

grateful nation will realize the inequity of the present circumstances and rectify this by increasing educational aid and training, by increasing disability compensation, by expanding and improving the rehabilitation programs, and most importantly, by recognizing these veterans for the sacrifices and for the services they yielded to our country:

VIETNAM VET IS FORGOTTEN AMERICAN
(By Jack Anderson)

They called it peace with honor and said our men would come home on their feet, not on their knees. Just a year ago this week, the last combat troops were withdrawn. Now thousands of veterans find they are flat on their faces.

Vietnam was a war with no glory and, for the men who fought there, no heroes. Many of the young soldiers who risked their lives in the rain forests and rice paddies of Southeast Asia remain alienated from the society that sent them to a war most Americans neither wanted nor like to remember.

The memories are painful, and the process of forgetting has been harsh on the men who came back from Vietnam. The regrettable result: the Vietnam veteran has become today's forgotten American.

He came home to a cold welcome. He found his peers had taken the available jobs, his elders regarded him with suspicion and his government was interested only in cutting veterans' benefits.

The educational benefits of the GI bill, which helped two generations of vets complete their schooling, are now laughably inadequate. Even these small benefits get entangled in the bureaucratic red tape which snarls the Veterans Administration. Scores of former servicemen have complained to us that their college checks arrive too late or not at all.

GI loans for home purchases, which gave

birth to clusters of small but adequate suburban residences across the nation, are virtually worthless in today's inflated real estate market.

Despite half-hearted efforts by the government, many veterans have found they cannot find decent jobs. In hard purchasing power, according to the VA's own private calculations, a single Vietnam vet buys \$203 less with his government check than did his father after World War II. Married vets are even worse off.

Disabled veterans tell us they don't receive adequate treatment, training or compensation. But the darkest cloud hanging over the Vietnam vet is the drug problem. An internal government memo reports that the American public "assumes that all Vietnam era veterans have abused drugs and this makes them more skeptical when it comes to hiring the younger veteran."

There's no denying many GIs came to rely on drugs in Vietnam, some to relieve the pain of wounds, others just to escape the cruel realities of war. The treatment centers promised by the Pentagon have fallen woefully short. They aren't even open to men who received "less than honorable" discharges, although these men often are the ones who most need treatment.

Facing a hostile world that offers them insufficient benefits and few opportunities, some vets have fallen back on their chemical crutches.

Many veterans complain that President Nixon behaved as if the only men who served in Vietnam were the 600 POWs. While he was hosting them in a tent on the White House grounds, he gutted programs that would help the soldiers who didn't get captured.

He slashed disability compensation for severely disabled vets, opposed GI educational increases as "excessive and inflationary," impounded funds voted by Congress to help colleges enroll vets, cut funds for a "mandatory job listing" program intended to give vets

first crack at over a million jobs, and vetoed special burial and health benefits for veterans.

In one celebrated case, the President's budget managers tried to save money by cutting off funds for cooling veterans hospitals in the summer. The Senate responded with a vote to cut off the air conditioning at the Office of Management and Budget. The hospital cooling systems were hastily restored.

The President paid brief attention to the veterans in 1972 when he was running for reelection. The "Veterans Mobile Outreach" program, for instance, sent vans to assist veterans three months before the election. The scheduling and publicity were handled, not by the VA, but by the President's campaign committee. Veterans have charged that the vans visited areas where the President needed votes, not where veterans needed assistance.

But perhaps the biggest obstacle for the returning veterans is the Vietnam war itself. America hasn't yet recovered from the war. The nation was torn apart, and the wounds are deep and slow in healing.

Professional counseling was desperately needed, but seldom provided, for those returning from combat to a country in the midst of rapid social change. The forlorn veteran, suddenly shorn of his uniform and confronted with the conflicts of a nation in turmoil, had nowhere to turn.

It is odd that a country that won't forgive those who refused to serve in Vietnam also refuses to reward those who did their duty. But the veteran is a living symbol of that war, a reminder to his fellow Americans of a pain they would rather forget.

So in a sense, the forgotten veteran has become the last victim of the Vietnam war.

Footnote: Dozens of Massachusetts vets are planning to come to Washington on March 29 to sell apples on street corners. "Project Apple" is patterned after the post-World War I action of veterans.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, April 1, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John W. Eyster, First Congregational Church of Emerald Grove, Janesville, Wis., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Your creative power and meaningful involvement in the process of life challenge us to assume the responsibilities of this hour.

We rejoice in the creative energies and capabilities which You have bestowed upon us for Your glory and the service of our fellow men. It is our awareness of these blessings which humbles us in confessing that we often choose to do that which contradicts Your just purposes and righteous ways.

Clarify for us anew the good which You require of us: To do justice, to love kindness, to walk humbly with You.—Micah 6: 8.

Source of courage and wisdom, so guide and direct us as a people that the means of our governance may help us fulfill the responsibilities of our days.

For Yours is the kingdom, the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 12341. An act to authorize sale of a former Foreign Service consulate building in Venice to Wake Forest University;

H.R. 12465. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1974; and

H.J. Res. 941. Joint resolution making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11873. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the several States in carrying out a program of animal health research; and

H.R. 12466. An act to amend the Department of State Appropriations Authorization Act of 1973 to authorize additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1974, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of

the House to the bill (S. 39) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide a more effective program to prevent aircraft piracy, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. COOK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2348. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code to transfer the functions of the clerk of the U.S. District Court for the District of the Canal Zone with respect to the issuance and recording of marriage licenses, and related activities, to the civil affairs director of the Canal Zone Government, and for other purposes;

S. 2835. An act to rename the first Civilian Conservation Corps Center located near Franklin, N.C., and the Cross Timbers National Grasslands in Texas in honor of former President Lyndon B. Johnson; and

S. 2844. An act to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as amended, to provide for collection of special recreation use fees as additional campgrounds, and for other purposes.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the bill on the Consent Calendar.

DECLARING CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS HELD IN TRUST FOR THE CHIPPEWA CREE TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5525) to declare that certain mineral interests are held by the United States in trust for the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, Mont.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 5525

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all right, title, and interest of the United States in minerals, including coal, oil, and gas, underlying lands held in trust by the United States for the Chippewa and Cree Indians of the Rocky Boy's Reservation and lands located within the legal subdivision described in the Act of March 28, 1939 (53 Stat. 552), are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, Montana: *Provided,* That existing leases issued by the United States shall remain in force and effect subject to payment of all future rentals and royalties to the Chippewa Cree Tribe.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out all of lines 1, 2 and 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "all existing mineral leases, including oil and gas leases which may have been issued or approved by the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 443), as amended, or the Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), prior to the effective date of this Act, shall remain in force and effect in accordance with the provisions thereof.

"SEC. 2. All bonuses, rents and royalties received by the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, from leases of lands identified in section 1 that were issued or approved by him and are now held in special deposits, and all such proceeds received from and after the effective date of this Act shall be deposited to the credit of the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation for such beneficial programs as may be determined by the Tribal Council of the Chippewa Cree Tribe.

"SEC. 3. All applications for mineral leases, including oil and gas leases, pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, covering any of the minerals referred to in section 1 hereof shall be rejected and the advance rental payments returned to the applicants.

"SEC. 4. This Act shall have no application to the north $\frac{1}{2}$ northwest $\frac{1}{4}$, southeast $\frac{1}{4}$ northwest $\frac{1}{4}$, northeast $\frac{1}{4}$ southwest $\frac{1}{4}$, southeast $\frac{1}{4}$ southeast $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 21; the southwest $\frac{1}{4}$ southwest $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 22; and the northwest $\frac{1}{4}$ northeast $\frac{1}{4}$, northeast $\frac{1}{4}$ northwest $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 27 of Township 29 North, Range 14 East, and the north $\frac{1}{2}$ southwest $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 23 of Township 30 North, Range 15 East, M.M.; which lands have heretofore been patented to the State of Montana without reservation of minerals."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

THE INDIAN'S PRAYER

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, we may all find comfort and a way to shore up our courage on the side of right by reciting the Indian's Prayer:

Great Spirit, with the ever-seeing eye, grant that I may not criticize my President until I have walked a mile in his moccasins, and not then until I have examined my own record thoroughly.

We might all be better off if we would recite the Indian's Prayer, then act according to the meaning it conveys.

ONE THOUSAND MIA'S STILL UNACCOUNTED FOR

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, for over a year the American people, especially the families of our missing servicemen, have waited ever so patiently for the North Vietnamese to live up to the terms of the cease-fire agreement. We have received the remains of 23 servicemen who died in captivity. But we are yet to receive any information whatsoever on the fate of well over 1,000 men still listed as missing in action.

Mr. Speaker, this continued example of inhumaneness on the part of the North Vietnamese Government must be brought to the attention of the world. As the elected Representatives of the missing servicemen and their families, we should take the lead in focusing attention on the actions of the North Vietnamese and their unwillingness to live up to the agreements which they signed in Paris.

I call on my colleagues to join me in pressing the North Vietnamese for a complete and factual accounting of all servicemen missing in action in Southeast Asia.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that we are adding a bill to the list of suspensions tomorrow—and I hope the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) is paying particular attention to this—S. 1585 which prevents the unauthorized manufacture and use of the character "Woodsy Owl" of the Forest Service.

THAT SBA AFFAIR

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

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, last

Wednesday here, I detailed some of the results of an investigation my office conducted into Cincinnati, Ohio, operations of the Small Business Administration.

I understand that another investigation, other than my own, has been made by a two-man team of the Small Business Administration and that a report has been filed with the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Today, I am respectfully writing to the Honorable ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR., chairman of the subcommittee, again, asking for a copy of that report.

It is my understanding that the report reinforces and adds information to the investigation which my office conducted, indicating that loans were made or guaranteed by SBA in Cincinnati for businesses which obviously were poor risks and had virtually no chance of succeeding. According to SBA's own files, at least 35 were charged off at a cost to taxpayers of at least \$1 million.

These are only partial investigations which have been conducted but they obviously demonstrate that a full scale, thorough investigation should be made by appropriate authorities.

Therefore, I am respectfully requesting the Small Business Subcommittee to schedule an investigation as soon as possible so that legislation can be prepared which will preclude this manner of thing from happening again to waste taxpayers' hard-earned money.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services:

APRIL 1, 1974.

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

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 301(c), Public Law 93-155, The Department of Defense Appropriations Authorization Act, 1974, provides as follows:

"(c). The Committee on Armed Services of the House shall report to the House by April 1, 1974, a detailed and independent study on the advisability of maintaining our present military commitment to Europe in view of the current economic and military situation in Europe."

On January 24, 1974, I appointed an ad hoc subcommittee to conduct the study required by the above-cited statute and to report its findings and recommendations to the full Committee on Armed Services.

In order to comply with the deadline date of April 1, 1974, there is herewith enclosed a copy of the ad hoc subcommittee's report. The Committee on Armed Services will meet on Thursday, April 4, for a roll call vote on approval of the report. I anticipate that the report will be printed and formally submitted shortly thereafter.

Sincerely,

F. EDW. HEBERT,
Chairman.

FINANCING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF INDIANS AND INDIAN ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1341) to provide for financing the economic development of Indians and Indian organizations, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendment, as follows:

Page 4, line 21, of the engrossed House amendment, strike out "than—per" and insert "than 50 per".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment to the House amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 1003 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That (a) the Committee on House Administration is authorized to incur such further expenses (not in excess of \$2,400,000) as the committee considers advisable to provide for maintenance and improvement of ongoing computer services for the House of Representatives and for the investigation of additional computer services for the House of Representatives, including expenditures—

(1) for the employment of technical, clerical, and other assistants,

(2) for the procurement of services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)), and for the procurement of equipment by contract or otherwise,

(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.

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

(b) Not to exceed \$478,500 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(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)), and not to exceed \$9,000 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 expendi-

tures 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.

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.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1003 is to provide for the House Information Services the sum of \$2.4 million, which represents the same amount as for last year.

Mr. Speaker, the process of devising computerized systems to work for the House and for its Members is going forward splendidly under Dr. Frank Ryan and his staff. It is being watched and has been watched very carefully by the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) and the other members of the committee. This resolution was reported unanimously from the 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.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, 2D SESSION, 93D CONGRESS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 945 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 945

Resolved, That, during the second session of the Ninety-third Congress, the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Ways and Means acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$395,000, 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(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); 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 Ways and Means 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 945 is to provide funds for the Committee on Ways and Means in the amount of \$395,000. This represents an increase which the committee considers vitally needed, in the amount of \$124,549.79 for additional professional staff, which is badly needed by the committee.

The resolution was reported unanimously by the 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.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 163

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 886 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 886

Resolved, That the further 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 \$802,000, 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(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); 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, this resolution would provide funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the amount of \$802,000. It was unanimously agreed upon in the 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.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR EXPENSES FOR INVESTIGATION AND STUDY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 267, 93D CONGRESS

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 952 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 952

Resolved, That for the further expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 267, Ninety-third Congress, incurred by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$561,235 including expenditures for the employment of experts, 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(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); 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 Foreign 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 952 would fund the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the amount of \$561,235, the same as in the first session. This resolution again was unanimously agreed upon by the 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.

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATION AND STUDY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 228

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 987 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 987

Resolved, That, for the further expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 228, by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$1,394,480, 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 \$180,000 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(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); 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 Public Works 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 987 would

fund the Committee on Public Works in the amount of \$1,394,480. It was unanimously agreed upon by the Committee on House Administration.

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 INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 162

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 957 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 957

Resolved, That, effective January 1, 1974, 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(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); 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 957 would fund the Committee on the District of Columbia in the amount of \$275,000, the same amount as in the first session. It, too, was unanimously agreed upon.

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 in nowise provides money for the Committee on the District of Columbia to do any foreign junketing, does it?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that they can junket only within the confines of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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 INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 916 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 916

Resolved, That the further expenses of investigations and studies to be made pursuant to H. Res. 182 by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$639,000, including expenditures for the employment of professional, 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.

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 purposes by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce 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 916 is for the funding of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in the amount of

\$639,000, some \$171,266.71 less than last year, the reason being that they had a carryover that was unanimously agreed upon by the Committee on House Administration.

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 INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 19

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 920 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 920

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1974, the expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 19, by the permanent Select Committee on Small Business, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$431,000, 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 \$25,000 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(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); 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 permanent Select Committee on Small Business 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 920 would fund the Committee on Small Business in the amount of \$431,000. It was unanimously agreed upon by the 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.

AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 937 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 937

Resolved, That (a) effective January 3, 1974, 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(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); 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 \$25,000 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(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); 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.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 937 provides funding for the Committee on Internal Security and will provide that committee with the amount of \$475,000, the same level of funding as in the 1st Session of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN) for purposes of debate only.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, this year is a different year for funding of the House Internal Security Committee. In 1974 all of the evidence points to the fact that we should finally cast a negative vote and defund this committee of the Congress.

The Committee on Committees under the distinguished leadership of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) has recommended that the function of the House Internal Security Committee be transferred to the Committee on Government Operations. Never before has this committee been recommended by another House committee for action of this nature.

President Nixon has recommended finally that we do something about privacy. I appeal to both sides of the aisle to recognize that finally the President of the United States has recognized the concept and the value of privacy.

I appeal to all Members to ask how we can justify the continuation of the House Internal Security Committee and reconcile its existence with the basic fundamental concept of privacy. I appeal to the Republicans particularly because now that the President has recognized the concept of privacy it is imperative that the Congress itself admit that we have a committee in existence that defies the very basic concept of privacy.

The case is overwhelming. Members of the House, for the elimination of this committee.

First, little if any legislation has come out during the past year.

Second, the investigation into the allegedly subversive groups that is carried on by this committee could and should be done by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or by other agencies.

Third, the continuation of the preservation of the files of this particular committee is totally indefensible.

Two years ago there were 752,000 Americans on whom this committee kept files. I have regularly, at the request of constituents and others, secured from the files of the House Internal Security Committee the material which they have on Americans. That material is worthless. It is taken from public sources. It is hearsay. It is totally unverified.

I think another shocking thing, and I have brought this fact out before, and a disgrace to the House Internal Security Committee and to the House is the fact that 25 executive agencies of the Federal Government regularly, day after day, come in and gain access to the files of the House Internal Security Committee. Members of the House, that is lawless. There is absolutely no Executive order that permits or justifies the intrusion of the executive branch into the files of a committee of this House.

Time after time I have asked the distinguished chairman to eliminate this. I have pleaded with the executive agencies not to take advantage of the leniency of the chairman. I suggest to the Members that such access in and of itself is an

abuse of the files of this committee and should be eliminated.

In short, I ask the Members of the House how we can justify the continuation of this committee and this practice, this collection of raw data on Americans who are allegedly subversive. This committee is an anachronism. It is a hangover from the era of the cold war. This is a committee which is no longer justified.

I urge the Members of the House to vote no on this resolution.

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

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman serves on the Committee on Internal Security?

Mr. DRINAN. I do. I have served for 3½ years.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, what would be the objection of having the public come in and check this collection of information, if indeed, the files are intended for public reference? What is so bad about that?

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the files are not kept for public information. The files are available, like every other file in the House of Representatives, to Members. If a constituent writes to a Member, to any Member, he may secure whatever the House Internal Security Committee keeps on the individual who has written to him.

They are not public files, and that is the precise nature of my objection. They are private files. They are secret dossiers. They are dossiers on three-fourths of a million Americans. I think that violates the fundamental role of this House.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, did I understand him to say that these files contain information that would leave the impression that the persons named in the files were guilty of some acts of subversion or who are subversive?

Mr. DRINAN. Precisely. There is a distinguished rabbi from Massachusetts on whom the House Internal Security Committee had an extensive file. I obtained that file. They had the fact or allegation in there that this rabbi went to an allegedly Socialist event 15 or 18 years ago.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I found this a collection of hearsay, of reports from Socialist or Communist newspapers which were scurrilous, to say the least. That rabbi rightfully felt indignant and outraged that a committee of the Congress would keep this in a file; that it was available to Members of the Congress and also to 25 agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, would not the material, the way it is, so far as Members are concerned, be available to them, and if they ask for the information contained in the files they can get it?

Mr. DRINAN. Aside from the harm it does, there is absolutely no justification for spending \$700,000, at least, of Federal money, on the preservation of those files and the continuation of this committee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I too am economy minded, and I have looked at that aspect of the matter very closely myself.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, quite recently I read a committee report on the Symbionese Liberation Army. Would the gentleman deprive the American people of the knowledge that the gentleman has gained in his committee on that particular group of people, who without any provocation, are admitted anarchists, murderers and kidnapers? Does the gentleman not think that his committee owes to the American people this kind of worthwhile information?

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, investigation of groups such as that obviously should be done, but it should be done by the FBI or the Department of Justice and law enforcement agencies. The investigation of allegedly criminal subversive activities is not a function of this House. Usually, we investigate only in order to get facts upon which we can make laws.

The FBI has extensive files, as they should, on the alleged subversive organization the gentleman mentioned. Obviously, we need this, but I think it is done in the wrong place. There is no evidence, furthermore, that it is done in a way that could not be done better by the FBI.

Mr. HUNT. I respect my colleague's admiration for the FBI. They do an excellent job but the abdication of the Congress on matters of this nature must never come to pass—we must continue the committee as now constituted and make investigations where necessary.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Internal Security, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

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

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it had not been my intention to reserve time today, but after the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the committee, I feel that I am constrained to do so.

I would point out to the gentleman from Tennessee that the gentleman from Massachusetts has stated that he went on the committee for the purpose of destroying the committee from within.

And he is exercising that prerogative today. The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct when he states that all of the information in the files and reference section is public information. He is incorrect, I would state to the gentleman from Tennessee—and I have cor-

rected this on the floor of the House previously, but the figure in the RECORD continues to be picked up and re-used—he is incorrect when he states that there are 775,000 or 750,000 files in the files and reference section. I believe that is the figure he used.

There are no files upon 750,000 individuals. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not observed that there may be more than one entry on any particular individual. For example, I am quite sure that Gus Hall, the chairman of the Communist Party of the United States of America, would have several thousand entries in the files and reference section. I am also sure that the people whom I often refer to as the "kookie" revolutionary type, like Eldridge Cleaver or Jerry Rubin, would have innumerable entries concerning their activities.

Mr. Speaker, I have been the chairman of the Committee on Internal Security for the 5 years which the committee has existed. During that time, I might say that I have heard the same arguments year after year against the appropriations for the operations of the committee. Those arguments essentially come from the same Member of the House who, I believe, are opposed to internal security work on the part of the House of Representatives in any shape or form.

The average vote on the appropriations during these years has been 300 yeas and 76 nays, and it is principally to those 300 or so colleagues that I would address my remarks today. I think those Members are entitled to know whether their votes have been justified.

Before proceeding further on that point, I wish to recall with the Members that this body decided 5 years ago that it would have a Committee on Internal Security as a standing committee of the House. The instructions from the House were that this Committee on Internal Security should conduct investigations concerning organizations or groups which advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States or any of its subdivisions by force, violence, terrorism, or other unlawful means.

It was clear that the House felt it should have within it a body designated to keep the Members informed on matters affecting one of our basic responsibilities: To preserve the Constitution of the United States and the form of free government which we have. It was also clear at the time that the House intended the Committee on Internal Security to be primarily an investigative and oversight committee, since it was very obvious that a very limited legislative output could be expected from a committee with such a narrow mandate.

Mr. Speaker, with these brief reminders of the intentions of this House when it set up the Committee on Internal Security, I would like to return to my earlier point: Has the committee justified the confidence of those who have supported the appropriation measure?

In the 91st Congress, in the first 2 years of the committee's existence, some 30 bills were referred to the committee, and the committee favorably reported upon 3: the Defense Security and In-

dustrial Security Act, an amendment to the Internal Security Act dealing with the obstruction of Armed Forces during periods of armed conflict abroad, as well as amendments to the Emergency Detention Act.

The committee conducted an extensive investigation of the Black Panther Party, a paramilitary organization of militants, which had achieved national notoriety for its physical and propaganda assaults on law enforcement officials.

The Congress not only benefited from the accurate information—and I stress the word accurate, developed by the committee but also caused the revision of the Federal firearms laws to plug a loophole which had been widely used by Black Panther Party members. Corrective action was taken by the Agriculture Department when the committee disclosed the misuse by Black Panther Party members of Federal food stamps. The evidence of those hearings resulted in the introduction of legislation making it a Federal crime to kill or assault a law enforcement officer under certain circumstances. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration was urged to encourage utilization of Federal funds to improve the intelligence collection capability of local law enforcement agencies and, at the committee's instigation, the Postal Service caused review of the law relating to the use of the mails for distribution of revolutionary propaganda. The committee urged the Internal Revenue Service to take appropriate action against the Black Panther Party which had never filed tax returns since its inception.

A special report on the SDS relating to its attempts to recruit teenagers was prepared because of the great concern on the part of the school administrators, teachers, and parents.

In the 92d Congress bills were reported out to expand the jurisdiction of the Subversive Activities Control Board, to impose penal sanctions for travel to countries engaged in armed conflict with the United States in violation of travel restrictions, and to remedy deficiencies in the Federal civilian loyalty-security program.

The committee held extensive hearings concerning allegations that organizations espousing violent revolution were involved in efforts to disrupt the Armed Forces of the United States. As a result of the committee's work, the Department of Defense conducted an in-depth review of its policies and practices in the security field. The committee reported extensively upon two Maoist terrorist groups, the Revolutionary Union and the Venceremos Organization. The report was forwarded to the Department of Justice for review with a view toward prosecutive action under Federal laws.

