Servicemen's Group Life Insurance for such members and certain members of the Retired Reserve up to age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6063. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for cost-of-living increases in compensation, dependency, and indemnity compensation, and pension payments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6064. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to liberalize the provisions relating to payment of disability and death pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6065. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish a National Cemetery System within the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6066. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide improved and expanded medical and nursing home care to veterans; to provide hospital and medical care to certain dependents and survivors of veterans; to provide for improved structural safety of Veterans' Administration facilities; to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. QUILLEN (for himself and Mrs. HANSEN of Washington):

H.R. 6067. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code with respect to the observance of Memorial Day and Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 6068. A bill to authorize grants to States and political subdivisions to assist them in modernizing the management, organization, systems and methods, and operations of their tax administrative agency(s) by providing training, managerial development, and research assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 6069. 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. RUPPE:

H.R. 6070. A bill to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 6071. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that an individual shall be considered to have completed the minimum service required to qualify for a retirement annuity under the provisions of that act if he or she had at

any time in the past completed the minimum service required to qualify for a retirement annuity under the corresponding provisions of law in effect at that time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 6072. A bill to amend the Communication Act of 1934 to provide grants to States for the establishment, equipping, and operation of emergency communications centers to make the national emergency telephone number 911 available throughout the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 6073. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety and effectiveness of medical devices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEELE (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. FISH, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. LENT, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. ROE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 6074. A bill to amend the act of May 20, 1964, entitled "An act to prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by vessels other than vessels of the United States, and by persons in charge of such vessels," to define those species of Continental Shelf fishery resources which appertain to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 6075. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOWELL of Nevada:

H.R. 6076. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for transportation expenses of certain individuals employed at remote Federal installations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. HOGAN, and Mr. MOAKLEY):

H.R. 6077. A bill to permit immediate retirement of certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALDIE (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California):

H.R. 6078. A bill to include inspectors of the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the Bureau of Customs within the provisions of section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the retirement of certain employees engaged in hazardous occupations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, and Mr. VIGORITO):

H.R. 6079. A bill to amend section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special allowance for depreciation with respect to certain byproduct and waste energy conversion facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 6080. A bill to designate the Interstate System as the "Eisenhower Interstate Highway System"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 6081. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. DENT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HUDNUT, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. RARICK, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. PODELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. MARAZITI):

H.R. 6082. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional itemized deduction for individuals who rent their principal residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WON PAT (for himself and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

H.R. 6083. A bill authorizing veterans' benefits for persons who served in the Local Security Patrol Force of Guam during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WYMAN (for himself, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 6084. 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. 6085. A bill to amend titles 37 and 38, United States Code, to encourage persons to join and remain in the Reserves and National Guard by providing full-time coverage under Servicemen's Group Life Insurance for such members and certain members of the Retired Reseve up to age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 455. Joint resolution concerning the power of Congress in foreign affairs to participate in the making of international agreements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 456. Joint resolution repealing the Military Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUBER:

H.J. Res. 457. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit busing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR., Mr. DU PONT, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LANDGREBE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.J. Res. 458. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the month of May in each year as "National Arthritis Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZELL:

H.J. Res. 459. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.J. Res. 460. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the period from October 12 through 19 of each year as National Patriotic Education Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FROEHLICH (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. OBEY, Mr. REUSS, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. ZABLOCKI):

H. Con. Res. 162. Concurrent resolution designating De Pere, Wis., as "America's Votingest Small City"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H. Con. Res. 163. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to negotiate with the Government of Canada to establish water levels for the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOWELL of Nevada:

H. Con. Res. 164. Concurrent resolution to collect overdue debts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H. Res. 322. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct an investigation and study of the high price of lumber and plywood; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. Res. 323. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of matters affecting, influencing, and pertaining to the cost and availability of food to the American consumer; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

101. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to broadcasting projections as to the election of the President of the United States before all polls have closed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

102. Also, memorial in the form of a referendum from the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the voluntary recitation of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

103. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the decennial census of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

104. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to dissolving the highway trust fund; 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. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 6086. A bill for the relief of Elena Schwarze-Chamier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H.R. 6087. A bill to authorize Col. Thomas E. Chegin, U.S. Army, Retired, to accept appointment by the Paraguayan Government as an Honorary Consul of Paraguay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 6088. A bill for the relief of Patrick W. Russ; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6089. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie E. Yotz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 6090. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Jesse B. Morris, Jr., U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.