Noting that the public had not been kept informed concerning the Communist influence in the leadership of the two principal anti-war groups, the committee held extensive hearings concerning these organizations—the National Peace Action Coalition and the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice. As a result of evidence detailing the exten-

sive damage to Federal property caused by demonstrators acting under the auspices of these two groups, legislation was introduced requiring the posting of a bond by organizers of major demonstrations.

The committee issued a comprehensive legislative report following a 2-year inquiry into the Federal civilian loyalty-security program and executive branch agencies in response to this report advised that they were adopting significant changes in the conduct of their program in this field. For example, the Civil Service Commission took steps to revise its fitness standards and revise its training requirements for suitability examiners and security specialists, as well as its security appraisal functions.

During the present Congress, members of the committee responded to the concern of all thinking Americans concerning the necessity for prison reform and conducted hearings concerning allegations that members of various revolutionary groups had become involved for ulterior purposes in the prison reform movement to the detriment of efforts toward real reform. The committee's report called attention to the lack of information on the part of correctional officers concerning the identities and activities of such groups and has recommended to the Attorney General that the expertise of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and the Bureau of Prisons be utilized to correct this deficiency. The committee is awaiting the Attorney General's report.

In August last year the committee produced a report on political kidnappings, and I warned therein that they could happen here, a prediction that unfortunately came true with the kidnapping of Patricia Hearst by the Symbionese Liberation Army. I personally sent each Member of the House a special report on this group as a matter concerning which all public officials should be aware. The committee is presently holding hearings on the subject of terrorism with the hope that some useful recommendations for executive branch action will result.

The committee has also begun an exhaustive review of the law, regulations and practices of the executive branch in the field of domestic intelligence collection, and I expect this oversight work to be one of the most significant efforts of the committee.

These are the highlights and I will leave it to the Members as to whether these are the kinds of investigations and reports for which they have voted and want continued.

I have repeatedly said that I am less concerned with who does the work of internal security in the House as long as it is done and done effectively. I would be greatly concerned if this Committee's efforts were hampered by lack of funding or by attempts to stifle its work by burying it in some other committee with inadequate resources and staff.

There is simply no other reliable source of information available to the Congress. Where would you go for accurate up-to-

date information in the field of internal security? To the Congressional Reference Service, which has neither the records nor the personnel to answer your questions? To the FBI? That organization is limited to furnishing the Congress a few brief paragraphs annually in support of its appropriation request. To the Subversive Activities Control Board? The administration killed it last year. Where else would you go? The answer is there is not any place else to go.

I need not remind you that world conditions have changed little since you set up the Committee on Internal Security. On the Communist side at least the hoped for détente appears to be mostly words rather than deeds. We are once again reminded that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance and that, therefore, the necessary work of insuring our internal security as well as our national defense must continue.

For further clarification of the full and reference section function I am submitting descriptive information which I supplied to the Select Committee on Committees in June 1973. The material follows:

DATA CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF FILES AND REFERENCE SECTION

1. What various kinds of material are utilized as sources for information to be retained in the files?

In addition to published hearings and reports of this and other congressional and State committees, the Committee utilizes such material as periodicals and other primary source material (letterheads, press releases, handbills, conference calls or programs, and other official literature) of organizations which have been cited or characterized as subversive by a Federal authority. This would also include publications of organizations currently under investigation by the Committee or publications of organizations which may be potential subjects of future Committee investigation.

To supplement this primary source material, the Committee also makes use of news items from the public press. Fair reporting requires review of the public press because primary source material coverage of events and activities may be scanty, misleading, biased, or inaccurate. Also, newspapers often are the most up-to-date source of information.

2. By what means does this material come to the staff?

Source material comes to the Committee's files by various means. Some comes on a regular basis by subscription (in addition to the periodicals subscribed to, the Committee receives other material sent to those on the subscription mailing list). Other items may be sent in by concerned citizens or may be acquired by staff members individually.

3. Approximately how many publications are received with regularity on a subscription basis?

At present, the Committee receives 40 periodicals by subscription.

4. What means and standards are utilized in choosing material for subscription, or in seeking other material for review?

Periodicals chosen for subscription are largely those which are self-described or generally recognized as official organs of groups which have been cited or characterized as subversive by a Federal authority, or which contain considerable information concerning such persons. This would also include organizations currently under investigation by the Committee or organizations of possible future Committee investigation.

5. Enumerate the physical procedures which are employed in reviewing incoming publications.

Some incoming periodicals are reviewed regularly by members of the staff of the Research Section, for possible use in connection with their specific assignments and/or for the purpose of obtaining general information for possible future use. These periodicals deal largely with the theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism and various forms of radicalism of domestic origin.

Other incoming periodicals are reviewed and indexed regularly by members of the staff of the Files and Reference Section. Information of interest is extracted and summarized on 3 x 5 index cards. Each such card carries complete documentation, and the source itself is retained in Committee files for ready reference.

6. What specific standards are used in determining whether information concerning an individual, an organization, a publication, or other subject matter will be retained for file?

A judgment to retain information is generally based on whether the information relates to activities in connection with organizations which have been cited or characterized as subversive by a Federal authority. This would also include activities in connection with organizations currently the subject of Committee investigation or possible future investigation. In addition, it would include press clippings of acts of revolutionary violence which may not have any particular organization tie-in.

This does not mean that the information is necessarily derogatory. The staff is careful to index any item which comes to its attention indicating that a person known to have a "record of subversive activities" may have expressed an opinion or taken a stand in opposition to communism or some other forms of subversion. When the staff prepares a report on an individual, any known statement which may serve to clarify his "record" is included.

It may not be possible to determine at the time an item is picked up whether it may properly be used in the future, but if in any way it appears to pertain to or clarify activities already documented in Committee files, it is normally retained. In any event, whenever information which may be considered derogatory is reported concerning an individual, the Committee also reports any information in files which may appear to contradict or clarify such information.

7. What categories of persons and organizations have the right to information from the files?

House Rule XI, clause 26(c) states: "All Committee headings, records, data, charts, and files . . . shall be property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access to such records."

Thus, all Members of the House have the right to information from the files under House Rule XI. The courtesy has also been extended through the years to Members of the Senate. In addition, investigation of applicants for positions in the Federal Government includes a search of the index cards in the Files and Reference Section. Requests for this information are made by authorized representatives of the Federal departments and agencies. These representatives have "clearance" and their departments or agencies furnish the committee letters of authorization.

In connection with the above matter, it is noted that President Truman in Executive Order 9835 on March 21, 1947, his so-called "loyalty order," directed that the names of every applicant for Government employment be checked against the files of the Committee. This procedure was followed when President Eisenhower's Executive Order 10450 of April 27, 1953, superseded Executive Order 9835. This practice is clearly within the national interest.

The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in *United States v. Gojack* (280 F.2d 687-681) determined that the practice of the Committee in making these files available to Members of Congress was further evidence of the Committee's concern with its constitutional duty of assisting in the enactment of legislation rather than being an act for which the Committee was to be censured. The Court stated:

"A large collection of material and exhibits is maintained by the Committee in connection with its constituted duties in order to furnish reference service not only to the Committee's own Members and staff in its investigations and hearings, but also to every Member of Congress who submits a written request for information in that file."

The Committee each year makes an annual report to the House and the public in general in which it includes statistics on the information service its Files and Reference Section provides for the Members and also reports on the number of visits made by representatives of Federal agencies in checking information in Committee files.

8. In what manner are they required to present requests, and to what extent do they have access?

All requests for information from the Files and Reference Section must be presented in writing.

When representatives of the Federal Government visit the files section, they must present their credentials and register their time of arrival and departure. They do not have access to the actual file folders containing correspondence and source material. Index cards only are searched for them by a member of the Committee staff.

As a rule, requests from Members of Congress are in the form of a letter or printed transmittal slip bearing the signature of the Members. Requests from the Federal Government are in the form of typewritten lists on stationery bearing the name of the department or agency. Some are submitted by mail, and others are presented in person by authorized representatives.

9. Who determines who should have access, and what safeguards are employed to prevent abuse?

Policies concerning access to files have been determined largely by the Committee Chairman, usually in consultation with the Committee chief counsel and/or administrative chief.

Safeguards include limited admittance to the space occupied by the Files and Reference Section, and registration of persons who are not members of the staff. Even members of the staff outside the Files and Reference Section are restricted in their use of the files.

Admittance to the space occupied by the Files and Reference Section is limited to the staff, authorized representatives of the Federal Government, and individuals accompanied by staff members. Only those in the first two categories may seek information from the files.

All requests from any source are recorded in a journal, and each entry is followed by a written account of any action taken.

10. In what form is information furnished to persons or organizations who have a right of access?

Members of the Committee staff may examine file material within the Committee space (material is not loaned for use outside the Committee space). Under some circumstances, material may be reproduced for the convenience of staff members, and in some cases the material may be summarized in a typewritten report.

Representatives of the Federal Government examine index cards only, within the Files and Reference Section.

Information is furnished to Members of Congress on printed report forms. This explanation appears on the form:

"This Committee makes no evaluation in this report. The following is only a compila-

tion of recorded public source material contained in our files and should not be construed as representing the results of any investigation or finding by the Committee. The fact that the Committee has information as set forth below on the subject of this report is not per se an indication that this individual, organization, or publication is subversive, unless specifically stated."

11. Is all information available in a file made available to the person making a request?

Only the card index is searched for representatives of the Federal Government.

Reports prepared by the Files and Reference Section for Members of Congress are thoroughly documented compilations of information, based on a complete search of all indexed public source material in files. The information is extracted and prepared by trained members of the Files and Reference Section staff. File folders are not available to persons outside the staff.

12. What procedures are utilized in putting information together to answer requests, and what standards are employed to resolve what shall be included and what shall be excluded?

Requests for information are assigned to trained members of the Files and Reference Section staff, who search all index references to the subject and examine the original sources. Written reports are prepared in accordance with guidelines set forth some years ago in consultation with Committee counsel. They are carefully proofed with original sources to insure accuracy. Generally speaking, the information reported relates to activities in connection with organizations which have been cited or characterized as subversive by a Federal authority. Reports are not furnished on present Members of Congress, individuals concerning whom the Committee has only two or less very old and insignificant references, and deceased individuals (unless they were self-proclaimed Communists, were named as officials or members of the Communist Party in Party publications, or were identified as such in sworn testimony before duly constituted governmental agencies).

13. Are there any restrictions on the use which may be made of information furnished to a person or organization authorized to receive it?

The Committee has no power or authority to control the action a Member may take in using the information furnished. Information furnished to representatives of the Government is subject to the policies and procedures of the Federal security program.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of time, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, following our agreement, I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) for the purpose of interrogation.

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

The gentleman, who is the chairman of the Committee on Internal Security, I am sure will agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts and others that the matter of privacy and Government files and the dissemination thereof are mat-

ters of large interest in the country today. Is that correct?

Mr. ICHORD. I would state to the gentleman from California that there are many people who are very concerned about the problem of intrusion by the Government into the privacy of individuals; yes.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Can the gentleman point out to me and to the House where in the rules of the House your authorization exists to maintain this reporting system for Members of Congress to obtain information about American citizens and for Government agencies to obtain information about American citizens? If I might read your mandate, the Committee on Internal Security shall report to the House or to the Clerk of the House the results of any investigation. How are you able to maintain that?

Mr. ICHORD. I will state to the gentleman from California, as has been pointed out previously, that all of the information contained in the Files and Reference Section that is furnished to the Members of the House is already public information. I would refer the gentleman to the general rules, and I do not have the specific number thereof in mind at this time, to the effect that the records of all committees are the property of the House of Representatives. It is under that rule and it is under the precedent of the predecessor committee, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, that the House Committee on Internal Security does comply with requests of the Members. I would state to the gentleman from California that the gentleman from Massachusetts objected to the operations of the files and reference section. The gentleman from Massachusetts has, I am quite sure, requested more information on individuals than any other Member of the House of Representatives. However, the gentleman man from California and I have discussed this matter many times previously. I have stated that under the rules and under the precedents I will continue to supply this information to the Members of the House upon request and I would point out that I have offered many, many times, as the gentleman from California well knows, both to the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Massachusetts, any time they want to get a particular resolution up before the House of Representatives for debate and decision on this matter I will help them to do so, and I renew that offer today. However, as yet the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Massachusetts have not made one effort to my knowledge to direct any resolution toward the operation of the files and reference section to the House Committee on Internal Security. I would ask the gentleman from California if he has done so?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I would like to point out—

Mr. ICHORD. Has the gentleman from California done so?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Well, I believe that the next step is up to the gentleman from Missouri. The gentleman from Missouri is operating without con-

gressional authority and he admits that. This long and involved answer says the same thing.

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

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

Mr. ICHORD. Let me state in reply to the gentleman from California that I do not admit that I was operating without House authority.

I stated that I was operating under the rule that states that these records are the property of the House of Representatives. They are available to the Members. And I am operating under the precedents established by preceding committees. And I will continue to do so. True, the gentleman from California objects to that method of procedure.

If the gentleman wants the House to resolve this matter, I will assist the gentleman in getting this matter before the House by separate resolution. The gentleman knows that. We can then have the House decide how it should be operated.

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

Mr. ICHORD. In just 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I also made the offer to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DRINAN). And I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts has the gentleman offered such a resolution?

Mr. DRINAN. The distinguished Chairman has said that many times on the floor of this House.

Mr. ICHORD. I have stated it before on the floor of the House, and I have also stated it individually to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and the gentleman from Massachusetts has not seen fit to avail himself of this offer. If the gentleman desires to do so I will help the gentleman get the matter before the House so that the House can resolve the issue. Why does not the gentleman from Massachusetts do that?

Mr. DRINAN. When the chairman of the committee is accused by his colleagues of acting illegally and without authorization—

Mr. ICHORD. Oh, no, the gentleman from Massachusetts is making that illegal allegation.

Mr. DRINAN. The committee is acting without authorization.

Mr. ICHORD. That is the contention of the gentleman from Massachusetts. The gentleman states that the committee is acting illegally, but I think the committee is not acting illegally. If the gentleman from Massachusetts wants to get that matter before the House in the form of a resolution I will help the gentleman get the matter of the operation of the files before the House and let the House pass upon it.

I ask the gentleman how much more fair can the chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security be?

Mr. DRINAN. This is a matter for decision by the House. If the Members vote for this funding they are implicitly voting for terrorism.

Mr. ICHORD. That is the interpretation of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the chairman and to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the chairman is probably correct that this is a part of the precedents, and the past history of the House, and I would accept that as a rule of the House.

Mr. ICHORD. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio.

I think the gentleman from Massachusetts is really attacking the voting records of all of the Members of the House who voted for the appropriation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, you know, this is kind of a dreary subject. We have considered it so many, many times.

We have a committee that is looking into restructuring—and I am not here by any manner or means to commend them for all of their recommendations—but I understand this bipartisan 10-member committee voted unanimously that HISC be abolished, and its functions transferred to the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Government Operations. I suspect that they arrived at this recommendation because HISC, by any measurement, has not served any useful purpose.

I am sure we all know that even if we vote down this added money that HISC will have available to it, some quarter-million dollars in staffing each year.

Looking back over the 10 or 11 times I have taken this floor to enlighten my colleagues as to my views on this ennobling subject, I think we have made a mistake. We have been making an effort to reduce the total funding of the old House Un-American Activities Committee, now otherwise known as HISC. In the absence of abolishing the committee or cutting out all additional funds, perhaps what we should have done is given them what they asked for, or a little less, and merely denied them the right to take newspaper subscriptions, to buy or keep or use scissors, and deny them the right to use Scotch tape or glue. Because about all their staff does is sit around reading the daily and the weekly press, having people neatly cutting out articles, trimming the articles they cut out, having someone else Scotch tape them, and a third person indexing these Scotch taped newspaper clippings—perhaps sometimes they use glue.

But, really, it is a little bit absurd, I think, that this body any longer provide added funding over the quarter-million dollars already available to this rather useless appendix in the American body politic.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the resolution.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the

chairman for yielding this time to me. If anyone has any doubt, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, last year, the National Broadcasting Co. ran a TV special on the Communist Party, U.S.A., which contained the results of a very significant poll which NBC financed through the Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J.

No one can accuse either NBC or the polling organization of any special prejudice in favor of the House Committee on Internal Security so I think it behooves us to reexamine the results of that poll of the American people.

Said NBC-TV Moderator Frank McGee:

It was our intent to find out what Americans think of communists today. We asked whether communists should be prohibited from holding federal jobs or jobs in defense industries. 83% replied that communists should be prohibited. On the question of communists teaching in public schools—79% said they should be barred. We asked whether the Communist Party should be outlawed—61% said that the Party should be outlawed. Should communists be required to register with the Justice Department? 82% said that they should be required. Should communists be prohibited from running for public office? 74% believed they should be prohibited. Do Americans consider the communist threat greater from abroad or from within? 20% said the foreign threat is greater 32% said the domestic communist threat is greater.

Mr. McGee concluded:

The poll shows that the American attitude changed little in 20 years. It is still a firm, anticommunist attitude. It is true that communism has faded into the background of consciousness so there is less of it as a political issue. The enforcement of anticommunist laws has all but vanished, the emotionalism has subsided. What we have is tolerance, what we do not have is acceptance. For example, communists trying to qualify candidates for the 1972 elections gathered hundreds of thousands of petition signatures, yet in the presidential election Gus Hall's national vote total was only 25,000.

This clearly reflects how the American people feel and we—as the Representatives of the people—may be expected to reflect the views of our constituencies when we vote on this appropriation for the House Committee on Internal Security.

The problems of internal security are still very much with us. We have seen the alleged abuses in the name of internal security in the Watergate case and more recently we have been shocked by the kidnapping of an innocent girl to promote the revolutionary cause in the United States. Our Committee on Internal Security has long ago proceeded in its low key, businesslike way to conduct oversight hearings in the area of executive branch intelligence operations and has published several highly informative studies on terrorism and is currently continuing hearings on the subject. Thus we have in the Congress a unique committee which is responsive to the practical up-to-date problems in the internal security field and I think com-

monsense tells us that its continued funding is highly justified.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAN DANIEL).

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, Communists and their sympathizers are at the forefront of those who are clamoring for the abolition of the House Committee on Internal Security. They have been working toward this objective for many years.

It has recently come to my attention that the well-known Communist front, the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation (NCARL), formerly known as the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee and the National Committee To Abolish HUAC/HISC, has boasted in its February 1974 newsletter that during 1973 some 60,000 copies of its publication, "Ten Reasons Why HISC Should Cease To Exist" were distributed. The newsletter also noted that NCARL has vowed to continue to give top priority to the anti-House Committee on Internal Security campaign and asserted that 1974 will be the year of abolition.

To those who may not be familiar with the Communist background of the NCARL, which incidentally maintains a lobbyist in Capitol Hill in its efforts to abolish the HCIS, I would point out that at the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., held in New York City during December 1959 there was a resolution passed calling on all party members to work toward "abolishing the 'witch-hunting' House Un-American Activities Committee."

Shortly thereafter, due primarily to the efforts of Frank Wilkinson, an identified Communist Party member, the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee was formally established during the summer of 1960 for the purpose of leading and directing the CPUSA's campaign to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Seven of the national leaders of this group at the time of its formation have been identified as Communists. The top-heavy representation of Communists in official positions of leadership indicated that the Communist Party was taking no chance that the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee would deviate the slightest degree from the Communist Party line. The Communists were inherently dedicated to the opposition of any investigation of subversion, because the principal target would necessarily be the CPUSA and its network of front groups. The use of the word "abolition" carried a concept of utter liquidation. There was no compromise in the attack by the Communists and no suggestion of reform.

In recent years, the National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee has undergone a name change on two different occasions. This is primarily because it cannot afford the exposure of the Communist background of its leaders. But the names and faces of its promoters are the same.

After changing its name to the National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee/House Internal Security Committee in early 1969, the NCARL adopted its current name and expanded its activities to work toward the abolition of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as well as all legislative committees, both State and Federal, engaged in the investigation of domestic subversion. It revised its overall objective to include "dedication to abolition of all 'inquisitorial' committees, and for the opposition to all 'repressive' laws." The NCARL continues to flourish pursuant to its expanded objective. A glance at its leaders, officers, and sponsors removes any possible doubt about the fact that this organization is under Communist Party domination and has been so since it came into existence in 1960.

Frank Wilkinson, NCARL's executive director, has been described as the "brains and energy" behind NCARL. Wilkinson has been identified as a CP member in sworn testimony by Mrs. Anita Schneider and Robert Ronstandt, both of whom have been undercover members of the Communist Party reporting to the FBI for several years. When Wilkinson appeared as a witness before the HCUA, he refused to answer questions concerning his CP membership and also refused to rely on the protection of the fifth amendment. He was found guilty of contempt of Congress and after his conviction was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court on February 17, 1961, he spent a year in a Federal penal institution.

Harvey O'Connor, NCARL's national chairman, has been publicly identified as a member of the Communist Party; so has Richard Criley who heads the NCARL's midwest region. Carl and Anne Braden, who operate the NCARL's southern region, have also been identified as members of the CP.

The CPUSA press, which over the years has been exhorting the party faithful to concentrate on the abolition of the House Committee on Internal Security, has been extremely vocal in its opposition to the committee. For example, on November 1, 1973, the House Committee on Internal Security announced it would begin a series of hearings to update the committee's information concerning the continuing close ideological ties between the Communist parties of the United States and the Soviet Union and to examine the Communist interpretation of coexistence and detente. On the following day, the Daily World, the CPUSA's east coast organ, launched a vicious attack against these hearings, which it termed "an effort to revive the anti-Communist McCarran Act" and a "witch-hunting proceeding against the Communist Party."

Mr. Speaker, this long-time active organization doing the work of the Communist Party annually stirs up a flurry of opposition to the continuation of internal security work by this committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr.

Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, once again the Members of the House are being asked to approve an additional appropriation for a standing committee which in its entire history has yet to exhibit any legitimate function. I submit to you that the approximately \$250,000 which the House Internal Security Committee receives automatically each year is more than sufficient for any legislative responsibilities before the committee.

A brief look at HISC's legislative record for 1973 demonstrates my point. Of the 13 bills referred to the committee, 8 were duplicate bills and 4 of the remaining 5, if they had not been authored by members of the committee, would probably have been referred to other committees, such as Judiciary, Post Office and Civil Service, and Armed Services.

Of the five different bills referred to the House Internal Security Committee, four are still in committee. The fifth bill, H.R. 8023, to prohibit U.S. citizens from traveling to countries in armed conflict with U.S. military forces, has been pending before the Rules Committee since June 1973. The administration opposes this bill, in favor of a similar one before the Judiciary Committee, and indeed, it appears that H.R. 8023's only supporters are the members of the House Internal Security Committee.

Because HISC's legislative record in past years is so bleak, I do not feel it is necessary to reiterate its history.

Nor do I feel it is necessary for us to repeat past mistakes by providing this committee with an additional \$475,000 to continue its unproductive hearings and staff investigations and to build up its data bank of often unsubstantiated and detrimental information on U.S. citizens, public and private.

The stockpiling of such information is not authorized in the committee's mandate. I personally do not believe it is a legitimate function of any congressional committee, and I consider the committee's practice of making this information available to Government agencies at least as damaging as the activities alleged to have been committed by individuals whose names are retained in these files.

In closing, I wish to remind my colleagues that a vote for House Resolution 937 is a vote for the continuation and expansion of this unauthorized data bank, it is a vote to give Government agents access to information the veracity of which even we, as Members of Congress, have no way of determining, because we are not allowed access to these files, and it is a vote for continued invasion of individual privacy by an arm of the U.S. Congress.

I urge my colleagues to consider carefully the mistakes the House has made in the past, first by giving HISC the status of a standing committee, and second by continuing to support it with additional funds year after year. We can begin to

rectify these past mistakes by refusing to grant additional appropriations, and I urge a "no" vote on House Resolution 937.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER).

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of continued funding of the Committee on Internal Security.

When I was originally assigned to this committee some 5 years, I did not particularly relish the assignment, since I was familiar with the committee's old "witch-hunting" image. After 5 years of service, I can say that whatever the committee's practices in the past, under Chairman ICHORD it has become increasingly more responsible. The committee operates in controversial areas, and Chairman ICHORD has established procedures for navigating these treacherous waters that are fair in both spirit and practice.

I have also become more and more convinced of the need for such a committee. As Chairman ICHORD has stated in connection with the congressional committee reorganization plan—the Bolling committee—"it is not important which committee does the work in the area of internal security, but it is vitally important that the work be done."

A perennial question is how a democratic society escapes the dilemma of tyranny or anarchy. How do we avoid the tyranny of unjust laws, on the one hand, or the anarchy resulting from the freedom to do anything one's conscience dictates? Basically we resolve this dilemma in a democratic society by submitting the question to continued public debate, through which we work out reasonable compromises to live and let live. Tyranny is avoided by allowing the dissenter to remain free to agitate for repeal. Anarchy is avoided by obeying the majority decision as the law, after the votes are counted.

To conduct such a dialog, two sides are necessary. HISC generally emphasizes the conservative pole of the agreement—the dangers of anarchy. I submit that it is the only committee in Congress devoting its major attention to this side of the dialog. If it is eliminated or merged into another committee, its role as a counterbalance will be lost or seriously diluted. HISC is viewed by a large part of the public as the one sure watchdog on the right, sometimes barking at the mailman instead of a real intruder, but always ready to raise the alarm and so hold the question up for inspection. The academic world and the most influential section of the media—in short, most intellectuals—emphasize the dangers to our free institutions from restrictive laws and bureaucratic overreaching, and play down the dangers arising from subversion and from the actions of those who would use our freedoms to destroy our free institutions. I think this emphasis is proper, believing as I do that our most serious dangers will arise from too little freedom rather than too much. But, surely the other pole of the agreement is entitled to be

heard. The public is right in insisting that this side of the argument be heard, and that full-time attention be given to the internal security of this country.

The threat of subversion remains a present danger, and always will as long as power rather than love is the reality that controls relationships in foreign affairs. Détente and an age of cooperative relationships does not change this underlying reality. We can wish that it is love that makes the world go around; we can hope that some day this will be the case. But unfortunately today it is power.

Our Government must have a strong and fair internal security system. The public must have confidence that no Communist or revolutionaries are holding tax-supported jobs. Government employees must have pride in being public servants and the high morale which comes from the knowledge that only people without reproach hold such jobs. The system must work so well that there can be no possible excuse for setting up "plumbers" units or vigilante groups operating outside the lawful internal security system. Extensive hearings by HISC have indicated that we do not have that kind of system now and that a number of weaknesses need to be corrected.

The advent of urban terrorism as a means of achieving social objectives by force is a recent development which requires sustained attention. HISC is the only committee that has developed expertise in this area.

These are solid areas of inquiry, and not "witch-hunting." They are areas that make the committee's activities more relevant and more important today than in the past.

There is one further point that I would like to make, Mr. Speaker.

One of the most useful things my colleagues can do in determining the need for the funding of the Committee on Internal Security is to carefully review the committee's 1973 annual report which summarizes its work during the first session of the 93d Congress. Of particular interest to me are pages 7-11 which contain the remarks of Law Professor William A. Stanmeyer who has very effectively refuted what he terms the "romantic fallacies" about internal security programs. These "romantic fallacies" are summarized by Committee Chairman ICHORD in the foreword to the report as follows:

1. That there is no danger to society except from its own security agencies; 2. that democratic institutions are indestructible and efforts to protect them are unnecessary; 3. that all that is—quote—political—unquote—is permissible; 4. that a free society may never limit or inconvenience its innocent citizen's autonomy; 5. that Government can tolerate a—quote—little bit—unquote of subversion; 6. that one's belief-system and associational patterns are irrelevant to predictable conduct; 7. that the Constitution may be used to protect those who would destroy it.

Professor Stanmeyer points out that such misconceptions must not impel the House to abandon the Committee on Internal Security. He concludes with the very astute observation that—

The committee's work is necessary if we are to follow the path of order and freedom which lies between the paths of repression and anarchy.

I urge my colleagues to read the full remarks of Professor Stanmeyer and the committee's annual report. They are thought provoking and represent the basic arguments in favor of the retention and continued funding of the Committee on Internal Security.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Internal Security, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time. I cannot help but feel a little bit like my former colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, who used to take the well when he was a member of the Committee on Agriculture for so many years. In discussing legislation, he often referred to the Chinese foghorn. He said, the foghorn keeps blowing and the fog keeps coming in.

In this particular case I think we see a little bit of the same thing. We have talked about this for years. The fog has kept coming in.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration has recommended an appropriation of \$475,000 to enable the House Committee on Internal Security to continue its vital work during 1974. As ranking minority member of the HCIS, I fully support this figure as a reasonable compromise proposal and urge all my colleagues to vote for it. Should our investigation of terrorism and related subversive activities require additional funds, of course, we may be compelled to request a supplemental appropriation.

The American people, despite all the Communist and other leftist propaganda to the contrary, have historically supported congressional investigations of subversion. Likewise, our committee has through the years received the overwhelming support of Members of the House. In a year when naked political terrorism has finally reached this country with the kidnaping of Patricia Hearst, we need more than ever before to have a standing committee with sufficient staff to investigate subversive activity and propose such remedial legislative recommendations as may be necessary.

This is not the time to allow our continuing effort in this field to wither and die for lack of funds. Nor, I might add, is it the time to extinguish it by the stratagem of transferring our jurisdiction to another House committee where it would be effectively buried in an already excessive jurisdictional workload.

You will doubtless be subjected this year to the usual arguments of those, both in and out of Congress, who seem to make a career of trying to abolish the Committee on Internal Security. These people will tell you that our staff is too large—despite the fact that it is not nearly as large as those of many other House committees—and that we have failed to produce an enormous volume of

legislation, an argument that blithely of three House committees with a primarily investigative function.

This latter argument is especially disturbing to me because it is, or should be, obvious that we deal in a uniquely sensitive area which involves essential rights guaranteed to all Americans under the Constitution. Thus, when we investigate the extent of Communist or other subversive involvement in an organization or movement, we are often charged with investigating the organization or movement itself. Of course, this is not true and never has been.

Our committee, most emphatically, is not concerned with trying to stifle the right of protest, for example. Rather, we are concerned with the extent to which certain groups with concealed motives try to exploit this right. We were vitally concerned with the degree of Communist influence in the anti-Vietnam war movement, to use but one illustration, but not with the movement as such. Our committee recognized, as repeatedly emphasized by our chairman, that there is a legitimate right of protest which is protected, and which should be protected, by the Constitution. But we also saw that there were elements occupying dominant positions within that movement that were manipulating it for Communist purposes. Such concealed Communist activity, based as it is on a philosophy which teaches and advocates the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government, is clearly within the scope of our committee's mandate.

Indeed, one of our committee's most significant on-going contributions has been the exposure of Communist activity and the philosophy of revolutionary violence which underlies it. Experience demonstrates beyond a scintilla of doubt that the Communist Party, U.S.A., and other assorted Communist organizations still constitute the most serious threat to the internal security of the United States.

As noted repeatedly by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and as confirmed repeatedly by sworn, documented testimony before our committee, the CPUSA is today, as it has always been, entirely subservient to the interests of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, acting in effect as an extension of the Soviet Communist Party within the United States. The documented record shows to those who will but heed it that the CPUSA acts as an unregistered agent of a foreign power that has operated as a cover for espionage activity and as a promoter and exploiter of discord in our country in accord with the dictates of the Kremlin.

Similarly, as shown by our committee's publications, other Communist groups operate to undermine our system of government. The Socialist Workers Party, about which our committee has published significant documented information that is virtually unobtainable elsewhere, teaches its members that the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government is inevitable. And there exists today within the SWP, as shown by information

summarized in our 1973 annual report, a significant tendency that openly supports armed terrorist activity such as that carried on by Trotskyite groups in Latin America.

Further, there are the Maoists such as the Revolutionary Union, a well organized group that stockpiles weapons and advocates violence. Basic information on the RU and its now-defunct offshoot, the Venceremos Organization, was published by our committee in July 1972 in a comprehensive report entitled "America's Maoists: The Revolutionary Union, the Venceremos Organization."

Also, one must not overlook the violence-oriented Progressive Labor Party and its youth apparatus, the Worker-Student Alliance on which we have also held detailed hearings. Though PLP has lost the imprimatur of the Communist Chinese to the Revolutionary Union, it remains an active grouping within the Communist spectrum in the United States and maintains a record of promoting and participating in violent activity.

All of these groups share the basic Communist view that violence against the so-called ruling class is inevitable and even desirable. Thus, all of them are potential threats to the internal security of this country and are worthy of—in deed, they require—continual scrutiny by Congress.

For any Members of the House who may doubt the reality of Communist violence and terrorism within the United States, I commend to their attention our committee's recently issued staff study on the Symbionese Liberation Army. This group, which the study shows to be heavily influenced by former members of the Maoist Venceremos Organization, has been prominent of late for its kidnapping of Miss Patricia Hearst, daughter of newspaper publisher Randolph Hearst, whose brother recently wrote a cogent defense of the Committee on Internal Security that was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 18 by my distinguished colleague, Mr. DICKINSON.

Added to the SLA study is the committee's August 1973 staff study on "political kidnappings" which contained the prophetic warning by our chairman that "we must not be beguiled into feeling that 'it can't happen here.'"

Parenthetically, I might also note that I addressed the House on May 29, 1973, on the subject of the Ford Motor Co.'s payment of blackmail to Argentinian Communist terrorists. At that time, I also warned that "the automaker's agreement to provide the terrorists with supplies valued at \$1 million can only encourage revolutionary Communists in the United States and throughout the world to try the same tactics."

Our committee currently has in preparation a major study on terrorism that will provide a wealth of new information to the Congress and the American people on the groups that are engaged in terrorist activity around the world, even within the United States itself. Surely, information of such current value and importance must not be lost because of

any failure of the House to allocate sufficient money to support the expert research and investigative effort needed to produce it.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident my colleagues will recognize that we on the Committee on Internal Security are performing a task which, while it may be thankless and unpleasant, nevertheless badly needs to be performed, just as I am confident that, today as in the past, there will be overwhelming support for the committee's appropriation as recommended by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ZION) for purposes of debate only.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Internal Security, I am continually amazed at the efforts put forth by the Communist Party, U.S.A., in its feverish attempt to get us abolished—an effort that is, of course, only one ingredient in the party's campaign to render ineffective all governmental antisubversive agencies, both legislative and executive.

We have seen in recent years the growth of a trend that, in my view, is genuinely alarming. We have seen congressional efforts designed to wipe out intelligence-gathering by the military, despite the fact that such effort is fully justified by the need of the military to possess adequate information on those groups and individuals that promote and participate in violent civil disorder.

In a similar vein, we have seen a campaign of steadily growing momentum, both in Congress and in certain segments of the Nation's press, that is patently aimed at crippling the Federal Bureau of Investigation's intelligence-gathering capability. At the same time, we have seen the end of the Subversive Activities Control Board and the downgrading of the Justice Department's Internal Security Division with its incorporation into the Department's Criminal Division.

Mr. Speaker, it is truly disquieting to note that while the openly terrorist Symbionese Liberation Army is holding Patricia Hearst in California and an American diplomat in Mexico for ransom and bringing to the United States the sort of armed political kidnapping and terrorism that has plagued the rest of the world, the House Committee on Internal Security is virtually the only official governmental body left that can investigate and publicly disseminate hard, documented information on Communist and other subversive activities that undermine our system of government as guaranteed by the Constitution.

And, despite the usual propaganda to the contrary, this does not mean only Communist groups. Note that I said "Communist and other subversive activities." The fact is that our committee and its predecessors have conducted major hearings and issued documented reports on Nazi, Fascist, and other organizations at the opposite extreme of the ideological spectrum, including the Ku Klux Klans, the National Renaissance Party, and such earlier groups as

the German-American Bund, the Knights of the White Camellia, and the Silver Shirts. We also maintain scrutiny of such potentially dangerous armed groups as the Minutemen and the National Socialist White People's Party, formerly the American Nazi Party of George Lincoln Rockwell along with the National States Rights Party, the personnel of which interlocks with Klan and avowedly Nazi groups.

In fact, the investigation of the Ku Klux Klan organizations conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1965 and 1966 even drew a letter of commendation from former Judiciary Committee Chairman Emanuel Celler, who was certainly never accused of being a committee partisan, and remains even today the definitive body of information on the Klan's lawless and terrorist nature.

Mr. Speaker, the only way the House can continue this vital effort is to grant the Committee on Internal Security its full appropriation. To do otherwise would be to deprive ourselves of our only effective agency in the internal security field—and at precisely the time when such an agency, with its expert staff, is most urgently needed.

Perhaps the best education of this need is the fierce intensity with which the Communist Party and other subversive groups have constantly tried to wage their campaign to have the Committee on Internal Security abolished.

It is perhaps easy for most people to forget the origins of the abolition campaign that has been waged against the House Committee on Internal Security and its predecessor, the Committee on Un-American Activities, over the years. The record shows, however, that this campaign was set up by the Communist Party, U.S.A., and that it has been waged with tireless intensity by the party and by a network of front organizations under party control.

Chief among these Communist fronts has been the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, formerly known as the National Committee To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee. The NCAHUAC was cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities—on the basis of irrefutable evidence—as a Communist front set up in the summer of 1960 "to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign." The committee also noted that at least seven of the national leaders of the NCAHUAC had been identified as Communists. It is significant that the leadership of the NCARL is today substantially the same as that of the predecessor NCAHUAC.

Other groups that have been active in the party-directed campaign against our committee have included the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, originally known as the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee; the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms, a now-defunct west coast organization; the Chicago Committee To Defend the Bill of Rights; the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, a New York group; and a new

national apparatus known as the National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression, cited as a Communist Party front in a report entitled "Revolutionary Target: The American Penal System," issued by the Committee on Internal Security on December 18, 1973.

Another major organization that forms part of this Communist abolition network is the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc., which operated until very recently with members of the Communist Party in virtually all of its key leadership positions. As the result of a controversy within the organization, several of the CPUSA members lost their positions or resigned from them, but it is important to note that many of them remain on the group's board, with the key leadership positions now in the hands of a mixed bag of nonparty Communists and other assorted radical types.

One of the most important standards by which to recognize Communist fronts, as shown by long experience, is the extent to which there exists an interlocking of Communist personnel among them. Upon examination, there is no doubt that such an interlocking exists within the abolition network. For the sake of brevity, I shall cite but a few significant examples, although a fully detailed accounting would probably fill a book.

Frank Wilkinson, who has been publicly identified in sworn testimony as a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., serves as executive director and field representative of the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation. He was also the moving force behind the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms and is a member of the National Council of the NECLC. Wilkinson was a sponsor of the founding conference of the National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression in May 1973 and attended the conference. Such affiliations indicate just how much he deserves the title that has been given him many times: "Mr. Abolition."

One of the founders of what is now the NCARL was Aubrey W. Williams, identified in sworn testimony in 1954 as a member of the Communist Party. Williams also served as one of the founders of the Communist-front Southern Conference for Human Welfare, the predecessor of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, and was one of the principal leaders in SCEF during its period of outright CPUSA control.

NCARL's "adviser on Constitutional law" is Prof. Thomas I. Emerson, identified in 1952 in sworn public testimony as a member of the Communist Party. Though Emerson denied ever having been a party member, the testimony of the witness who identified him—Louis Budenz, who had been one of the party's top leaders—is lent much credence by Emerson's consistent record of affiliation with party fronts and causes. Emerson serves also as a member of the National Council of the NECLC.

The Southern Regional Office of NCARL is directed by Mike Honey, a

prominent figure in SCEF who attended the May 1973 founding conference of the NAARAPR and who currently serves as a member of the NAARAPR's national executive committee along with Judi Simmons, a CPUSA member who also has been a prominent SCEF activist.

NCARL's chairman is Harvey O'Connor, another identified member of the Communist Party who also serves as a member of the national council of the NECLC.

Among NCARL's vice chairmen are Anne and Carl Braden, both of whom have been publicly identified under oath as members of the Communist Party. The Bradens were for many years the principal functionaries in SCEF and were among the sponsors of the NAARAPR founding conference in 1973. Carl Braden is one of the three cochairmen of the NAARAPR—all of the three are publicly identified or avowed CPUSA members—while Anne Braden, who ran as a Communist Party candidate for Presidential elector in the State of Kentucky during the 1972 general elections, serves as another member of the NECLC's National Council.

In Chicago, the major NCARL affiliate is the Chicago Committee To Defend the Bill of Rights, directed by Richard Criley. Criley also sponsored and attended the founding conference of the National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression in May 1973 and is yet another of NCARL's major figures that have been publicly identified in sworn testimony as members of the Communist Party. Criley has been, in fact, the motivating force within the Chicago Committee To Defend the Bill of Rights since its inception, just as Frank Wilkinson has been the prime mover in the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the organizations that I have discussed briefly here comprise the principal groups in the campaign to abolish the House Committee on Internal Security. The pattern is clear, and the pattern is Communist.

I do not believe for one moment—and let me emphasize this as strongly as I can—that everyone who opposes our committee is a Communist or necessarily pro-Communist. That would be manifestly unfair. But I do believe that the documented record shows beyond question that the primary impetus for our abolition is and always has been a Communist one and that the driving force behind this movement is the Communist Party, U.S.A., and its network of abolition fronts.

Without intending to cast even the slightest aspersions upon the motives of any of my colleagues, I feel constrained to express my deep concern that if they vote to curtail the House Committee on Internal Security's vital work in behalf of our country, they will have played, however unwittingly, into the hands of the very Communist forces that would destroy this country.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, every year about this time the opponents of the Internal Security Committee sub-

ject the House to the same dull and dreary debate over the demerits of HISC.

In this regard, the vice president of a New York-based, multinational corporation which produces weapons control systems wrote to the committee that—

I am appalled that our legislators expend any time in listening to and evaluating over and over again the attempts . . . to scuttle what I believe is not only an extremely competent and efficient fact-gathering vehicle to assist our legislators, but also an excellent medium for information to the various intelligence groups in government and (to) contractors performing on high-level classified work.

The late director of the FBI also thought that a House Committee engaged in security pursuits was "an excellent medium for information." To those persons who propose that HISC's work duplicates that of the FBI, the views of J. Edgar Hoover, the recognized artist of the craft of intelligence, given in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations, should be noted:

Committee of Congress have served a very useful purpose in exposing some of these activities which no Federal agency is in a position to do, because the information we obtain in the Bureau is either for intelligence purposes or for use in prosecution, and committees of Congress have wider latitude in that respect.

In the same vein, that dedicated architect of modern intelligence methodology, had stated in an article in Newsweek, in reference to HISC's predecessor, the Committee on Un-American Activities, and to its files that—

This committee has for its purpose the exposure of un-American forces and as such its files contain voluminous information which . . . provide an excellent source of information. The FBI, unlike this committee, must of necessity keep the contents of its files confidential.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hoover's comments, noted above, were made in 1947 and 1956. How aptly his remarks apply in 1974 as evidenced by the release of the recent committee study on the Symbionese Liberation Army—SLA—the revolutionary terrorist group responsible for the cruel kidnapping of the teen-age daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Randolph Hearst, and which boasted of its role in the murder of Oakland's black school superintendent, Dr. Marcus Foster.

A representative of a large, Cleveland-based manufacturer of business machines, when requesting a quantity of SLA reports from the committee, remarked that he was "amazed at the speed" with which the committee report was published.

Mr. Speaker, this corporation executive's amazement at the prompt appearance of the SLA report is readily explained—except to those committee antagonists in the terminal stages of HISC file-phobia. Simply stated, the committee had long been monitoring those revolutionary groups, that is, the Vietnam Veterans Against the War; the pro-Peking, Venceremos organization, and the United Prisoners Union, to which SLA members belonged.

Alice Widener, well-known and respected publisher of the magazine,

U.S.A., commented in her March 15, 1974, press release entitled, "Let's Protect our Internal Security," that—

The identification, description and documentation of violently revolutionary political groups is a difficult task requiring a tremendous amount of background research and painstaking fact-gathering. The House Committee on Internal Security has such expertise. In these anarchic times, it must be maintained.

Mr. Speaker, every professional group has its files, has it not? An organization in the security field is no different. The House of Representatives, HISC's principal client, deserves—in fact should demand—the best, that is a professional, dedicated staff supported by a comprehensive file, professionally serviced to meet its requirements in this day of rising revolutionary activity in America. But HISC's needs cannot be achieved in a fiscal vacuum.

Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in overwhelming support of a meaningful appropriation for HISC, to vote for operational funds commensurate with the vital functions levied upon its members and its staff, whose role some of us are only now beginning to fully appreciate.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, there is no Member of this body unaware of the seriousness of the latest escalation of revolutionary violence in our country. The kidnapping of Patricia Hearst by violence oriented subversives has been followed, and will be followed by other such crimes. As we know, when a crime of violence receives massive publicity, other emotionally disturbed criminals seem compelled to emulate the success of the first criminal.

We cannot say that we have not been warned that political kidnappings would begin in the United States. On May 29, 1973, our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) commented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the payment of \$1 million by the Ford Motor Co., to a group of Trotskyite Communists in Argentina to bribe them to stop their acts of kidnapping and assault against Ford executives. Mr. ASHBROOK pointed out that this paying of extortion demands, "can only encourage revolutionary Communists in the United States and throughout the world to try the same tactics."

I am sure that Mr. ASHBROOK had hoped to be proved wrong, but his prophetic words of almost a year ago now come home to haunt us. Mr. ASHBROOK, ranking minority Member of the House Committee on Internal Security, told the House last May of the work being done by the committee's minority staff to investigate the role of Marxist-Leninist terrorists in the mounting wave of kidnappings and political violence around the world.

In the past few years, the Committee on Internal Security has provided the House of Representatives with a substantial body of valuable information on the activities and potential of the revolutionary terrorist organizations. In 1972 the committee published a report on "America's Maoists: The Revolutionary Union; The Venceremos Organization."

In 1973 the committee published a report entitled "Revolutionary Target: The American Penal System." Both of these reports were based on lengthy hearings by the committee on these subjects.

As we now know, the Symbionese Liberation Army, the group of gangsters that kidnaped Miss Hearst, consists of some white radicals out of the Venceremos Organization and some black criminals recruited by the revolutionaries in the prisons. Incidentally, in 1973 the Committee on Internal Security published a valuable report on "Political Kidnapings 1968-73" followed by a 1974 report on "The Symbionese Liberation Army." The "Political Kidnapings" report also contained a survey of Trotskyite terrorists and potential terrorists around the world which was prepared by the committee's minority staff. I am informed that the committee is still working on hearings and reports on this subject.

Congressman JOHN ASHBROOK did not predict the present wave of kidnappings by looking in a crystal ball. Our intelligent and knowledgeable colleague has maintained a careful watch over the activities of subversives and radicals since his entry into Congress. As a result of his work on the Internal Security Committee he has made a valuable contribution to our understanding of the subversive threat to American freedom and tranquillity.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Internal Security is a valuable and hard-working committee of this Congress. The chairman of the committee has pointed out that staff had to be curtailed as a result of appropriation cuts in the recent past. Despite these cuts the committee has produced a massive amount of valuable information for Congress and the public on the threats to internal security. I urge my colleagues to support the work of this committee. I urge you to vote in favor of the committee's appropriation of \$475,000.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, during 1969 and 1970 I was privileged to serve on the Committee on Internal Security and to participate actively in its investigations of the subversive leadership and activities of such organizations as Students for a Democratic Society; the Communist Party, U.S.A.; the Black Panther Party; and the New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam.

During my 2 years on the committee, we also considered proposed legislation dealing with such problem areas as industrial, vessee, and port security; obstruction of Armed Forces; repeal of the Emergency Detention Act, which was title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950; and the administration of the Subversive Activities Control Act and the Federal Civilian Employee Loyalty-Security program.

During 1970 the committee also undertook what developed into a continuing inquiry into the theory and practice of communism. We heard witnesses who had fled the tyranny of the Soviet Union, Cuba, and Czechoslovakia, as well as the expert testimony of Dr. William Kintner, one of America's most outstanding experts on communism.

After 1970 I had to resign from the Internal Security Committee in order to accept a seat on the House Appropriations Committee, but my belief in the work of the House Committee on Internal Security has not diminished. If anything, it has grown stronger with each year as I have watched it continuing to investigate the activities of those who are trying to besmirch and destroy this country.

I have noted, for example, that the committee has held extremely informative and valuable hearings on proposed legislation designed to control travel by supposed Americans to areas of the world, such as Southeast Asia, where we have been engaged in armed hostilities. During these hearings, much attention has been paid to the plight of our POW's who had to suffer torture and systematic degradation in Vietnamese Communist prisoner of war camps.

Such efforts are of great value, for the legislation considered by the Internal Security Committee during 1972 and 1973 would fill a gap in our law that badly needs filling. There is no excuse for people like Jane Fonda, Dave Dellinger, and others of that sort being able to travel to Hanoi to give aid and comfort to the enemy without effective legal sanction. But the House Committee on Internal Security is trying to do something about it, and I think we owe them our strongest possible support.

The committee's efforts to bring the POW problem to our attention take me back to December of 1969 when we heard the testimony of Lt. Robert Frishman and Petty Officer Douglas Hegdahl of the U.S. Navy. Both have been POW's in Vietnam and had been released to a so-called American "peace" delegation. It was both fascinating and, at the same time, horrifying to sit and listen to the testimony of these brave young Americans who had been through torture and were not afraid to speak out and tell the American people the truth of what they had seen.

Now the Internal Security Committee has undertaken a most significant new inquiry into the terrorist problem. We are all aware of the problem now because of the kidnapping of Patricia Hearst by the Symbionese Liberation Army. The Mexican branch now claims credit for the kidnapping of U.S. Diplomat John Patterson. But I wonder whether all of my distinguished colleagues here today are aware that the Internal Security Committee has issued an excellent monograph on the nature of the SLA and the subversive backgrounds of those known to be connected with it.

Each member of this House should read the committee study and see for himself just what sort of effort the Committee on Internal Security puts forth to inform us of current internal security problems. In all probability the committee's inquiry into terrorism may well result in a major legislative proposal designed to deal with the problem, demonstrating once again the need for this committee and its expert staff.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen the Committee on Internal Security at first hand, as a former member, and I know what it does and how scrupulously it goes

about doing it. I know that we need this committee and that the only way to investigate and legislate at all intelligently in the sensitive area of internal security is to preserve it and to grant it adequate funding.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I add my voice to those of my colleagues and urge the approval of the full appropriation request of the Committee on Internal Security.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, once again we are witnessing the annual spectacle of the House debate on the validity of the Committee on Internal Security. To my mind, the usefulness of this committee—which used to gain its notoriety as the House Committee on Un-American Activities—HUAC—is no longer even a question. Yet, once again, we are asked to approve funds for HISC, despite the continued inability of this committee to demonstrate one shred of value. I urge my colleagues in the House to reject House Resolution 937, which would provide \$475,000—on top of more than \$250,000 automatically received by the committee—to continue the existence of this archaic committee.

Last year, during the first session of the 93d Congress, an average of 579 bills were referred to each of the 21 standing committees of the House. Of the total of 12,150, only 13 bills were referred to HISC. Eight of these 13 were duplicate bills. As for the remaining five bills, it is uncertain whether the House Internal Security Committee had proper jurisdiction over them in any case.

Public hearings and committee reports by HISC are few and far between. A total of 21 days of public hearings were held by HISC last year, and, the committee met only 28 times in any form. In fact, since the committee's first organization—as the so-called Dies committee in 1938, only six bills reported by the committee have become law. Of 174 contempt citations issued by HISC up to 1970, 142 have failed in the courts. The truth is that HISC is a continuing waste of the taxpayer's money, and the maintenance of thousands of ill-controlled dossiers on American citizens is an insult—and a menace—to the civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution.

The funding resolution we are now considering would perpetuate—to the tune of nearly a half million dollars—the practice of this House in throwing more and more good money after bad. For a committee with a legislative function just short of invisible—to judge by the record—a staff of 42 individuals is rather large. Principally, this staff is used to maintain the committee's investigations and compilation of data on alleged un-American activities of individuals and organizations. What the committee finds, through its often slipshod work, then works its way into the files for which the committee has deservedly gained ill repute.

More than 25 Government agencies and departments use the HISC files for preemployment checks, although in recent years checks have diminished substantially. In 1967 the Civil Service Commission used HISC files 288,000 times, while in 1972 the number of searches fell

to 20,000. The reason for this is that 95 percent of the data in the HISC files is discarded by the Civil Service Commission, and the information gained from the files is of very doubtful value.

Even if used less, the maintenance of HISC files is open to serious criticism. In the first instance, we might ask by what authority the executive agencies and departments utilize these files. There is no such authority. In fact, it would seem far more proper, in view of the separation of powers, for the executive agencies to do their own security checks. In this regard, I have no doubt that the Justice Department has every necessary capability to assume the functions that HISC presently pretends to do. A further question, of course, is whether a free society can tolerate any sort of organized supervision as is at the core of HISC.

It seems to me that committees exist to review, develop and refine legislation, and to carry out certain oversight functions. HISC does not fit this mold. Its legislative output is virtually nonexistent, and its nominal functions are best reserved to the judicial or executive branches—as they are of a police or intelligence character—not the Congress.

As I am sure is known to this House, the Select Committee on Committees has urged that HISC be eliminated and that its functions be transferred to the Committee on Government Operations. I concur in part and disagree in part. There is little question that the need for HISC, if it ever existed, is now long gone. But to transfer its functions to the Government Operations Committee—rather than the Judiciary Committee, which would be better equipped to consider internal security issues—seems more a function of internal politics within the House than sensible, functional division of jurisdictional responsibilities.

In view of the Committee on Committees report, I cannot see any justification for pumping another \$475,000 down the drain to support HISC. I urge that my colleagues reject House Resolution 937.

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 appear 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 247, nays 86, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—247

Abdnor	Ashbrook	Blackburn
Alexander	Bafalls	Bray
Anderson, Ill.	Baker	Breckinridge
Andrews	Barrett	Brinkley
N. Dak.	Bauman	Brooks
Archer	Beard	Broomfield
Arends	Bennett	Brotzman
Armstrong	Blester	Brown, Mich.

Brown, Ohio	Hansen, Idaho	Rinaldo
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Wash.	Roberts
Broyhill, Va.	Hastings	Robinson, Va.
Buchanan	Hays	Robinson, N.Y.
Burgener	Hébert	Rodino
Burke, Fla.	Henderson	Roe
Burke, Mass.	Hillis	Rogers
Burleson, Tex.	Hogan	Roncallo, Wyo.
Burlison, Mo.	Holt	Roncallo, N.Y.
Butler	Horton	Rooney, Pa.
Byron	Huber	Roush
Carney, Ohio	Hudnut	Roy
Carter	Hunt	Ruth
Casey, Tex.	Hutchinson	Sandman
Cederberg	Ichord	Sarasin
Chamberlain	Jarman	Satterfield
Chappell	Johnson, Calif.	Scherle
Clancy	Jones, N.C.	Schneebell
Clark	Jones, Okla.	Sebellus
Clawson, Del.	Kemp	Shipley
Cleveland	Ketchum	Shoup
Cochran	Kluczynski	Shuster
Cohen	Lagomarsino	Sikes
Collier	Landgrebe	Sisk
Collins, Tex.	Landrum	Skubitz
Conable	Latta	Slack
Cotter	Lent	Smith, Iowa
Coughlin	Litton	Smith, N.Y.
Crane	Lott	Snyder
Cronin	McClary	Spence
Daniel, Dan	McCollister	Staggers
Daniels	McDade	Stanton
Dominick, V.	McEwen	J. William
Davis, Ga.	McFall	Steed
Davis, Wis.	Mahon	Steelman
de la Garza	Martin, Nebr.	Stelger, Ariz.
Delaney	Martin, N.C.	Stelger, Wis.
Dellenback	Mathias, Calif.	Stratton
Denholm	Mayne	Stuckey
Dennis	Melcher	Symington
Dent	Michel	Symms
Derwinski	Miller	Taylor, Mo.
Devine	Mills	Taylor, N.C.
Downing	Minish	Teague
Duncan	Minshall, Ohio	Thomson, Wis.
du Pont	Mitchell, N.Y.	Thone
Edwards, Ala.	Mizell	Thornton
Esch	Molohan	Treen
Eshleman	Montgomery	Udall
Evins, Tenn.	Moorhead	Ullman
Fascell	Calif.	Vander Jagt
Findley	Morgan	Veysey
Fish	Murphy, N.Y.	Vigorito
Fisher	Murtha	Waggonner
Flood	Myers	Walsh
Flynt	Natcher	Wampler
Fountain	Nelsen	Ware
Frelinghuysen	Nichols	White
Fulton	O'Brien	Whitehurst
Fuqua	O'Neill	Whitten
Gaydos	Parris	Whidall
Gibbons	Passman	Wiggins
Gilman	Patten	Wilson
Ginn	Perkins	Charles, Tex.
Gonzalez	Pettis	Winn
Goodling	Peyser	Wyatt
Green, Oreg.	Pike	Wylder
Griffiths	Powell, Ohio	Wylie
Gross	Preyer	Wyman
Grover	Price, Ill.	Yatron
Gubser	Price, Tex.	Young, Alaska
Gunter	Rallsback	Young, S.C.
Haley	Randall	Young, Tex.
Hamilton	Rarick	Zablocki
Hanley	Regula	Zion
Hanrahan	Rhodes	Zwach

NAYS—86

Adams	Green, Pa.	Mink
Addabbo	Gude	Mitchell, Md.
Anderson	Harrington	Moakley
Calif.	Hawkins	Moorhead, Pa.
Annuizio	Hechler, W. Va.	Mosher
Ashley	Heistowski	Moss
Aspin	Hollfield	Nedzi
Badillo	Holtzman	O'Hara
Bergland	Hungate	Podell
Boland	Johnson, Colo.	Pritchard
Brademas	Karth	Rangel
Brasco	Kastenmeier	Rees
Brown, Calif.	Koch	Reuss
Burke, Calif.	Kyros	Riegle
Burton	Leggett	Rosenthal
Collins, Ill.	Long, La.	Roybal
Danielson	Long, Md.	Ryan
Dellums	Lukens	St Germain
Diggs	McCloskey	Sarbanes
Donohue	McCormack	Schroeder
Drinan	McKay	Seiberling
Edwards, Calif.	Madden	Stanton
Ellberg	Mallory	James V.
Evans, Colo.	Mazzoli	Stark
Ford	Meeds	Studds
Forsythe	Metcalfe	Thompson, N.J.
Fraser	Mezvisky	Tieman

Van Deerlin Wilson, Wolff
Vanik Charles H., Yates
Whalen Calif. Young, Ill.

NOT VOTING—99

Abzug Frey Matsunaga
Andrews, N.C. Froehlich Milford
Bell Gettys Murphy, Ill.
Bevill Gialmo Nix
Biaggi Goldwater Obey
Bingham Grasso Owens
Blatnik Gray Patman
Boggs Guyer Pepper
Bolling Hammer Pickle
Bowen Schmidt Poage
Breaux Hanna Quile
Camp Harsha Quillen
Carey, N.Y. Heckler, Mass. Reid
Chisholm Heinz Rooney, N.Y.
Clausen Hicks Rose
Don H. Hineshaw Rostenkowski
Clay Hosmer Rousselot
Conlan Howard Rannels
Conte Johnson, Pa. Ruppe
Conyers Jones, Ala. Shriver
Corman Jones, Tenn. Steele
Culver Jordan Stephens
Daniel, Robert Kazen Stokes
W., Jr. King Stubblefield
Davis, S.C. Kuykendall Sullivan
Dickinson Lehman Talcott
Dingell Lujan Towell, Nev.
Dorn McKinney Vander Veen
Dulski McSpadden Waldie
Eckhardt Macdonald Williams
Erlenborn Madigan Wilson, Bob
Flowers Mann Wright
Foley Maraziti Young, Fla.
Frenzel Mathis, Ga. Young, Ga.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Obey against.
Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.
Mr. Bevill for, with Mr. Carey of New York against.
Mr. Stephens for, with Ms. Abzug against.
Mr. Stubblefield for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Bingham against.
Mr. Breaux for, with Mr. Gialmo against.
Mr. Davis of South Carolina for, with Mr. Blatnik against.
Mr. Hicks for, with Mr. Nix against.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee for, with Mr. Stokes against.
Mr. Kazen for, with Mr. Conyers against.
Mr. Mann for, with Mr. Howard against.
Mr. Mathis of Georgia for, with Mr. Macdonald against.
Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Clay against.
Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Reid against.
Mr. Flowers for, with Mr. Young of Georgia against.
Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. Waldie against.
Mr. Pickle for, with Mr. Biaggi against.
Mr. Rannels for, with Mr. Corman against.
Mr. Wright for, with Mr. Culver against.
Mr. Dickinson for, with Mr. Eckhardt against.
Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Hanna against.
Mr. Rousselot for, with Ms. Jordan against.
Mr. Rose for, with Mr. Heinz against.
Mr. Guyer for, with Mr. Murphy of Illinois against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Vander Veen.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Owens.
Mr. Andrews of North Carolina with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Frenzel.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. McSpadden.
Mr. Lehman with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Milford with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Bowen with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Madigan.

Mr. King with Mr. McKinney.

Mr. Lujan with Mr. Quile.

Mr. Maraziti with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Quillen with Mr. Steele.

Mr. Shriver with Mr. Williams.

Mr. Towell of Nevada with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Bob Wilson with Robert W. Daniels, Jr.

Mr. Young of Florida with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Froehlich with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Conlan with Mr. Talcott.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 12253, AMENDING GENERAL EDUCATION PROVISIONS ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers have until midnight tonight to file the conference report on H.R. 12253, to amend the General Education Provisions Act to provide that funds appropriated for applicable programs for fiscal year 1974 shall remain available during the succeeding fiscal year and that such funds for fiscal year 1973 shall remain available during fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 39, ANTIHACKING ACT OF 1974

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 39) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide a more effective program to prevent aircraft piracy and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, JARMAN, DINGELL, DEVINE, and KUYKENDALL.

PUBLICATION OF MATERIAL RELATING TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF INDIANS

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and

pass the Senate bill (S. 969) relating to the constitutional rights of Indians.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 969

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 701 of title VII of the Act entitled "An Act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes", approved April 11, 1968, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) There is authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions of this title such sum as may be necessary."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLODY) will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on the Judiciary, by unanimous vote, reported out favorably S. 969, a copy of which is before you.

S. 969 was introduced to amend subsection (c) of section 701, title VII, of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, to authorize the appropriation of funds for the printing of certain legal materials relating to the constitutional rights of American Indians. This subsection of the Civil Rights Act authorized and directed the Secretary of the Interior to revise and update a massive compilation of legal materials and to have them printed as a Government publication at the Government Printing Office. This subsection contained an authorization for the appropriation of the necessary sum "with respect to the preparation but not including printing" of these items. S. 969 would authorize the appropriation of funds for the printing of these Indian law materials by rewriting the pertinent subsection to read:

There is authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions of this Title such sums as may be necessary.

This revision would eliminate the exclusion of printing from the purposes for which money could be appropriated. Let it be understood that these materials have been completely prepared and stand ready to be printed. The years of work that have gone into this important project would seem needlessly stifled at this point by denying that appropriation. The Department of Interior has projected that the cost of the printing will be approximately \$330,000.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 969.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will ask the gentleman, Is this a one-shot affair or is it anticipated that printing costs will be continued?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. This is a one-shot affair, I will tell the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California has adequately explained this legislation. It is supported by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I urge favorable support of this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 969).

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT ENTITLED "AN ACT TO INCORPORATE THE AMERICAN HOSPITAL OF PARIS"

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1836) to amend the Act entitled "An Act to Incorporate the American Hospital of Paris," approved January 30, 1913 (37 Stat. 654).

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1836

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the American Hospital of Paris," approved January 30, 1913 (37 Stat. 654), is amended by deleting "nor more than twenty".

(b) Section 6 of such Act is amended by deleting "an equal number of" wherever it appears therein.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on the Judiciary, by unanimous vote, reported out favorably S. 1836, a copy of which is before you.

S. 1836 is a proposed amendment to the Federal charter of the American Hospital of Paris. It would remove the limitation on the maximum number of members on the hospital's board of governors. By its charter, its board of governors is now limited to 20 members. It is now proposed to eliminate this restriction so that, as recommended by its management consultants, the hospital may broaden its board membership to include more individuals, preferably in the lower age bracket, who evidence some interest in the hospital and who hopefully might be in a position to help financially. The amendment would make it possible for the American Hospital of Paris to more easily raise more money for the moderni-

zation and expansion of its facilities. There is no money involved in this bill.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 1836.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

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

We already have a board of directors of 20 and I assume that this will increase the number of directors. Is that not correct?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. In all conscience how large do they expect to increase this board of directors, by how many?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. This legislation would enable the American Hospital in Paris to increase its board of governors to 30 from 20. They are undertaking a redevelopment and expansion program of the hospital in Paris, and they feel a wider base, including younger people, for the board of governors would not only help them in creating a spirit of more cooperation but also would aid in financing the hospital privately. Most of the money for the hospital is raised privately and a larger board of directors would aid them in this program.

Mr. GROSS. What is the amount of money they expect to raise?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I believe we have the program here.

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I believe the report shows they are trying to raise \$25 million.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, can this legislation be interpreted in any way as committing the Federal Government to appropriate funds for this purpose?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. In no way is this an authorization for an appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. And it will not be so construed in the future?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. It will not be so construed certainly by any member of the House Judiciary Committee, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman is willing to let the record show that this legislation is in no way designed at a later date to commit the Federal Government to any funds?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks) such time as he may consume.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I introduced legislation identical to the bill we now have under consideration and I am hopeful that S. 1836 will receive favorable approval today.

By the charter of the American Hospital in Paris, the board of governors is limited to 20 members, and each seat on the board is currently filled. This bill proposes to eliminate this restriction. The hospital could then offer board membership to certain individuals—

both men and women preferably in the lower age bracket—who represent our country in business and Government and who evidence some interest in maintaining and promoting better health services. They would hopefully be in a position to help financially, either themselves or through contact with other individuals who might become contributors.

This hospital was founded in 1910, and was incorporated by an act of Congress (37 Stat. 654), approved January 30, 1913, as a nonprofit institution for the express purpose of serving Americans, with or without funds, residing or traveling in France. Through the years, it has earned an international reputation for providing outstanding medical care to its patients.

The complex task of managing this hospital is made even more complicated by the effort currently being made to expand the facilities and to rebuild and modernize many of the buildings, some of which date back to 1910, and are no longer useful or economical to operate.

Working with the help of U.S. management engineers, the American Hospital has also begun to improve further the quality of its health care delivery system by developing a biological and scientific research institute as part of the hospital complex. This they expect will lead to an even greater exchange of scientific ideas and talent. In this connection, some financial assistance through AID's program to help American schools and hospitals abroad is anticipated. However, the major part of the money needed for the project will be privately subscribed.

According to the hospital's consultants, the demand for the use of the hospital facilities will more than double over the next 7 to 10 years. This amendment to the charter will allow the hospital to expand its board of governors to help it meet the continuing challenge to provide medical care to the American community of Paris.

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

The Board of Governors for the American Hospital of Paris are not now paid and will not be paid out of public funds. This legislation will enable them to carry on the operation of the hospital through private financing in a more efficient way.

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

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

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

I was not alluding to the board of directors as becoming a burden upon the taxpayers of this country. I am particularly interested in whether this legislation by increasing the board of directors would in any way imply that this Government will be called upon to finance any part of the expansion of this private hospital in Paris.

Mr. McCCLORY. There is nothing in the legislation which would authorize the expenditure of Federal funds.

Mr. GROSS. Nor is it designed for that purpose?

Mr. McCCLORY. That is not the inten-

tion of the committee in recommending this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill S. 1836.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT OF FEBRUARY 24, 1925, INCORPORATING THE AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2441) to amend the act of February 24, 1925, incorporating the American War Mothers, to permit certain stepmothers and adoptive mothers to be members of that organization.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2441

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the American War Mothers", approved February 24, 1925, as amended (38 U.S.C. 97), is amended by inserting after "her son or sons or daughter or daughters of her blood" the following: "her legally adopted son or sons or legally adopted daughter or daughters, or her stepson or stepsons or stepdaughter or stepdaughters".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on the Judiciary, by unanimous vote, reported out favorably S. 2441, a copy of which is before you.

S. 2441 would be a simple amendment to the Federal charter of the American War Mothers. It would permit the stepmothers and adoptive mothers of persons who served in any war or conflict involving the United States to be members of that organization, which is now limited to mothers by blood. It now seems grossly unfair to the organization to deny membership on this basis and they have petitioned Congress to change their charter to now alter the qualifications for membership.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 2441.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a favorable vote on this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill S. 2441.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the

rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

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 in which to revise and extend their remarks on the three resolutions just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING THAT INCUMBENT LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS BE DEEMED A CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYEE

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13515) to provide that the incumbent Librarian of Congress shall on certain conditions be deemed a congressional employee for civil service retirement purposes.

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 notwithstanding any other provision of law, that individual who is Librarian of Congress on the date of the enactment of this Act shall, if such individual is separated from the civil service not later than thirty days after such enactment, and upon deposit by him of an amount equal to the difference between the retirement deductions actually made from his compensation and the retirement deductions which would have been made had the Librarian of Congress been deemed a congressional employee prior to the date of the enactment of the Act, plus 3 per centum interest compounded annually, be deemed a congressional employee for the full period of his creditable service as Librarian of Congress for the purposes of computation of his annuity under section 8339 of title 5 of the United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13515 would confer on the incumbent Librarian of Congress congressional-employee status for retirement purposes on the fulfillment of two conditions: First, that the Librarian resign that position within 30 days after enactment of the bill; and second, that he pay the difference, plus 3 percent compound interest, between his pension contributions as a civil service employee and those paid by congressional employees over the same time period.

Section 8335 of title 5, United States Code, provides that Federal employees who have served 15 years or more must

resign by the end of the pay period following the attainment of age 70 unless specifically exempted therefrom by the President. The Librarian, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, celebrated his 70th birthday on December 11, 1973. On December 30, 1973, the President issued Executive Order 11757 exempting Dr. Mumford from mandatory retirement before December 31, 1974. It is my understanding that the administration has begun a search for a successor. A great many individuals are reportedly under consideration.

The Joint Committee on the Library, which I chaired, last December took up the question of the continued tenure of the Librarian in view of the ongoing construction of a third Library building and the expansion of Library operations and services. The latter include pilot programs on the preservation of rare book materials and national dissemination of bibliographic data, automation of bibliographic facilities and the central charge file, the increased role of the Copyright Office subsequent to anticipated copyright revision legislation, and the expansion and improvement of the Congressional Research Service.

The joint committee concluded that, given these factors, the expeditious appointment of a new Librarian would be in the best interests of that institution, the Congress, and the public. It also agreed that given the close relationship between the Congress and the Library, it would be appropriate to designate the Librarian as a congressional employee, at least for retirement purposes.

Accordingly, the joint committee has endorsed this legislative approach to insure the speedy selection of a successor to provide a continuity of leadership during an important growth period. This will in turn make it possible for the various Library components to better serve the needs of the Congress and of the Library's worldwide clientele. I urge the adoption of H.R. 13515.

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

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan to answer a question with reference to this bill.

Is it accurate to say that this legislation concerns only one person, the present Librarian of Congress?

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, when, in the course of events, is the present appointment of the Librarian scheduled to expire?

Mr. NEDZI. In the course of events, December 31, 1974.

However, as the gentleman knows, his original term of appointment expired December 31, 1973.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, in the event that the Librarian then chooses to retire, either presently or between now and December 31, 1974, what would his annual retirement benefits be?

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, his annual

retirement benefits under existing circumstances would be \$15,068 a year. Under the terms of the legislation, the benefits would be \$20,715, with the proviso that he contribute some \$855, plus 3 percent compound interest, into the fund.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the gentleman undertaken to calculate the actual cost to the Librarian of this increase in annual benefits of some \$6,000?

Mr. NEDZI. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I have just stated what the contribution would be.

Mr. BUTLER. That would be \$800 or so, plus 3 percent, over how many years?

Mr. NEDZI. Plus 3 percent compound interest, over the period of his employment with the Library of Congress, which is 21 years, 2 months, and 21 days, as of the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, however meritorious the legislation might be, I would like to share with the membership this bit of information concerning exactly what we are doing in terms of dollars.

All employees of the Library of Congress are presently covered by the standard civil service retirement system. This legislation would bring one employee—the present Librarian—under the congressional retirement system which has greater benefits.

In effect, the Librarian of Congress would be required to pay approximately \$900 into the congressional retirement fund and his annual retirement compensation would thereupon be increased by something between \$5,000 and \$6,000 a year.

This is a pretty good deal, when we analyze it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot conscientiously support the use of conditionally improved retirement benefits for this purpose. That is exactly what it is, because he has got to act upon this legislation within 30 days, or he does not get the benefit of it. I cannot conscientiously support the use of this conditionally improved retirement benefit as a means of purchasing the retirement of an Executive employee, however desirable that situation might be in this instance.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the legislation, and I shall do likewise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Nedzi) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13515.

The question was taken.

Mr. SEBELIUS. 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 pro tempore. 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 103, nays 226, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—103

Adams	Fasell	Mitchell, Md.
Alexander	Flood	Mollohan
Annunzio	Ford	Mosher
Armstrong	Fraser	Moss
Badillo	Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Ill.
Barrett	Fuqua	Murphy, N.Y.
Bergland	Ginn	Nedzi
Bingham	Green, Oreg.	O'Hara
Blatnik	Gude	Patten
Brademas	Hansen, Idaho	Podell
Brasco	Harrington	Preyer
Bray	Hawkins	Rangel
Breckinridge	Helstoski	Reuss
Brown, Calif.	Holt	Riegle
Burke, Calif.	Holtzman	Rodino
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Calif.	Roe
Burton	Jones, N.C.	Roncalio, Wyo.
Byron	Jones, Okla.	Rooney, Pa.
Carney, Ohio	Jordan	Rosenthal
Casey, Tex.	Karth	Ryan
Cederberg	Kastenmeier	St Germain
Chamberlain	Koch	Sarbanes
Clark	Kyros	Staggers
Collins, Ill.	Ladrum	Stanton
Daniels	Leggett	James V.
Dominick V.	Long, La.	Steed
Davis, Ga.	McFall	Stuckey
Dellums	Madden	Thompson, N.J.
Denholm	Mazzoli	Udall
Diggs	Meeds	Ware
Donohue	Metcalfe	Whalen
Edwards, Calif.	Miller	White
Ellberg	Mills	Wyatt
Esch	Mink	Young, Alaska
Evins, Tenn.	Minshall, Ohio	Zablocki

NAYS—226

Abdnor	Fisher	Mitchell, N.Y.
Addabbo	Flynt	Mizell
Anderson	Forsythe	Moakley
Calif.	Fountain	Montgomery
Andrews	Fulton	Moorhead,
N. Dak.	Gaydos	Calif.
Archer	Gibbons	Moorhead, Pa.
Arends	Gilman	Morgan
Ashbrook	Gonzalez	Murtha
Ashley	Goodling	Myers
Aspin	Green, Pa.	Natcher
Bafalis	Griffiths	Nelsen
Baker	Gross	Nichols
Bauman	Grover	Obey
Beard	Gubser	O'Brien
Bennett	Gunter	O'Neill
Blester	Haley	Parris
Blackburn	Hamilton	Passman
Boland	Hanley	Perkins
Brinkley	Hanna	Pettis
Broomfield	Hanrahan	Peyser
Brotzman	Hastings	Pike
Brown, Mich.	Hébert	Powell, Ohio
Brown, Ohio	Hechler, W. Va.	Price, Ill.
Broyhill, N.C.	Henderson	Price, Tex.
Broyhill, Va.	Hillis	Pritchard
Buchanan	Hogan	Rallsback
Burgener	Horton	Randall
Burke, Fla.	Huber	Rarick
Burleson, Tex.	Hudnut	Regula
Burlison, Mo.	Hungate	Rhodes
Butler	Hunt	Rinaldo
Carter	Hutchinson	Roberts
Ciancy	Ichord	Robinson, Va.
Clausen	Jarman	Robison, N.Y.
Don H.	Johnson, Colo.	Rogers
Clawson, Del.	Kemp	Roncalio, N.Y.
Cleveland	Ketchum	Roush
Cochran	Kluczynski	Roy
Collins, Tex.	Lagomarsino	Roybal
Connally	Landgrebe	Ruth
Cotter	Latta	Sandman
Coughlin	Lent	Sarasin
Crane	Litton	Satterfield
Cronin	Long, Md.	Scherle
Daniel, Dan.	Lott	Schroeder
Danielson	Luken	Sebelius
Davis, Wis.	McClory	Seiberling
de la Garza	McCloskey	Shipley
Deaney	McCollister	Shoup
Dellenback	McDade	Shuster
Dennis	McKay	Sikes
Dent	Macdonald	Sisk
Derwinski	Madigan	Skubitz
Devine	Mahon	Slack
Downing	Mallory	Smith, Iowa
Drinan	Martin, Nebr.	Smith, N.Y.
Duncan	Martin, N.C.	Snyder
du Pont	Mathias, Calif.	Spence
Edwards, Ala.	Mayne	Stanton
Eshleman	Melcher	J. William
Evans, Colo.	Mezvinsky	Stark
Findley	Michel	Steelman
Fish	Minish	Steiger, Ariz.

Stratton	Vander Jagt	Wilson,
Studds	Vanik	Charles, Tex.
Symington	Veysey	Winn
Symms	Vigorito	Wolff
Taylor, Mo.	Waggonner	Wylder
Taylor, N.C.	Walsh	Wylie
Teague	Wampler	Wyman
Thomson, Wis.	Whitehurst	Yates
Thone	Whitten	Yatron
Thornton	Widnall	Young, Ill.
Tiernan	Wiggins	Young, S.C.
Treen	Wilson,	Young, Tex.
Ullman	Charles H.,	Zion
Van Deerlin	Calif.	Zwach

NOT VOTING—103

Abzug	Frey	Matsunaga
Anderson, Ill.	Froehlich	Millford
Andrews, N.C.	Gettys	Nix
Bell	Glaime	Owens
Bevill	Goldwater	Patman
Biaggi	Grasso	Pepper
Boggs	Gray	Poage
Bolling	Guyer	Quile
Bowen	Hammer-	Quillen
Breaux	schmidt	Rees
Brooks	Hansen, Wash.	Reid
Camp	Harsha	Rooney, N.Y.
Carey, N.Y.	Hays	Rose
Chappell	Heckler, Mass.	Rostenkowski
Chisholm	Heinz	Rousselot
Clay	Hicks	Runnels
Cohen	Hinsaw	Ruppe
Collier	Hollifield	Schneebell
Conlan	Hosmer	Shriver
Conte	Howard	Steele
Conyers	Johnson, Pa.	Steiger, Wis.
Corman	Jones, Ala.	Stephens
Culver	Jones, Tenn.	Stokes
Daniel, Robert	Kazen	Stubblefield
W., Jr.	King	Sullivan
Davis, S.C.	Kuykendall	Talcott
Dickinson	Lehman	Towell, Nev.
Dingell	Lujan	Vander Veen
Dorn	McCormack	Waldie
Dulski	McEwen	Williams
Eckhardt	McKinney	Wilson, Bob
Erlenborn	McSpadden	Wright
Flowers	Mann	Young, Fla.
Foley	Maraziti	Young, Ga.
Frenzel	Mathis, Ga.	

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof), the motion was rejected.

The clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Owens.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Lehman.
 Mrs. Grasso with Mr. Cohen.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Collier.
 Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Conlan.
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Robert W. Daniel, Jr.
 Mr. Rose with Mr. Dickinson.
 Mr. Reid with Mr. Goldwater.
 Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Camp.
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Eckhardt.
 Mr. Clay with Mr. Corman.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Frenzel.
 Mr. Pickle with Mr. Conte.
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Foley.
 Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Harsha.
 Ms. Abzug with Mr. Waldie.
 Mr. Glaime with Mr. Erlenborn.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
 Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Guyer.
 Mr. Mann with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Mathis of Georgia with Mr. Lujan.
 Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Stokes.
 Mr. Andrews of North Carolina with Mr. Hosmer.
 Mr. Bevill with Mr. Johnson of Florida.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Maraziti.
 Mr. Davis of South Carolina with Mr. Froehlich.
 Mr. Dingell with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. King.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Heinz.
 Mr. Hicks with Mr. Quile.
 Mr. Runnels with Mr. Kuykendall.
 Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Rousselot.
 Mr. Kazen with Mr. McKinney.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Quillen.
 Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Patman.

Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Young of Georgia with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.
 Mr. Bowen with Mr. McCormack.
 Mr. Breaux with Mr. Rees.
 Mr. Milford with Mr. Ruppe.
 Mr. Chappell with Mr. Shriver.
 Mr. Conyers with Mr. Culyer.
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Schneebell.
 Mr. Flowers with Mr. Steele.
 Mr. Wright with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Vander Veen with Mr. Talcott.
 Mr. Williams with Mr. Towell of Nevada.
 Mr. Bob Wilson with Mr. Young of Florida.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONGRESSMAN WALSH INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO APPLY PUBLIC UTILITY CONCEPT TO OIL INDUSTRY

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, in this month of March we have seen a marked increase in the supply of gasoline. Any number of reasons are given for the increase, but the fact is that we have about 90 percent of what we had at this time last year.

We must not, however, let this good news lull us into complacency. The problem of the shortage will remain with us, although in the short-run it may appear that we have plenty. Steps must be taken to protect the American consumer from potential and actual problems which are both a part of and a result of the structure and functioning of the major oil companies.

The oil companies provide us with vital products and they are in business to make a profit. These two facts, while they are the foundation of our free enterprise system, are very much altered by the fact that the product provided in this case is so vital that a shortage can rock the entire economy of this Nation.

In a famous decision handed down by the Supreme Court in 1877—Munn against Illinois—it was stated:

Property does become clothed with a public interest when used in a manner to make it of public consequence, and effect the community at large. When, therefore, one devotes his property to a use in which the public has an interest, he, in effect, grants to the public an interest in that use, and must submit to be controlled by the public for the common good . . .

This decision dealt with grain elevators in the Midwest along the Chicago waterfront and marked the beginning of the public utility concept in America. It is my feeling that this concept must be applied to the oil industry for the protection of everyone and I am today introducing legislation toward that end.

Mr. Speaker, my bill utilizes the public utility concept by first establishing an independent regulatory agency consisting of three commissioners who will be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate.

It will be the job of the commission to set maximum prices for each sale of a refined petroleum product in the United

States by a major oil company. This price will be such that the aggregate revenues from the sales will be equal to the sum of allowable operating costs and a fair return on investment in domestic refining and distribution assets.

These assets will be based on the value of assets of the company in the United States to the extent they are used or usable for refining, distributing or selling refined petroleum products which are sold here. The commission will make this determination.

Allowable domestic operating costs are expenses of operation of domestic refining and distribution assets of the company, including the allowable expenses of obtaining crude oil used to conduct such operations and of obtaining refined petroleum products which are not refined by the company.

Expenses with respect to goods and services are allowable only to the extent they are reasonable and do not exceed the fair market value of such goods and services.

Any company which sells at a price higher than the maximum would be subject to a civil penalty of \$20,000 per violation and a fine of \$20,000 and a jail sentence of 1 year for each violation.

Finally, a major oil company is defined as any major refiner including all affiliates who are engaged to any extent in refining, sale, or distribution of refined petroleum products. A major refiner is one who, together with his affiliates, has an aggregate refining capacity which exceeds 175,000 barrels per day.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this legislation will serve the best interests of the American people and protect them from potentially serious harm from further shortages of petroleum products in the future. The oil industry is vast and its products are one of the cornerstones of our economy. In my opinion, this makes the public utility concept the most likely alternative means of controlling this industry and making it responsive to our needs. I sincerely urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation and to help speed it into early enactment into law.

THE POSSIBILITY OF DÉTENTE DOES NOT OUTWEIGH THE NECESSITY OF A STRONG DEFENSE

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

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, we hear much today about détente—the intended relaxation of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union. We hear much about the contrast between the easy words and rhetoric of détente on the one hand and the more difficult actions and deeds of détente on the other. We hear much too about why we need—or do not need—to maintain a strong national defense during this period of searching for a genuine détente and a lasting peace.

Unfortunately, much of the discussion about détente and defense has been either/or, black-or-white, one or the

other. Nothing could be further from the realities which ought to punctuate this debate. For, détente and defense are goals which can be attained only if the one reinforces the other; our search for peace requires a coextensive pursuit of both détente and defense. A détente is impossible of realization unless sufficient defense capabilities make it desirable, and those capabilities are guarantees of the peace during the protracted period of searching for genuine détente.

Since the request was made for supplemental appropriations for the current fiscal year and the President's budget message for fiscal year 1975 was submitted to the Congress, the debate on this issue has intensified. I am not fully confident, however, that all the statements which have been made have been based on careful reflection and examination of our defense needs and the interface between détente and defense. I hope, most sincerely, that philosophical or political predispositions will not overshadow the examination of this issue which needs to be made by every Member. This is no time for emotional reactions; it is a time for careful reflection and hard decisionmaking.

I have spent some considerable time on the testimony of the Secretary of Defense and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as the statements of the Secretary of State. These remarks have been buttressed in each instance by volumes of hard data on the state of America's defenses and on the burgeoning defensive and offensive strengths of the Soviet Union, our principal potential adversary. I have come to the conclusion that there is a pressing need for the United States to reinforce its military capabilities.

The United States today bears the principal burden of maintaining the worldwide military equilibrium which is the foundation for the security and the survival of freedom. This is not a role which we have welcomed, for it has been thrust upon us by history and necessity, but it is not a role from which we can run.

Let me examine for a moment the intricacies of this issue from three principal perspectives: the attitudes of our times, the strength of Soviet military might, and the status of U.S. defenses. I think, when all three of these are examined, one will agree with me that the United States should—and must—maintain a strong defense capability as we search for a lasting peace.

THE MOOD OF OUR TIMES

I believe it is clear that in some circles in American today, including some who serve in the Halls of Congress, the attitudes we see, generated to a large degree by our long and disenchanting involvement in Vietnam, as well as overall domestic pressures, are similar in many respects to the attitudes prevailing at the end of World War II or perhaps even worse prior to World War II when our Nation was totally unprepared.

We see the same proposals to "reorder priorities," principally that means to cut back on defense spending and proceed

more vigorously on social programs. We hear calls to cut down sharply on U.S. commitment overseas. Yet, we are also faced with a significant buildup of the military capabilities of our principal adversaries, the Soviet Union and Communist China. And, the world is smaller, in strike and response times, today than it was at the end of World War II, making response and protection even more important characteristics of our defense arsenal. This means that we must maintain ready forces—forces actually in being—for today the United States finds itself to be the actual front line of defense, not just “the arsenal of democracy.”

There is one striking dissimilarity between now and the period immediately following the Second World War. In an economic sense the most difficult aspect of the world community's problem is the serious problem of allocation of critical materials, shortages which historically put additional pressures on nations to expand their military and economic spheres of influence. In no small measure, this is much, if not most, of what the conflict in the Middle East among the big powers is all about—control of the vast oil fields.

The Secretary of Defense put his fingers firmly on the mood of the country today, and how too much a relaxation in our resolve to maintain a strong defense capability can undercut our means of assuring the peace, in his Annual Department of Defense Report of March 4, 1974:

We have a long tradition in this country of arming with great haste when war comes upon us, and disarming with even greater haste when the war is over; and we have tended, often, to view our relations with other nations in terms of absolutes—friend or foe, ally or adversary, cold war or detente.

Our experience in this country has amply demonstrated that satiating our military establishment in wartime and starving it in peacetime brings us neither peace nor long-term alleviation of the heavy burden of defense. In both blood and treasure, it will cost us less to maintain a reasonably stable level of defense effort until it is possible to achieve genuine mutual reductions in armaments.

We would serve ourselves and our allies poorly indeed if we relied solely on fond hopes or soft words while failing to take practical account of improving Soviet capabilities.

As Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said recently, one cannot negotiate from a position of inferiority, and until success is achieved in negotiations, we cannot unilaterally reduce our strategic, nuclear, or conventional forces. To do so invites our own destruction.

WHY WE MUST MAINTAIN A STRONG DEFENSE

We must maintain a strong national defense for several reasons, all of which are interrelated.

The best guarantee of the peace is a strong defense. The best deterrent to aggression is a defense so strong that no potential adversary would risk a military engagement with us. The Soviet Union will never risk its own destruction, when such a risk is not only possible, but

highly probable, if it attacks the United States.

On some issues one can afford to take the risk of spending too little money. But on defense, one cannot take that risk. To cut corners with our defense budget is to cut corners with the guarantees for our national survival, and the survival of all we stand for and believe in as a Nation. I, too, wish we could spend money we are now spending on defense for meeting other priorities, but we do not live in such a hoped-for world. We must live with the realities of competing interests among nations, and the dangers of war are always greater as nations compete for limited resources—and we are in such a period today. There is only one thing worse than an arms race and that is arms inferiority, for as President John Kennedy once said: “There is no first or second in this race; there is only first and last.”

We must also maintain a strong defense as a buttress to our policies of detente. There is no assurance that a real detente will actually come about. No better authority for this view could be cited than the Secretary of State, Dr. Kissinger.

Writing in 1968, Dr. Kissinger observed:

There have been at least five periods of peaceful coexistence since the Bolshevik seizure of power, one in each decade of the Soviet state. Each was hailed in the West as ushering in a new era of reconciliation and as signifying the long-awaited final change in Soviet purposes.

Each ended abruptly with a period of intransigence, which was generally ascribed to a victory of Soviet hardliners rather than to the dynamics of the system.

Dr. Kissinger's observation rings as true today as it did then. The many steps toward detente—treaties, agreements, SALT, mutual reduction in forces conferences, ostensible cooperation in the emigration of Jews, trade agreements—almost all went out the proverbial window when the Soviets decided to aid the Arabs in the recent Yom Kippur War. Strategic advantages to be had in the Middle East outweighed any perceived advantages to be had through detente. Power politics remained power politics in the Kremlin. Until their words are matched by deeds, we must maintain our national defense.

Our defense commitments reinforce other foreign policy commitments. The might of the United States standing behind our commitment to Israel during the Yom Kippur war is an example of how we can accomplish peaceful objectives by a show of military force. We must never overlook this reinforcement character of our defense ability.

DEFENSE AND THE FEDERAL BUDGET

I think the record needs to be set straight on the subject of how great a share of the total Federal budget is taken by our defense commitment, for there has been too much misleading information on this question.

The defense of our country is, of course, entirely a matter of Federal responsibility. Not one dollar of State or local taxes goes into national defense. This is not true of all the other many categories of government responsibility.

What does this mean?

It means that the share of taxes—Federal, State, and local—which goes for nondefense programs, such as that spent for social welfare measures, is a much larger percentage of taxes in this country than an examination of the Federal budget alone would indicate. State and local government has a great share of the burden for nondefense spending, and we must never overlook their exercise of that responsibility, one which has historically rested on the State and local level.

The facts are clear that defense outlays for fiscal year 1974—in terms of gross national product, total Federal budget outlays, and net public spending—have decreased sharply over the past 10 years.

In fiscal year 1964 defense outlays constituted 8.3 percent of the gross national product; by fiscal year 1974, they were down to 5.9 percent of GNP.

In fiscal year 1964 defense outlays were 41.8 percent of the Federal budget; by fiscal year 1974, they were down to 27.9 percent of the Federal budget.

In fiscal year 1964, defense outlays were 28.1 percent of the net public spending; by fiscal year 1974, they were down to 17.8 percent.

It is wrong, therefore, to assert that we are spending more and more on defense, for we are spending an ever-lessening percentage on defense in terms of the three main indices for judging our spending priorities—gross national product, percentage of Federal budget outlays, and net public spending.

Against this background, let us look at the Soviet military buildup.

THE STATUS OF THE SOVIET BUILDUP

In their Department of Defense and military posture reports for fiscal year 1975, Secretary of Defense Schlesinger and Admiral Moorer depict graphically the extent of the Soviet buildup. There can be little doubt about what we must do, after reviewing these and related documents.

Let me quote from these reports:

The Soviet Union is making significant improvements in its strategic nuclear forces and, in concert with its partners in the Warsaw Pact, maintains large and ready general purpose forces. These forces are, in fact, the most usable elements of their considerable and diversified military power.

A development of more recent years is the accelerated improvement in Soviet missile technology. The Soviet Union now has the capability in its missile forces to undertake selective attacks against targets other than cities.

The USSR has been pursuing a vigorous strategic R&D program. This we had expected. But its breadth, depth, and momentum as now revealed comes as something of a surprise to us.

I might add, at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the figures which support this last statement show that since 1968 our own research and development has been cut by 21 percent, while Soviet R. & D. has been sustained at a level a full 50 percent higher than ours. Most of our

research has, therefore, been limited to "safe bets," while the Soviets, with twice as many projects in motion, are much more likely to come up with farout weapons systems that could make the imbalance of power drastically worse, tipping further the balance of power in their direction.

Let me return to the Secretary's and the Admiral's reports:

During the past year alone, the Soviets have tested four new intercontinental ballistic missiles, and have developed their first multiple reentry vehicle submarine-launched missile. . . . All of them are being designed for increased accuracy. The very large SS-X-18 will have about thirty percent more throwweight than the currently deployed SS-9.

This throw-weight . . . could give the Soviets on the order of 7,000 one-to-two megaton warheads in their ICBM force alone. They would then possess a major one-sided counterforce capability against the United States ICBM force.

In the past ten years . . . we have seen a growing deployment of Soviet naval forces to distant waters. The Soviet Navy began continuous out-of-area deployments in 1964 in the Mediterranean; these deployments were expanded later to the Indian Ocean, the Caribbean, and the west coast of Africa. The overall level of Soviet deployment activity measured in ship-days increased roughly six-fold from 1965 to 1970.

The Soviet Navy . . . is not presently growing in numbers. It is growing in capability. The Soviet Navy has a vigorous ship-building program to replace older combatant ships with new, more capable types.

By the early 1980s the USSR will have approximately twice the planned United States submarine level. This relatively large Soviet submarine force will continue to pose the primary threat to our sea lanes throughout the decade.

In sum . . . we see a Soviet Navy that is becoming increasingly capable of overseas deployment, whose submarines could pose a significant threat to free world shipping, and whose surface combatants, with their considerable antiship cruise missile capability, could inflict serious damage on our naval forces in a surprise attack.

Numerically, the United States Navy has been declining steadily in recent years, and indeed has been reduced by about 45 percent since 1969.

And about the interrelationship between détente on one hand and Soviet military intentions on the other, the Secretary's report had this to say:

Soviet actions during the October 1973 Middle East War show that détente is not the only, and in certain circumstances not the primary, policy interest of the USSR. The immediate Soviet arms shipments to Egypt and Syria at the outset of hostilities, the deployment of nuclear-capable SCUD missile launchers, the peremptory Soviet note to the United States Government implying the possibility of direct Soviet military deployment of sizeable Soviet naval forces . . . provided another lesson in Soviet willingness to take risks with world peace.

These reports go on to demonstrate such U.S. defense weaknesses as Soviet superiority in ICBM's—their 1,618 to our 1,054; as Soviet superiority in SLBM's—their 740 to our 656; as Soviet superiority in force loading weapons—their 2,600

to our 2,200; as their superiority in the number of men in uniform.

Against this background—and against the Soviet Union's demonstrated capabilities to use its military powers to achieve both military and political/economic objectives—one can see the necessity of maintaining America's defense capabilities.

DEFENSE AS A GUARANTOR OF PEACE

The Father of our Country, in his first annual message to the Congress in 1790, stressed that—

To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving the peace.

Washington was echoing the warnings of the fourth century Roman historian who had declared—

Let him who desires peace be prepared for war.

Peace. All civilized men want peace. But, peace on earth is a plea for those conditions which make peace thinkable, and peace is unrealized in a world in which aggressors move forward when peaceful men sit silent. In seeking peace, we, rather, strive toward that period in time when a spirit of peace will settle in the hearts and minds of those people and leaders in the world who now desire domination, hoping that eventually that spirit will cause them to exercise the restraints which make peace possible.

We must be ever mindful that if peace were the first goal of men, we would not have to pray for it. We would have it. Until then, a strong national defense is the best guarantor of that peace.

HOW SECRET SCHOOL RECORDS CAN HURT YOUR CHILD

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, educational records affect all of us—more than 200 million Americans. If we are to have confidence in our educational process, the costs of which are borne by every taxpayer, then we have a right to inspect the records maintained about our educational experience.

The article by Diane Divoky, "How Secret School Reports Can Hurt Your Child," is most disturbing. Educators may raise questions as to whether abuses in large numbers really occur. But that is not the issue. The point to be made is simply that student and parental fears can be best allayed by the opening for inspection of educational records. Parents or guardians ought to be able to look at and question the complete file on their child. College and university administrators should similarly open their records to any student wishing to check or verify its contents.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this article for the attention of my colleagues:

HOW SECRET SCHOOL RECORDS CAN HURT YOUR CHILD

(By Diane Divoky)

"An habitual liar and a real sickie." "Ego-impaired and maladaptive." "Unnaturally interested in girls." "A real show-off in class, probably because of serious problems at home."

Who are these problem students? They're your children and mine, as described in increasingly fat folders maintained by the schools.

Student records—any teacher or school counselor will tell you—are used more and more to get a picture of the "whole child," his family, and his psychological, social and academic development. So besides hard data, such as IQ scores, medical records, and grades, schools are now collecting files of soft data: teachers' anecdotes, personality rating profiles, reports on interviews with parents, and "high security" psychological, disciplinary and delinquency reports. These are routinely filed away in school offices or stored in computer data banks.

You, the parent, probably can't see most of these records, or control what goes into them, much less challenge any untrue or embarrassing information they might contain. But a lot of other people—the school office clerk, potential employers, probation officers, welfare and health department workers, Selective Service board representatives, and just about any policeman who walks into the school and flashes a badge—have carte blanche to these dossiers on your child. And to top it all off, parents are never told who's been spying on their children.

OTHERS HAVE ACCESS

Recent surveys of representative school systems throughout the country found that CIA and FBI agents and juvenile court and health department officials had access to the entire records in more than half the school systems; local police in 33 percent and parents in less than 10 percent.

Even in the rare states or districts where parents have a legal right to inspect records, that right is often denied in practice. As a principal in a California suburb put it: "I know what the law is here in California. Parents are supposed to be able to see the cumulative record. But if a parent comes in and asks to see a record, first I ask why. If there's a really good reason, I'll share some of it with them—but there are certain items I'll always withhold."

OFFICIAL ARROGANCE

The schools argue that student records are their records, to share with whom they choose "for the benefit of the child." Forgetting that parents have the basic legal and moral responsibility for their child and only entrust the child to the school for educational purposes, many school officials arrogantly assume that somehow they know more about the welfare of the child.

A third of the schools do not ask parents for permission before collecting personality test data, and half don't get parents' permission before collecting data on families. Sixteen percent of the systems don't get any form of parental consent before submitting students to psychiatric tests. School counselors, who keep some of the most sensitive records, insist that they'll have to water down their records if they know parents may see them, an argument that raises provocative questions about what goes into those records, and about the school's attitudes toward parents. The results of the school's attitudes, in practice:

A community tutoring project's secretary calls an elementary school to check on a student's grade placement, and the principal gratuitously reads from the record that the child is a bed-wetter, and that his mother is an alcoholic with a different boyfriend in the house each night.

A mother sneaks a look at her junior high school son's record, and sees that back in second grade an anonymous teacher had written: "exhibitionist tendencies." After several months of work running down the teacher, who no longer taught in the school system, she discovered that the comment was based on a single incident when the youngster had hurriedly returned from the lavatory unzipped.

A black father who works for the school his daughter attends gets to see her file, and finds five pages of notes about his and his wife's "political activity."

A parent is informed by a guidance counselor, about to write a college recommendation for her son, that his "psychological" file labeled him a "possible schizophrenic" back in elementary school. The mother didn't know such a file existed.

The parents of a junior high student are told their daughter won't be able to attend graduation ceremonies because she's a "bad citizen." What has she done that's bad, the parents ask. Well, the principal says, the school had a whole file on her "poor citizenship," but the parents can't know what's in that file. In this Catch-22 case, one of the few to get a legal hearing, the New York State Commissioner of Education, Ewald B. Nyquist, stated flatly that the school's argument—that it was acting in the best interest of the student in refusing to reveal the information to the parents—had "no merit." The commissioner concluded: "It is readily apparent that no one had a greater right to such information than the parents."

"TREMENDOUS ABUSE"

"Most people don't even know their rights on this issue," says a staff member of the New York Civil Liberties Union.

"There is tremendous abuse in the preparation of these records. Teachers will think nothing of inserting comments like, 'I feel sorry for the teacher who gets this kid next year,' or 'This one is really a gem.'"

A 9-year-old boy who once hugged a classmate had "homosexual tendencies" written into his permanent record.

Even an affectionate, harmless kiss on the cheek can be interpreted by an overzealous teacher as an "unnatural interest in girls."

In one case, the parents of a 7-year-old boy who was killed accidentally obtained his school records in the litigation that ensued. Some of the comments they found: "Can read and do numbers, but is too immature"—this at the end of the first grade; and "Refuses to use left hand—dislikes being reminded to try." Not mentioned was the fact that the boy had an orthopedic problem on his left hand.

A high school student who criticized his principal on a radio station had "radical tendencies" placed in his record.

"It's an insidious problem," says the NYCLU official, "because most people don't even know who has seen their records and if they are being discriminated against as a result."

Concerned about the growing potential for abuses in school record keeping, the Russell Sage Foundation published in 1969 a widely distributed set of guidelines to aid school systems in establishing fair policies and practices. But five years later, the vast majority of school systems haven't gotten the message. The New York City Board of Education finally established good policies, but few parents or students there seem to know about the protections.

PROTECTIVE LEGISLATION

Des Moines, Iowa, and Jefferson City, Mo., have taken steps to safeguard records, and at the state level, Oregon and New Mexico have passed legislation to give parents and older students access to records, and to protect records from outsiders. New Hampshire bans records that tell of students' political beliefs and activities, and Delaware gives students control of their own records once they are 14 years of age. Elsewhere, the easy flow of information and misinformation—from school to police to social agency—goes unchecked.

One group that is concerned about the problem, the National Committee for Citizens in Education, headquartered in Columbia, Md., urges parents to take a stand—to find out if you can see all of your chil-

dren's school records, and what provisions your school has to protect records from outsiders' eyes. The committee is preparing a state-by-state guide of school record laws to tell parents where they stand, plus a handbook to guide parents and citizens in asking the questions that will give you the answers on school records policies and practices in your district. It will also provide you with model codes that your state board of education or school system might adopt.

If all else fails, the committee will even tell you how to proceed with legal action. You can write to the National Committee for Citizens in Education, Suite 410, Wilde Lake Village Green, Columbia, Md. 21044.

Last month President Nixon announced that he was setting up a top priority committee headed by Vice President Ford to provide a "personal shield for every American" against invasions of privacy from any source; surely this must apply to our children, too.

ASSISTING THE AGING IN NURSING HOMES

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, I have become aware of a provision in the original Medicare Act, Public Law 89-97, which has created a peculiar handicap for a small percentage of medicare recipients. The problem arises with the manner in which the law defines a "spell of illness" for determining eligibility for medicare payments.

Section 1861(a)(2) of Public Law 89-97 establishes "spell of illness" as the period of consecutive days—

(1) beginning with the first day (not included in a previous spell of illness) (A) on which such individual is furnished inpatient hospital services or extended care services, and (B) which occurs in a month for which he is entitled to benefits under part A, and

(2) ending with the close of the first period of 60 consecutive days thereafter on each of which he is neither an inpatient of a hospital nor an inpatient of an extended care facility.

Several residents of the Sixth District of Wisconsin are confronted with the loss of benefits because of this definition. I am certain that many of my colleagues have constituents with a similar problem. Elderly persons residing in nursing homes face the possibility of being unable to break the defined "spell of illness," or benefit period, and renew their eligibility for medicare coverage.

Under part A of the medicare program, limited hospital, extended care, and home health benefits are all combined into a single definition of "spell of illness." When those benefits are exhausted; that is, after the benefit period plus the nonrenewable lifetime reserve of 60 days, no further medicare benefits are available until a new benefit period begins.

Under current law, a benefit period ends with the close of the first period of 60 consecutive days during which time the individual is "neither an inpatient of a hospital nor an inpatient of a skilled nursing facility."

The effect of this provision is that any person residing in a skilled nursing facility, who has transferred from a hos-

pital but is no longer receiving skilled care, cannot break the benefit period.

Obviously, many elderly people must spend their last years in a nursing home, not because they require skilled nursing care, but simply because they are unable to care for themselves and have no other alternatives.

Even though the institution in which they reside is their legal residence, its dual existence as a skilled nursing facility prevents medicare benefits from becoming available.

The provision of 60 lifetime reserve hospital benefit days has not solved the problem. That is, a resident of a nursing home can exhaust his or her reserve by seeking necessary care. On the other hand someone residing elsewhere than a nursing home with the same medical history can maintain his or her reserve intact because they have been able to break the "spell of illness" test. The result is that the aging who are residing in a nursing home have no further hospital benefits under medicare.

Evidently, the present wording of the law is designed to prevent the artificial shifting of patients back and forth between levels of care for the purpose of qualifying for additional medicare benefits that might occur if the 60-day benefit period could be broken by certifying receiving a level of care lower than skilled nursing care.

Rather than deny all nursing home residents the opportunity to renew their eligibility for hospital insurance benefits, it would seem more realistic to devise an adequate test to determine whether a person is actually receiving long-term personal or custodial care as opposed to skilled nursing care.

To remedy this situation, I am introducing a bill providing a person residing in a skilled nursing facility with the opportunity to end a spell of illness with the close of the first period of 180 consecutive days on which he is no longer receiving either skilled nursing care or rehabilitation services and the nursing home is not receiving payment for skilled nursing services.

The amendment is not designed to provide medicare coverage for long-term custodial care but simply to enable persons requiring personal or custodial care to have the same medicare benefits available to others.

The cost of the change proposed by my bill is estimated by the Social Security Administration to be \$25 million in the first full year of implementation.

The Senate has already adopted a similar provision as an amendment to H.R. 3153. I would urge the House Ways and Means Committee to give prompt and careful consideration to this matter.

JURY TRIALS FOR HUNTING VIOLATIONS

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend Federal law regarding wildfowl protection. Very

simply, my bill would guarantee the right to a jury trial for those accused of violating Federal wildfowl laws and regulations.

While I have no sympathy for law violators and feel that those who are properly convicted should be punished, I also know that under present law, the possibility of inequities in prosecution is considerable. As things stand now, alleged violators are tried in Federal courts without juries, and in almost every instance they are convicted on the testimony of game wardens.

Too often, this procedure amounts to presuming that the accused individual is guilty until he proves himself innocent, a reversal of the ordinary presumption in American legal proceedings. This situation is made worse by the fact that recently, the courts have begun ordering jail sentences instead of, or in addition to, fines. The maximum 6-month sentence is rather serious punishment to be doled out without benefit of a jury trial.

Passage of this bill will help insure that evidence in wildfowl law violations trials is substantial, and that those accused will be given the normal presumption of innocence so vital to a fair and just system of American jurisprudence.

SOUTH AFRICAN AFFECTED ORGANIZATIONS BILL AND RIOTOUS ASSEMBLIES ACT

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

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert for the thoughtful attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the New York Times on February 20, 1974 commenting on recent repressive legislation in South Africa, specifically the Affected Organizations bill and Riotous Assemblies Act. I would also like to include the text of the Affected Organizations Act.

The material follows:

NEW CURBS ASKED IN SOUTH AFRICA SUPPRESSION OF OPPOSITION IS SEEN LEGISLATION'S INTENT

CAPETOWN, February 19.—Legislation that appears intended to suppress all opposition was laid before the South African Parliament today by Prime Minister John Vorster's Government. The Government has a firm majority in Parliament.

Part of the legislation is in the form of a new bill, under which any organization considered by the national president to be engaged in politics with aid from abroad can be declared "an affected organization." It could then be forbidden to bring in or receive funds from abroad under pain of harsh penalties—a fine as large as 20,000 rand (\$30,000) or 10 years imprisonment or both.

SEVERAL APPARENT TARGETS

In addition, the Government proposed changes in the Riotous assemblies act would give blanket authority to magistrates to ban even lawful meetings.

The proposed amendments would also give any policeman above the rank of warrant officer the power to bar the public from any place where he believed a prohibited gathering might occur and the power to use force, including firearms, to break up such a gathering.

The "affected organizations bill" appears to be aimed at various antiapartheid organizations not primarily involved in politics, such as the Christian Union of South African Students and several black social organizations that rely on funds from abroad and have irritated the Government.

Although the central issue is whether the president considers that "politics is being engaged in," the bill does not define the term "politics."

The bill says that if the president is satisfied that "politics is being engaged in by and through an organization with the aid of, or in cooperation with, or under the influence of, an organization of a person abroad," he will have the power to declare the organization involved an "affected organization."

This can be done without notice to the organization by proclamation in the Government paper. The president can take this action after the Minister of Justice has considered a "factual report" on the organization concerned by a committee of three magistrates appointed by the Minister, one of whom must be a chief magistrate.

Before this, however, the Minister would be given blanket powers by the new bill to investigate a suspect organization.

The bill provides that any person who hinders, resists or obstructs the investigation of a suspect organization would be subject to a maximum penalty of a 600-rand fine and a year's imprisonment.

An officer appointed to investigate a suspect organization would have the power to enter premises at will, demand and seize any documents or question any person.

The legislation to revise the Riotous Assemblies Act would remove the term "public gathering" from the act, which restricts gatherings of 12 or more people, and supply the term "any gathering."

The new measures also contain a sharp curtailment of press freedom. Any person who without the consent of the Minister of Justice disseminates the speech of any person banned from attending a gathering would be liable to a year's imprisonment without the option of a fine.

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA—AFFECTED ORGANIZATIONS BILL

(Introduced by the Deputy Minister of Justice)

Bill to provide for the prohibition of the receipt of money from abroad for certain organizations; and to provide for matters connected therewith

Be it enacted by the State President, the Senate and the House of Assembly of the Republic of South Africa, as follows:

DEFINITIONS

1. In this Act, unless the context otherwise indicates—

(i) "affected organization" means an organization which has in terms of section 2 been declared to be an affected organization; (iii)

(ii) "document" includes any book, statement, pamphlet, note, list, record, placard, poster, manifest, drawing, portrait or picture; (viii)

(iii) "Minister" means the Minister of Justice; (v)

(iv) "money" includes anything which can be cashed or converted into money; (iv)

(v) "officer-bearer", in relation to any organization, means a member of the governing or executive body of—

(a) the organization;

(b) a branch, section or committee of the organization; or

(c) a local, regional or subsidiary body forming part of the organization; (i)

(vi) "officer", in relation to any organization means any person working for the organization or for any branch, section or com-

mittee thereof, or for any local, regional or subsidiary body forming part thereof; (ii)

(vii) "organization" includes any body, group or association of persons, institution, federation, society, movement, trust or fund, incorporated or unincorporated, and whether or not it has been established or registered in accordance with any law; (vi)

(viii) "Registrar" means the Registrar of Affected Organizations appointed in terms of section 3. (vii)

PROHIBITION ON THE RECEIPT OF FOREIGN MONEY BY CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS

2. (1) If the State President is satisfied that politics are being engaged in by or through an organization with the aid of or in co-operation with or in consultation or under the influence of an organization or person abroad, he may, without notice to the first-mentioned organization, but subject to the provisions of section 8, by proclamation in the Gazette declare that organization to be an affected organization.

(2) No person shall—

(a) ask for or canvass foreign money for or on behalf of an affected organization;

(b) receive money from abroad for or on behalf of an affected organization, or receive or in any other manner handle or deal with such money with the intention of handing it over or causing it to be handed over to such an organization or with the intention of using it or causing it to be used on behalf of such an organization;

(c) bring or cause to be brought or assist in bringing from abroad into the Republic any money for or on behalf of an affected organization, or bring in or cause to be brought in from abroad any money into the Republic with the intention of handing it over or causing it to be handed over to such an organization or with the intention of using it or causing it to be used on behalf of such an organization.

(3) Money in the possession of an affected organization which that organization had, before it was declared to be an affected organization, received from abroad, whether before or after the commencement of this Act, shall not be handed over, transferred, donated, paid or give in exchange to any other organization or person for any purpose whatsoever: Provided that it may, within one year after the organization was declared to be an affected organization, be donated to a welfare organization which is registered in terms of the National Welfare Act, 1965 (Act No. 79 of 1965), and which is not an affected organization, for use in furtherance of the objects in respect of which that welfare organization is so registered, or to any other organization approved by the Minister.

REGISTRAR OF AFFECTED ORGANIZATIONS

3. (1) The Minister may appoint a person as Registrar of Affected Organizations and announce his office address by notice in the Gazette.

(2) The Registrar, or any person acting under his written authority, may at all reasonable times enter upon any premises there to inspect and extract information from or make copies of any document relating to the finances of an affected organization and may, if in his opinion it is desirable for practical reasons, remove any such document to any other premises for those purposes.

(3) The Registrar shall in respect of every affected organization fix a financial year and shall within six months after the close of every financial year, report to the Minister on the moneys received and paid out by the organization concerned during that fiscal year.

(4) The Registrar may require any person attached to an affected organization, particulars of moneys received or paid out in respect of that organization, and if he is furnished therewith, he shall submit them to the Minister.

(5) The Minister shall, as often as he deems fit, but at least once in every year, lay upon the Tables of the Senate and the House of Assembly any reports and particulars received by him in terms of subsection (3) or (4), or extracts therefrom.

(6) No person shall hinder, resist or obstruct the Registrar or any person referred to in subsection (2) in the exercise of his powers under this section.

CONFISCATIONS

4. (1) If the Registrar suspects that any money, in whose possession or under whose control it may be, is money which has been, is being or is to be dealt with in contravention of the provision of section 2(2), or is money as contemplated in section 2(3) which has not been donated within the period and in the manner and to an organization as therein prescribed, and lodges with the registrar of a division of the Supreme Court of South Africa an affidavit to this effect, that registrar shall issue an order prohibiting any person in whose possession or under whose control such money is from disposing thereof in any manner whatever, and after a copy of such order has been served upon any person in possession or control thereof by a member of the South African Police, such person may not in any manner dispose of or deal with it, except in accordance with an order of a division of the Supreme Court of South Africa.

(2) If the Registrar in an application to a division of the Supreme Court of South Africa alleges that any money, in whose possession or under whose control it may be, is money which has been, is being or is to be dealt with in contravention of the provisions of section 2(2), or is money as contemplated in section 2(3) which has not been donated within the period and in the manner and to an organization as therein prescribed, the court in question shall confiscate that money in favour of the State, and such confiscation shall be deemed to be a civil judgment in favour of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, unless any person having an interest in the money satisfies that court that the person in whose possession or under whose control the money is, and the person on whose behalf he holds the money, has not dealt with, is not dealing with or is not going to deal with it in contravention of the provisions of section 2(2), or that the money is not money as contemplated in section 2(3) which has not been donated within the period and in the manner and to an organization as therein prescribed, as the case may be, in which case the court may make any order it deems fit.

OFFENCES AND PENALTIES

5. (1) Any person who contravenes the provisions of section 2(2) or 4(1) or who in contravention of the provisions of section 2(3) deals with any money, shall be guilty of an offence and liable on conviction—

(i) in the case of a first conviction, to a fine not exceeding ten thousand rand or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding five years or to both such fine and such imprisonment; and

(ii) in the case of a second or subsequent conviction, to a fine not exceeding twenty thousand rand or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding ten years or to both such fine and such imprisonment.

(2) Any person who contravenes the provisions of section 3(6) shall be guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding six hundred rand or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding one year or to both such fine and such imprisonment.

AUTHORIZED OFFICER

6. (1) If the Minister has reason to suspect that the objects or activities of any organization or of any person who directly or indirectly takes part in the activities of any organization, are such that the organization should in terms of section 2(1) be de-

clared to be an affected organization, he may in writing under his hand appoint a person (hereinafter called an authorized officer) to inquire into the objects and activities of that organization or of persons who so take part in the activities thereof.

(2) An authorized officer may for the purpose of performing his functions—

(a) at any time enter upon any premises whatsoever and there carry out such investigations and make such enquiries as he deems necessary;

(b) demand from any person on those premises that he forthwith or at a time and place specified by the authorized officer, submit to him a specified document which is on the premises;

(c) at any time and place demand from any person who has possession or custody or control of any document, that he submit it to him forthwith or at a time and place specified by the authorized officer;

(d) seize any document referred to in paragraph (b) or (c) which in his opinion may afford evidence with regard to a matter referred to in subsection (1);

(e) examine such document and make extracts therefrom or copies thereof and ask any person whom he considers to have the necessary information, to give an explanation of any entry therein;

(f) with regard to a matter referred to in subsection (1), question any person, either alone or in the presence of any other person, as he deems desirable, whom he finds on premises entered upon by him in terms of this section, or whom he on reasonable grounds believes to be or at any time before or after the commencement of this Act to have been an office-bearer, officer, member or active supporter of the organization concerned, or to be in possession of information required by him; and

(g) order any person referred to in paragraph (b), (c), (e) or (f) to appear before such authorized officer at a time and place specified by him, and at such time and place question such person.

(3) Any person who is questioned in terms of subsection (2) (f) or (g) shall be entitled to all the privileges to which a person giving evidence before a provincial division of the Supreme Court of South Africa is entitled.

OFFENCES WITH REGARD TO AN AUTHORIZED OFFICER

7. Any person who—

(a) hinders, resists or obstructs an authorized officer referred to in section 6 in the performance of his functions or the exercise of his powers in terms of this Act;

(b) refuses or fails to answer to the best of his knowledge any question which such authorized officer has in the exercise of his powers put to him;

(c) refuses or fails to comply to the best of his ability with any demand or order of such authorized officer in terms of this Act, shall be guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding six hundred rand or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding one year or to both fine and such imprisonment.

DECLARATION IN TERMS OF SECTION 2 ONLY AFTER FACTUAL REPORT HAS BEEN CONSIDERED

8. The power conferred upon the State President by section 2 to declare an organization to be an affected organization, shall not be exercised unless the Minister has given consideration to a factual report made in relation to that organization by a committee consisting of three magistrates appointed by the Minister, of whom at least one shall be a chief magistrate or a regional magistrate.

SHORT TITLE

9. This Act shall be called the Affected Organizations Act, 1974.

MAINTAINING COUNTY AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

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

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to serve as a guideline to the Secretary of Agriculture in his desire to achieve what he deems to be an efficiency and a convenience—a program of consolidation of departmental service agencies. My bill would assure that each county which now has any agricultural agency service office would continue to have that service within the county, and would enable the Secretary to achieve these objectives by maintaining a cohesion to the historic trading, administrative, and social centers in counties.

The interest of the Secretary of Agriculture by establishing what he artificially and euphemistically calls "one-stop service centers" is most impressive. It was impressive also when it was undertaken by Secretary Brannan 25 years ago; abandoned by Secretary Benson as having no merit 20 years ago; and again undertaken by Secretary Freeman in the early sixties.

We in Kansas support, even praise, any attempt to achieve economy and efficiency. But we fear very much that this may be another case where these desirable goals are mirages, chased but not attained, and one more occasion to divert and delude the farmer. The agencies the Secretary would combine are service agencies; their mission—to serve the farmer, not to show a profit—the only thesis the Secretary understands, although we look in vain to find where he believes profit necessary for the family farmer.

Consolidated multicounty one-step service centers may be efficient for the visiting bureaucrat and the census taker, but until some better system is shown, I do not want this administration to force any farmer to go beyond his own county to obtain the information and services his Government owes him and has by law promised to him.

LABOR—FAIR WEATHER FRIEND—XVIII

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, organized labor appears to be suffering from the pangs of corporate gigantism. The giants of labor do not know what the midgets are doing in their name, and when they find out, the giants are too embarrassed to take any corrective action.

For instance, the AFL-CIO set up and pays the bills for running the Labor Council for Latin American Advancement, which took as its first action a public announcement condemning me for some imaginary offense. The LCLAA supposedly sent me a telegram complaining of what they thought I had done, but I never got the telegram.

Then they put out a press release duly noting their actions in behalf of all those they claim to represent. This press release was signed by Ray Mendoza and J. F. Otero and Don Slaiman.

Now I have no idea who these fellows Mendoza and Otero are. I do not recall ever having met them. How they could know anything about me, being total strangers, I do not know. But they felt able to send out a great blast in my general direction.

I know what I have done in behalf of the working man for, lo, these many years. What I want to know is what these guys Otero and Mendoza have ever done, except draw pay from the dues of honest unionists. I want to know what they have done that gives them any right or competence to make any judgment of me.

Otero and Mendoza know that their attack on me had not been authorized by the board of their organization. They had not bothered to see if what they had been told about me was true. To this day they do not show any interest in learning what the facts are.

Privately, the people in the AFL-CIO like Don Slaiman will say that the attack on me was wrong, should never have taken place, and that they are sorry that it happened. But their chagrin is just for private consumption. They either do not know what to do about the abuse of their good names and offices, or think that it is more important to appease the likes of Otero and Mendoza than it is to correct an egregious and wholly false attack on a good friend of labor. Thus it is that the midgets of labor seem to control the giants.

But if the house of labor is going to be legitimate, it is going to have to be honestly built. Judging from what happened to me, the old plumber should start checking around and see what has been happening in his good name.

It will not be hard for labor to win my good will. All it has to do is correct the record. When I have been victimized by an unfair public attack, I am not about to accept any privately expressed regrets. A little exercise in forthrightness should not be harmful to anyone. In a situation like this, wherein the generals seem overwhelmed by corporals, it might do the generals good to start taking some responsibility for what has been happening in their name. They cannot pay for, put their name on, carry out, and claim public attention for attacks—and then deny any responsibility. If labor's two corporals lied, the generals ought to know about it, take the responsibility, and do the right thing.

CONGRESSMAN BRADEMÁS REPLIES TO PRESIDENT ON EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, my very able colleague, JOHN BRADEMÁS, acted as spokesman for the House in replying to the President's recent network address on education.

In this instance, JOHN really was speaking for the entire Congress, not just for the Democratic members. For despite all his assurances to the contrary, President Nixon has repeatedly attempted to thwart the bipartisan desire of most members of the Congress for a continued, and improved, Federal commitment to assist education at every level. The President has shown a fundamental unwillingness to cooperate with Congress toward this end. He has vetoed essential legislation. He has slashed this year's budget request for elementary and secondary schools, alone, by some \$300 million, over the current appropriation. He has frequently sent his agents to Congress to oppose important programs. And when Congress has ignored his opposition and passed the legislation, he has withheld funding.

In his radio address, JOHN detailed the considerable accomplishments of this Congress in the education field. Few members of Congress are more suited to this task. During his years in Congress, JOHN has developed an enviable expertise on education matters. The passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, last week, stands as a tribute to this Congress. It would not have been possible without the efforts of Chairman PERKINS and JOHN BRADEMÁS.

I insert the text of JOHN's statement in the RECORD, and commend it to all my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMÁS OF INDIANA, MARCH 29, 1974

Good afternoon.

Last week in a radio address to the nation, President Nixon expressed his views on education.

I have been asked by the Leadership of Congress to speak to you today about education in our country and what your Congress is doing to support it.

Because I have served for over 15 years on that committee of the House of Representatives with chief responsibility for education legislation, I have had an opportunity to observe how the Federal government has come to provide significant assistance to education at every level, from preschool through graduate school.

The best evidence that most of us in Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, are committed to continuing such support was the overwhelming vote last Wednesday in the House of Representatives to extend for three more years the major program of Federal aid to the nation's grade schools and high schools.

The bill was passed by a vote of 380 to 26. It extends compensatory education for underprivileged children, provides support for school libraries, educational innovation and state departments of education, and continues a number of other special programs, such as aid for migrant, handicapped, delinquent and Indian children.

The bill extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was in large part the product of close cooperation between Democrats and Republicans in Congress.

Unfortunately, the strong commitment that Congress has demonstrated to the support of education has not been shared by the Administration of President Nixon.

In his radio message, Mr. Nixon said that "by working together we will insure that the future of our system of education . . . amply fulfills the promise of its past."

But with only a few exceptions, President Nixon has shown no willingness to work together with Congress to strengthen our

schools and colleges and universities and improve our system of education.

WIDE GAPS BETWEEN PRESIDENT NIXON'S PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE IN EDUCATION

Let me give you some examples of what I mean by showing you the wide gaps between President Nixon's promises and the performance of his Administration in the field of education. And I tell you, too, of what Congress has done.

1. In his campaign for President, Mr. Nixon said, "When we talk about cutting the expense of government . . . the one area we can't shortchange is education."

But when Congress voted more funds to help the nation's schools, Mr. Nixon vetoed the bills. In fact, he vetoed four of them and in his budget request for elementary and secondary schools this year, he proposes to slash over \$300 million below this year's appropriation.

2. Mr. Nixon says that every qualified student should have an opportunity for college or vocational school.

And Congress over the past several years has provided a variety of forms of assistance for students of differing need.

The most recent is the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant, which Congress initiated in 1972 in an effort to help students from middle-income families.

The grants are limited to \$1,400 per student, depending on need.

Congress also voted in 1972 to continue the existing programs of Federal student aid—National Direct Loans, Supplemental Educational Grants, and College Work Study, and mandated that the current loan and scholarship programs be funded at minimum levels before the new grant program could come fully into effect.

But President Nixon's budget this year proposes—in direct violation of the 1972 law—to terminate funds for the loan and scholarship programs.

The President thereby threatens serious damage to students from thousands of low and middle-income families all over America.

But I am convinced that Congress will prevent him from doing so, and I am glad to report to you that only Thursday House and Senate Conferees, working on a student assistance bill moved, successfully, to rescue another key student aid program the President was imperiling, Guaranteed Student Loans.

NIXON OPPOSES DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION

3. Mr. Nixon says that "There is no higher priority in this Administration than to see that children—and the public—learn the facts about drugs in the right way and for the right purpose through education."

But when Congress wrote a bill to help schools teach young people about dangerous drugs, Mr. Nixon opposed it.

Congress passed the bill anyway, overwhelmingly.

Then the Administration opposed the money to make it work, and the President's budget this year asks not a penny for what he called a "high priority" program.

4. Mr. Nixon speaks frequently of the need to develop "environmental literacy" among our citizenry by, in the President's own words, "the development and teaching of environmental concepts at every point in the educational process."

But when Congress originated a bill to help schools teach about environmental problems, the Administration opposed it.

Congress passed it anyway, overwhelmingly, and the Administration again opposed money to make it work.

CONGRESS RESTORES FUNDS FOR LIBRARIES

5. In January, Mr. Nixon told Congress, "I . . . believe the Federal government has a responsible role to play" in maintaining public libraries.

Yet the Nixon Administration testified this

year in opposition to a bill, introduced by Vice President Ford when still a Member of Congress, to authorize a 1976 White House Conference on Libraries to examine the "responsible role" our Federal government and other governments should play in supporting libraries.

Indeed, President Nixon's budget for 1974 requested not one dollar for school libraries, college libraries, or public libraries.

I am glad to say, however, that in the Fiscal 1974 budget Congress restored the money for libraries Mr. Nixon so thoughtlessly discarded.

And I am confident that when we act on the 1975 budget, Congress will again insist on adequate funds for the nation's libraries.

6. Or turn to another crucial area, the lives of young children.

Said President Nixon in a 1969 message to Congress:

"So critical is the matter of early growth that we must make a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life."

But when Congress took him at his word and approved the Comprehensive Child Development Bill, aimed at precisely the purposes of which the President has so eloquently spoken, the President vetoed the bill.

And even this year, when Members of Congress initiated legislation to deal with the tragic problem of the abuse and maltreatment of young children, President Nixon opposed passage of the bill.

Congress approved it anyway, overwhelmingly, but Mr. Nixon's budget this year contains no funds to carry out the provisions of the Child Abuse Act.

NIXON'S IMPOUNDMENT OF SCHOOL FUNDS CAUSES CHAOS

7. In his talk last week, President Nixon said he favored "forward funding," letting school districts know in advance how much Federal money they can count on. Many of us in Congress have urged this approach for years, and I am pleased that the President has finally endorsed it.

But it is Mr. Nixon, through the device of impoundment, the deliberate withholding of school funds Congress lawfully appropriated, who has brought confusion and chaos to thousands of school districts all over America.

And when the Administration late last year finally, under court order, released the impounded money, school districts were faced with the prospect of being forced to spend it, perhaps wastefully, before the end of the fiscal year this June.

Fortunately, Congress is moving rapidly to allow schools to expend such money through the next fiscal year as well.

And I am pleased to announce that only Thursday several of us on a House-Senate Conference Committee reached agreement on such a bill, and I am confident Congress will approve it within a few days.

8. President Nixon is proud of his record in foreign policy and has warned against a return to isolationism in America. And yet he has repeatedly asked for cuts in the major Federal program to train foreign language and area specialists. In fact, last year he tried to eliminate it.

But Congress said, "No," and restored the funds.

Nor has President Nixon in any year of his Administration requested money for the International Education Act, which Congress passed to help colleges and universities here in the United States educate young Americans about issues and problems in world affairs.

9. Yesterday the nation honored our Vietnam veterans, but President Nixon's program for veterans' education fails to do so.

The President opposed adequate increases in GI education allowances as "excessive and inflationary" and withheld funds Congress voted to help colleges enroll veterans.

The House of Representatives last month voted a significant raise in veterans' education allowances and last week approved \$750 million for veterans' education. And the Senate is expected to pass similar legislation soon.

NIXON OPPOSES BILL TO EDUCATE HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

10. Or turn to another problem of rising concern nearly everywhere, the education of handicapped youngsters.

In January, President Nixon told Congress, "There is growing awareness of the special educational needs of handicapped children... we are seeking to learn how to identify handicapped children earlier and give them the help they need to enter regular school when other children do."

But when my own education subcommittee held hearings on a bill to expand Federal assistance for the education of handicapped children, how did Mr. Nixon respond?

He sent his spokesmen to testify against the bill on grounds that it was not—to quote them—"appropriate" for the Federal government to be a leader in supporting education for handicapped children.

By now, the pattern I have been describing to you must be familiar.

When it comes to the support of American education, the rhetoric of the Nixon Administration is fine—but not the record.

The words are there but not the deeds.

It has been rather the Congress of the United States, usually with Democrats and Republicans working together, that has provided the leadership, the initiative, the action to make good on the promise of a better education for all the people of America.

PANAMA CANAL: "GREAT DECISIONS 1974" TV PROGRAM COMMENTS

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, 1974, there was a telecast on the west coast of the United States on the "Great Decisions 1974" program of the Foreign Policy Association of New York on the subject of "Cuba and the Panama Canal Zone." It was led by Martin Z. Agronsky and the principal participants were former Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, and Ambassador Joseph J. Jova. Reports from a number of sources are to the effect that the last three presented the current State Department viewpoint, which has not been authorized by the Congress and is directly counter to informed opinion of the Congress as shown by the resolutions opposing surrender.

One of those who heard the indicated program was Phillip Harman of California, who wrote former Secretary Rusk about it and sent me a copy of that letter along with an earlier letter that he had received from Professor Rusk. The latter purports to answer a question raised by Mr. Harman as to the competence of the present de facto revolutionary Panama Government to incur international obligations.

Propaganda in support of Panamanian

an demands among certain elements in the press of the United States has been massive but unrealistic, some of it aiming at getting the U.S. forces out of the Canal Zone. As to this angle, there is a warning based upon experience: Remember the British withdrawal from the Suez Canal Zone, its subsequent nationalization in 1956 by Egypt, and all the jumble that followed.

The indicated exchange of letters follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
March 5, 1974.

HON. DEAN RUSK,
School of Law, University of Georgia,
Athens, Ga.

DEAR PROFESSOR RUSK: Thank you so very much for your thoughtful letter of February 25th. I appreciated your views concerning whether or not a non-constitutional government such as Panama is competent to incur international obligations by means of treaties. Since the treaty talks began on June 29th, 1971, I have kept both the Senate and the House informed of the unconstitutionality of the present government in Panama and the legal inability by their national Constitution to ratify a treaty with a foreign nation. As I am in daily contact with many members of the Senate and the House, I do not believe they would approve a treaty that would surrender the \$6 billion dollar U.S. Canal Zone to a government that was conceived in a military conspiracy with the Kremlin, nurtured by terror, and born through revolution.

Concerning the Great Decisions television program that was aired last Sunday, the 3rd, I was distressed over the statements that Ambassadors Bunker and Jova made concerning the Canal Zone that fell, innocently enough, into the Kremlin's propaganda strategy. Ambassador Jova, who does not know Panama and has never lived there, said that the Canal Zone is offensive to the Panamanians. *This is not so. It is only offensive to the Panamanian Communist Party.* As for Ambassador Bunker's answer to Mr. Martin Zama Agronsky's question about the great contrast between the living standards of the Zone and Panama, this question that is always brought up, rates high on the Kremlin's propaganda list. Ambassador Bunker's defensive answer said this is the way that Americans live in various parts of the world which implied that there is a great contrast between the Zone and Panama. *This is not so.* Ambassador Bunker could have explained that the Americans in the Zone "live in relatively modest circumstances in spite of occasional journalistic reports about luxurious living." This is the statement that Governor David S. Parker of the Zone made on April 13th, 1973, before a House Committee. I am enclosing copies of letters to both of these Ambassadors. Your knowledgeable answers about Cuba certainly were appreciated by all who watched the program and you explained it in such a way that the average layman could understand it.

In looking back over five years since the gunpoint grab of the Panamanian nation by the Communist Party, I can't help but think of the sentiments expressed at that time by the people of Panama who said *if the U.S. did not recognize this illegal regime, the de facto government would fall within days.* This was expressed also in President Arnulfo Arias' 74 page statement to the OAS on October 29th, 1968. The Panamanians remembered that the U.S. in 1933 did not recognize Grau San Martin's regime in Cuba.

Do remember what Sumner Welles said concerning this withholding of U.S. recognition: "The U.S. would have been derelict in its obligations to the Cuban people them-

selves had it given official support to a de facto regime which, in its considered judgment, was not approved by the great majority of the Cuban people." Without the economic aid and official support of the U.S. the Grau San Martin regime proved extremely short-lived. As a precedent had already been set with Grau San Martin's regime, why did the U.S. on Nov. 13th, 1968, recognize the de facto regime in Panama and especially when the CIA and the DIA had profiles on the Communist affiliations of Major Boris Martinez, Lt. Col. Omar Torrijos and Capt. Frederico Boyd who were responsible for this treasonous act against their own country?

For a great number of years both as a private citizen and as a former Honorary Panamanian Consul, I have exposed communism in Panama. I would be derelict in my moral obligations if I did not do so as this is a duty we all should share. Ted Shannon, the CIA agent on Ambassador Harrington's staff and a friend of mine, knew the strategy of the Communists in Panama as well. When I met with Foster Dulles in 1956 in Panama, I explained in detail the master plan of the Kremlin for Panama and how it started in 1930 when they first organized the Communist Party in the isthmus. Prior to the thirties, the great Spanish writer, Vicente Blasco Ibañez, who wrote the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, said in reference to Panama City, "La ciudad alegre y confiada." (A happy and confident city). Then came the thirties with the Kremlin's strategy to gain control over the country from within. From then on, it was downhill all the way.

We should not forget that the Kremlin regards every government of a non-communist state as in a transition phase on the way to achieving Soviet status and that all settlements with such countries are temporary, to be altered when the correlation of forces in the world is more favorable to Moscow. That is why I have the greatest respect for President Arnulfo Arias as through the years since his first presidency in 1940, he has stated the objectives of the Kremlin and has fought communism more than any other Latin American President as he knew that his country was top on the Kremlin's priorities as their first step in their strategy to gain control over the sovereignty of the Canal Zone. He is still the most popular and best loved President that Panama has ever had and the suppressed and gagged Panamanians are dedicated to the restoration of his legal government. I have every confidence that they will be successful.

In 1940, my family lived in Piedmont and I remembered when you were Dean of Mills College in Oakland, California. Mrs. Judd, if I recall, was also on the staff and was identified with China. President Sun Fo's daughter, Rose, I believe was a student at Mills at the same time. The reason that I am mentioning China is that prior to the war starting in the Orient, I was with General Tai Li's intelligence. This came about as there were 300 Chinese who were deported from Panama in 1941. General Tai Li, head of all Chinese intelligence, wanted to find out if there were any Communists among these Chinese. When war came, I was in Hongkong. My plans were to escape with Eugene Chen, Chiang's foreign minister in the late twenties, and his wife but I was advised at the last minute not to do so and instead I entered the Japanese concentration camp at Stanley. With me was Joseph Alsop who had been in Chungking on a special mission for FDR. Fortunately, the Japanese did not find out who we were otherwise I would not be writing this letter now.

The Communist takeover of China is very well known to you, I believe you went to the Far Eastern Bureau at State after China had fallen at the suggestion of one of America's

greatest men, General George C. Marshall. Prior to the fall of China, you were very much aware of the tremendous propaganda campaign that was initiated by many prominent people whose names today are meaningless. To counteract some of this massive anti-Chiang propaganda, Brigadier General P. E. Peabody, chief of U.S. Military Intelligence, said in his report of July 22nd, 1945, that the "democracy" of the Chinese Communists was Soviet democracy and that the Chinese Communist movement was part of the international Communist movement sponsored and guided by Moscow.

In 1946, I had lunch in Canton with Dr. Sun Fo along with some other members of Chiang's government. We discussed in detail the Communist strategy in which they were able to get Chiang to effect a coalition government in 1937. If you recall, Chiang insisted that they must come into his government not as a separate government but as loyal Chinese until the war was won against the Japanese. They insisted that they would only come in as a separate government with their own revolutionary armies intact. And when Chiang effected a coalition in 1937, this is exactly what they did. When the Japanese invaded in 1937, the Communist armies utilized the Japanese invasion to infiltrate whatever parts of China were most exposed. This was their primary strategy.

The strategy, both of Moscow and the Chinese Communists during the war years and postwar, was to launch political attacks against Chiang's government in order to discredit his government in the eyes of the world. Central to this propaganda were the operations of the Communist Party in the United States. Moscow's principal assignment for American Communists and fellow travelers was two-fold: to damage Chiang's prestige and to jeopardize the Sino-American friendly relations. This was done, as we all know, by influencing the U.S. government and American public opinion, and, indirectly, by exaggerating the contributions of the Chinese Communists to the war against Japan.

What we witnessed between 1937 and 1949 was this massive propaganda campaign on the part of the Kremlin to influence not only American public opinion but that of the whole world which culminated with Chiang surrendering China to Mao. I am bringing up the propaganda strategy purposely as the Kremlin has initiated the same tactics concerning Panama, a nation of only a little over one million compared to China's 800 million.

We know that every Panamanian Ambassador appointed by Juan Tack, the foreign minister who was kept underground until the Communists grabbed the nation, is trained, indoctrinated, brainwashed, and dedicated to the overthrow of the U.S. Canal Zone either through treaty negotiations or by force as the Kremlin's maritime strategy is to control all the waterways of the world of which the Panama Canal is the most important. The Ambassadors' strategy is to denounce the U.S. in their news releases, interviews, and official reports similar to what the Chinese Communists did to influence public opinion against Chiang. Again, this culminated in the Kremlin's success to influence the Latin American countries to put the Panama Canal Reversion on the agenda for the Mexico City meeting last month with Secretary of State Kissinger. I am very much aware of what the pro-Soviet Juan Tack is trying to do and I will not give up in my campaign to counteract this cancer of communism in Panama. We know there is no substitute for democracy.

Ever sincerely,

PHILLIP HARMAN.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA,
SCHOOL OF LAW,
Athens, Ga., February 25, 1974.

Mr. PHILLIP HARMAN,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. HARMAN: I have no information of any sort on the first question you put to me in your letter of February 20 and therefore I am not in position to comment on it.

With regard to your second question, the United States recognizes the State of Panama and the Government of Panama. The point which you have raised on a number of occasions on the illegality and unconstitutionality of the present government of Panama is one which has been raised very often over the years with respect to this or that government in a particular country. In general, international practice has been that such issues are internal in character and that a generally recognized government is competent to incur international obligations by means of treaties. How this general practice might apply in the specific case of Panama, I am not in position to say.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LEADERS JOIN IN TESTIFYING FOR H.R. 5808; THE URBAN EMPLOYMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JAMES V. STANTON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning the House Economic Development Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee, held its second day of hearings on extending the Economic Development Act, and I was pleased to appear before it with leaders of business, labor, and government in the city of Cleveland to urge support for H.R. 5808, the Urban Employment Act, which I introduced last year. This legislation would establish within the Economic Development Administration a new program to help solve unemployment and assist industrial expansion in urban areas.

Accompanying me were Sebastian Lupica, executive secretary of the Cleveland AFL-CIO Federation of Labor; Joseph Furber, acting director of the Department of Human Resources and Economic Development of the city of Cleveland; Richard L. DeChant of the Greater Cleveland Growth Association, which speaks for the business community; and Lawrence Jones, president of the Van Dorn Co., which has been an active participant in economic development in Cleveland.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most vexing problems facing those of us who represent urban areas are the plant closings and industrial migration of recent years. The reasons for our concern are obvious. When the plant gate closes for the last time, it closes out hope for many of the persons who had labored there. All of these workers—be they young and just beginning a career, or a family man, or a working widow, or someone nearing retirement—are thrown into a crisis of uncertainty and financial hardship.

Many such persons involuntarily become a drain on community resources through unemployment compensation

payments. Many others must suffer the degradation of going on welfare.

Surely no one can claim that this problem of plant closings and industrial migration is beyond the ability of government to deal with. At stake is the well-being of tens of thousands of people across this Nation. So the problem is, by definition, within the purview of the Federal Government.

The presence at the hearing of leaders of business, local government, and labor attests to the fact that this problem does not exist through the lack of any local concern. Indeed, local efforts to preserve industry and maintain the urban economic base in Cleveland and in other cities have been thoughtful, imaginative, and vigorous. Now is the time for the Federal Government to join in this effort by providing these officials with the tools they need. The Economic Development Act, which is now on the books only through the foresight and persistence of the Public Works Committee, lays the groundwork for this aid.

The heart of my proposal to expend the Economic Development Act is a program of grants and loans to large central cities—those of 100,000 population or more—for the purpose of establishing land banks. Cities could use this money to purchase land suitable for industrial development, clear it of existing structures, make any necessary improvements in it, and then either sell or lease it to private industry. A city might choose to buy individual parcels of land, or it may want to establish industrial parks with these funds. An annual authorization of \$200 million in loans, and \$50 million in grants, is provided.

This assistance would eliminate one of the main obstacles facing a growing business that wants to remain in the city: The tremendously high cost of land. Urban land invariably costs two, three, or four times as much per square foot as land in nonurban areas, and this factor can be decisive in a company's decision to move. Also discouraging development inside the city is the fact that much of the suitable land is covered by obsolete, outmoded structures. The cost of demolishing these dinosaurs of the first industrial revolution is substantial in itself.

In addition to making land available to industry, the land banking program envisioned in the Urban Employment Act would have the effect of giving local governments greater control over the economic destiny of their area.

In return for a choice section of land, a city could require that the business train and hire a number of hard-core unemployed, use appropriate techniques to control air and water pollution, and follow other policies for the benefit of the community. The city could allocate the land to businesses that have a high growth potential and that fit in well with the existing mix of area industries, and avoid those which may be a detriment. In order that businesses will be able to take full advantage of the opportunity offered them, a separate section of the act provides an additional an-

nual authorization of \$250 million for business loans for those who develop in accord with the provisions of the act. A program of land banking, combined with business loans, can, in my view, help to bring about wiser, more rational use of the resources of land and labor in our cities, and both the local and the national economy will benefit as a result.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal these days about returning power to local officials, and this is an objective with which I heartily concur. But we should not equate this goal with government by mathematical formula, as the administration would have us do. No matter what the issue, the administration seems to believe that the problem can be solved through computer printouts. A reasoned judgment of this land banking proposal will show that the grants and loans made for this purpose will immeasurably enhance the ability of local governments to handle for themselves the issues of economic development. And because it relies primarily upon loans, with grants being required only to make up the deficit incurred by cities in purchasing and reconveying the land, it will do so at a relatively lower cost than any revenue sharing program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the Urban Employment Act, we have an opportunity to see that at least some of the crucial decisions which determine who shall work, and who shall not, will be made in city hall, rather than exclusively in the corporate board rooms. And this would be done in a way that encourages, rather than stifles, the private investment essential to economic growth. Thus, I urge that the provisions of the Urban Employment Act be included in the economic development legislation to be enacted this year.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RECRUITING RESULTS FOR FEBRUARY 1974

(Mr. DAN DANIEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, again today I place in the Record the Department of Defense recruiting results for the month of February 1974. During February the four armed services obtained 32,930 enlistments recruiting prior-service and non-prior-service personnel. This represents 95 percent of their February quota objective of 34,560. Except for the Army, all services met their February recruiting objective. The Marine Corps exceeded its original objective by 5 percent or 210 enlistments. The Marine Corps had hoped to achieve 1,610 additional enlistments to help make up their shortfall sustained in prior months but were unable to do so. I believe this shows the continuing need of Congress to monitor the all-volunteer effort very carefully to determine whether this program is working. Results by service were as follows:

RECRUITING RESULTS—ALL SOURCES

	February			January percent objective
	Program objective	Actual	Percent objective	
Army.....	17,600	15,620	89	90
Navy.....	6,400	6,500	102	90
Marine Corps.....	4,450	4,660	105	98
Air Force.....	6,100	6,160	101	101
Total DOD.....	34,560	32,930	95	93

Year-to-date recruiting results by service: During the first 8 months of the fiscal year the four military services have achieved 93 percent of their cumulative recruiting objectives. The following table shows year-to-date performance by service:

RECRUITING RESULTS—ALL SOURCES, YEAR-TO-DATE FISCAL YEAR 1974

[Thousands]			
	Program objective July-February	Actual	Percent of objective
Army.....	143	127	89
Navy.....	60	58	98
Marine Corps.....	38	35	90
Air Force.....	51	51	100
Total DOD.....	292	272	93

Enlistments by source: The number of non-prior-service men enlisted was 27,860 or 95 percent of the services' February objective; the number of non-prior-service women was 2,570 or about 91 percent of the objective; and the number of prior-service personnel was 2,500 or about 110 percent of the objective. The following table shows the distribution of February enlistments by source.

RECRUITING RESULTS BY SOURCE

	February			January percent objective
	Program objective	Actual	Percent objective	
Nonprior service:				
Men.....	29,470	27,860	95	91
Women.....	2,820	2,570	91	97
Prior service.....	2,270	2,500	110	120
Total DOD.....	34,560	32,930	95	93

Total military strength by service: The total DOD military strength was less than 1 percent below the strength level planned at the end of January, as shown in the following table:

STATUS OF MILITARY STRENGTH BY SERVICE [In thousands]

	End of January				June 1974 Current objective ¹
	Objective ¹	Actual	Shortfall	Percent	
Army.....	784	784	0	0	782
Navy.....	561	554	7	1	551
Marine Corps.....	190	190	0	0	196
Air Force.....	674	673	1	1	645
Total DOD.....	2,209	2,202	7	1	2,174

¹ January strength objectives have been revised to reflect the lowered strength objectives for the end of the fiscal year which were announced in January and which resulted from congressional action on the fiscal year 1974 budget request. Program adjustments were made in late January.

Non-prior-service enlistments, men and women, by service: During February the services achieved the following results against their non-prior-service objectives for men and women:

NON-PRIOR-SERVICE RECRUITING RESULTS

	February		January percent objective	Year to date, percent objective
	Pro- gram objective	Actual		
MEN				
Army.....	14 800	12 910	97	86
Marine Corps.....	4 100	4 330	106	98
Air Force.....	5 270	5 320	101	101
Total, DOD.....	29,470	27,860	95	91
WOMEN				
Army.....	1 500	1 260	84	94
Navy.....	500	490	97	100
Marine Corps.....	110	120	113	100
Air Force.....	700	710	100	100
Total, DOD.....	2 820	2 570	91	97

Mental groupings, high school graduates: In February about 91 percent of all non-prior-service enlistees were in mental categories I-III, which are the average and above average mental groups; only 9 percent were in mental category IV, the below-average group. High school graduates amounted to 62 percent of enlistments; this is below the

65-percent figure achieved during the first eight months of the fiscal year, but is in line with seasonal trends. The average for July-February is shown in the following table along with the February results:

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES AND MENTAL GROUPINGS
(NON-PRIOR-SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN)

	High school graduates		Mental groups, I, II, III ¹	
	February	Year to date ²	February	Year to date ²
	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent
Army.....	8,010	57	11,930	84
Navy.....	3,730	64	5,640	97
Marine Corps.....	1,680	38	4,120	93
Air Force.....	5,590	93	6,000	99
Total DOD.....	19,010	62	27,680	91

¹ Above average and average categories
² Recent legislation has established minimum levels of 55 percent for high school graduates and 82 percent for mental groups, I, II, and III. The minimums are to be applied to fiscal year 1974 totals on a by-service basis.

March objectives: The services' manpower programs for March called for the

FISCAL YEAR 1974 SELECTED RESERVE STRENGTHS¹

(In thousands)

	ARNG	USAR	USNR	USMCR	ANG	USAFR	DOD total
Authorized end strength.....	412.0	260.6	116.9	39.5	92.5	51.5	972.9
Actual:							
June 30, 1973.....	385.6	235.5	126.2	37.5	90.4	43.8	919.1
Sept. 30, 1973.....	384.9	231.5	119.1	35.3	90.5	43.3	904.1
Dec. 31, 1973.....	392.5	227.2	119.1	33.1	92.5	46.2	910.0
Jan. 31, 1974.....	436.4	227.7	117.8	32.4	92.9	46.6	913.6
Change from previous month.....	+4.0	+5	-1.3	-7	+4	+4	+3.6
Net short/over authorized end strength.....	-15.6	-32.9	+9	-17.9	+4	-4.9	-59.8
Percent short/over.....	-3.8	-12.6	+8	-17.9	+4	+9.6	-6.2

¹ Unaudited preliminary reports from Services.

NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. DAN DANIEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point the following material from the National Guard Association of the United States:

Again in February, the National Guard showed substantial gains in strength, maintaining its position as the only Reserve Component which is consistently meeting its all-volunteer objectives.

The Army National Guard attained a strength of 411,848 on 28 February. This reflects a net gain for the month of 8,249, and an overall increase of 33,510 since it bottomed out at 378,338 two years ago.

The Air National Guard showed a gain of 264 in February to attain a strength of 93,757, or 100.5 percent of its authorized level.

The recruiting successes of National Guard organizations in the States are significant because they have been attained at a time when all other Reserve Components are below authorized strength levels and are experiencing continuing difficulty meeting manpower goals.

The Guard recruiting achievements result from aggressive leadership by State Adjutants General and commanders, and the determination of officers and non-commissioned officers at community level to produce results. They also reflect the strong community support which the Guard enjoys in the

2,600 communities in which its units are located.

I am attaching a summary of Reserve Component strengths which you may find of interest.

JAMES B. DEERIN,
Colonel, ARNG (Ret.),
Executive Vice President.

RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTHS
28 FEBRUARY 1974

Component	Authorized	Actual	Plus (+) or minus (-)
Army National Guard.....	379,144	411,848	+32,705
Army Reserve.....	232,591	228,113	-4,478
Air National Guard.....	92,291	93,754	+1,463
Air Force Reserve.....	49,773	47,992	-1,851
Navy Reserve.....	119,231	117,966	-1,265
Marine Reserve.....	39,735	32,421	-7,314

¹ Naval Reserve actual strength is for Jan. 31.

Note: The above figures include men enlisted but not yet entered on initial active duty for basic training.

TRIBUTE TO LT. COL. JOHN W. SHANNON, U.S. ARMY

(Mr. DAN DANIEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to recognize an outstanding American and a career soldier who has been of tremendous assistance to the Congress in the past few years. Lt. Col. John W. Shannon, U.S. Army, is an

following enlistment objectives from all sources:

March program objectives

Army.....	16,300
Navy.....	6,340
Marine Corps.....	4,150
Air Force.....	5,950
Total DOD.....	32,740

In addition to these program objectives the Navy is seeking 1,380 additional enlistments because of revised loss estimates, and the Marine Corps is seeking 1,440 additional enlistments to offset previous recruiting shortfalls.

Reserve components: The total selected reserve strength increased in January for the fourth consecutive month with the two National Guard Components, the Army Reserve and the Air Force Reserve showing net gains. Although non-prior-service enlistments for all reserve components are lower than the objectives for the year to date, the shortfalls have been partially offset by successes in recruiting prior-service enlisted personnel:

Infantry Officers Basic Course, Airborne, and Ranger training at Fort Benning, Georgia, included troop duty with the training command at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri as an instructor, platoon leader, and company commander. In 1957 he was assigned to Fort Knox, Kentucky where he served as a platoon leader and company commander with the 2d Armored Rifle Battalion.

After completion of the Advance Infantry Officers Course in 1961 he was a Battle Group staff officer in the 2d Infantry Division at Fort Benning, Georgia. Leaving Fort Benning in 1962 he served in Viet Nam from June that year to June 1963 as a Battalion Advisor.

Upon return to Conus he was assigned to the 2d Battalion, 8th Infantry, 4th Infantry Division at Fort Lewis, Washington. While there he was a company commander and battalion S-3.

Arriving in Europe in September of 1965 he was assigned to the 24th Infantry Division. During his service with the Division through January 1969, he served as a battalion executive officer, the Division assistant G-4, and then as the Division G-4. He reformed to Conus with the Division from Augsburg, Germany to Fort Riley, Kansas as the G-4.

He attended the Armed Forces Staff College in Norfolk, Virginia in 1969. In June 1969 he returned to Fort Knox, Kentucky for the second time in his career and was assigned to the Training Center as the Executive Officer of the 5th Training Brigade. Four months later he assumed command of the 7th Battalion, 2d Training Brigade.

In April 1971 he departed Fort Knox, returned to Viet Nam and assumed command of the 1st Battalion, 3d Infantry in the 23d Infantry Division. Following this assignment before returning to the United States, he was the Director of Logistics, Qui Nhon Area Support Command.

Lieutenant Colonel Shannon is currently serving in the Office of the Secretary of Army, with the Office of the Chief of Legislative Liaison.

He is a qualified parachutist and ranger. His awards include the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Meritorious Service Award, Air Medal, Army Commendation Medal with 1st silver oak leaf cluster, Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with palm.

NO PURPOSE COMMITTEE

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the appropriation of funds for the House Internal Security Committee. That committee serves no purpose other than self-aggrandizement. It should have been abolished long ago. Any funds appropriated for it will be used to collect material on citizens in this country with the sole purpose of continuing and creating new political dossiers. If the committee had a function, which it does not, it would properly be within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

In the Nixon era when we see how the democratic process can be subverted by those in power who would abuse it, the Members of this House should not only find it easy to oppose the invasion of personal privacy which the Internal Security Committee represents, but should feel an obligation to do so.

A PERMANENT HOME FOR THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, The National Endowment for the Arts, with more than \$60 million in funds this year and a staff of almost 100 persons, still has no permanent home of its own here in Washington. Along with my colleague, Representative KENNETH GRAY I am today introducing legislation which would rescue a familiar old Washington landmark from the wrecker's ball, and turn it into a home for the Endowment. The building in question is the old Romanesque Post Office Building on Pennsylvania Avenue with its marvelous interior galleries and its spacious, skylighted central courtyard.

The rehabilitation of the Old Post Office could be the focal point for the revitalizing of Pennsylvania Avenue, providing a lively blend of cultural and commercial activities as well as office space for local and Federal Government agencies and private organizations. The building could serve as a showcase for outstanding graphics, furnishings, and interior design.

In keeping with the recent Executive order calling for Federal stewardship in the area of historic preservation, the building could exemplify the adaptive use possibilities of older buildings. The historic nature of the Old Post Office as well as its location makes it a highly appropriate setting for a variety of projects relating to the Nation's Bicentennial Celebration. Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a better way to revitalize our Avenue of the Presidents for the Nation's Bicentennial. A text of the bill follows:

H.R. 13860

A bill to direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to transfer the Old Post Office Building located in the District of Columbia to the National Endowment for the Arts

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall transfer, without reimbursement, to the National Endowment for the Arts the Old Post Office Building, and the accompanying real property, located between Eleventh and Twelfth Streets and C and D Streets Northwest in the District of Columbia.

Sec. 2. The transfer provided by the first section of this Act shall be made at such time as the Administrator of the General Services Administration determines that the use of the Old Post Office Building by the Federal Government is no longer essential; but in any event such transfer shall be made within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

PETER RODINO—IN THE EYE OF THE STORM

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is natural that the New Jersey delegation take pride in having one of its members as Chairman of the great Committee on the Judiciary. I am sure that I speak for my colleagues from New Jersey and elsewhere that the whole House is proud of our colleague, Chairman RODINO, and of the other members of the Committee on the Judiciary who have done such an outstanding job so far on the very difficult subject of impeachment. I am honored to put in the RECORD a recent article which appeared in the Trenton Sunday Times Advertiser on the subject of Mr. RODINO:

PETER RODINO—IN THE EYE OF THE STORM

(By Saul Pett)

WASHINGTON.—Despite founded rumors that he loves opera and writes poetry secretly, his credentials as a middle American remain impeccable. He is as American as apple strudel in Milwaukee, Kielbasa sausage in Gary, corn pone in Kentucky, lasagna in the North Ward of Newark.

He is a graduate of the Depression, a product of a city political machine, a native of the East as far from the effete East as the light years that separated the rough democracy of Barringer High, Newark, from the elitism of the prep school at Groton.

Until life became "so serious," he used to do Jimmy Durante imitations at family parties and sing "Way Marie," "O Sole Mio" and other golden oldies of the Italian persuasion. His singing and speaking voice remains less than Olympian despite the fact that as a boy he used to practice orating with stones or marbles in his mouth, hurling Shakespearean monologues at two tall poplars in Branch Brook Park, Newark. An Italo-American Demosthenes growing up in New Jersey.

TWO ANTI-REDS MEET

A quarter century ago, he came to Congress from the East, worrying about Communism. That was two years after another young man came to Congress from the West, worrying about Communism.

The two parallel lines now meet.

One, of course, is Richard M. Nixon. The other is Peter W. Rodino, Democrat, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee inquiring into the possible impeachment of the President of the United States. One man reached his pinnacle by drive; the other by endurance.

And now at 64, Peter Rodino, a little man in stature and, until recent months, in reputation, becomes living proof that a cat can not only look at a king, he may even help dethrone him. This awes and depresses Rodino. His father, an Italian immigrant, brought him up to respect the institutions of America, especially the presidency.

The largest photograph on the wall of Rodino's office is one of him and a smiling Richard Nixon shaking hands the last time they met. The occasion was the signing of the renewed Law Enforcement Assistance Act of which Rodino was sponsor.

The date was Aug. 6, 1973, when "impeachment" was still only a whisper, although Rodino already was researching its problems unofficially.

PAISED BY PRESIDENT

He also keeps in his office, in a richly bound leather book of testimonials, a "Dear Pete" letter in which the President congratulated him for his "deserving recognition" in receiving the Man of the Year award from the Justinian Society of Lawyers. The President praised him for his "dedication to the best interest of the country."

The letter was dated Oct. 17, 1973. Three

days later Nixon fired the special Watergate prosecutor and brought on the resignations of the two top men in the Justice Department. Three days after that, in the ensuing uproar, five impeachment resolutions were introduced in the House and Speaker Carl Albert, D-Okla., officially assigned the matter to the Judiciary Committee.

Overnight, Pete Rodino who had needed 24 years, an upset election and the seniority system to move to the top of the committee's totem pole, was jerked from obscurity to a high chair of history.

"Can this really be happening?" he recalls thinking. "Will I really be the guy. If fate had been looking for one of the powerhouses of Congress, it wouldn't have picked me."

Though awed and saddened, he was not immobilized. He set the machinery in motion. And on Feb. 4, a man not renowned for his eloquence rose on the floor of the House in support of a resolution giving his committee full authority and complete subpoena powers for an inquiry of impeachment. It is though he grew taller as he spoke.

"FATIGUE OF SUPPORT"

"It has been said that our country, troubled by too many crises in recent years, is too tired to consider this one. In the first year of the Republic, Thomas Paine wrote, 'Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it.'"

"Now it is our turn."

"... When we have completed our inquiry, whatever the result, we will make recommendations to the House. We will do so as soon as we can, consistent with principles of fairness and completeness."

"Whatever the result, whatever we learn or conclude, let us now proceed, with such care and decency and thoroughness and honor that the vast majority of the American people, and their children after them, will say, 'That was the right course.' There was no other way."

The resolution passed, 410 to 4.

Peter Wallace Rodino is 5 feet 7. How "Wallace" infiltrated a nice Italian family he claims not to know. But his wife, Marianna, exposes his secret with a mischievous chuckle as a young man he just dreamed up the middle name to "add distinction" to his own.

Hair gray-white, wavy, senatorial. Eyes, dark, warm. Voice, soft, thin, apparently the result of diphtheria as a boy. Clothes, mostly dark pinstripes, the slightly wide tie and heavy sideburns being his only concessions to mod. Personality amiable, hardworking, warm, earnest, cautious, thorough, uncolorful. Speech habits ordinary, unringing, no quotable quotes from the saints, muses or folks back home. Eyebrows stable. In short, an unlikely TV replacement for Sam Ervin.

INTO THE COOKER

This man, all of him, is now in an historic pressure cooker unmatched in 100 years. He runs the inquiry with few precedents to guide him. If his committee votes articles of impeachment, he will have to floor-manage them through the House. Yet or nay, he will have to explain.

"One false move," John Pierson noted in the Wall Street Journal, "and Pete Rodino's in trouble, two, and the country's in trouble. Like bungled surgery, a botched impeachment could maim, not heal."

It is generally agreed that an unconvincing impeachment indictment suspect for political motives or an unconvincing non-indictment suspect of timidity could tear the country apart. People are that polarized, judging by the committee's mail.

Meanwhile, Rodino must steer a middle course toward "the truth," as he says, and as he doesn't say, somewhere between Re-

publican fire-eaters ready to accuse him of partisan delay and young Democratic "bomb-throwers" ready to charge him with spineless slowness.

At this writing, Rodino believes that most members of his committee, 21 Democrats and 17 Republicans, all lawyers and all politicians like their chairman, "are trying to push politics aside. They're trying. I think there'll be more soul searching as we go along."

At this point in time, most representative members of the committee, Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, go-slowers and go-fasters, appear to be satisfied that Rodino has been doing a fair, objective, impartial job. Several add the phrase, "so far."

MAYBE TOO CAUTIOUS

The one criticism heard is that he may be too cautious and too inclined to share the chairman's power. This is the other side of the coin of praise: that he is very thorough and democratic. Implicit in this is some nostalgia for Democratic Rep. Emanuel Celler, of Brooklyn, who ran the committee with an iron hand for 21 years until he was unexpectedly unseated in 1973.

Even Celler, it is generally agreed, could not run the committee as imperiously today because of a new spirit of independence in the House, especially among younger members. Also, the House has new liberalized rules of procedure, including one that requires committee chairmen to consult their members frequently. Rodino consults frequently. In any case, the role of imperious leader is not in his nature.

His voting record has been liberal on civil rights, welfare programs, school busing, organized labor and the end to U.S. involvement in Vietnam. But for 20 years on the Judiciary Committee, Rodino remained in Celler's shadow, getting relatively little to do while crawling slowly up the seniority ladder.

Still, he appears to have made the most of his few chances. In 1968, for example, while Celler was ill, Rodino successfully floor-managed the Fair Housing bill for 11 days. It was an act of political courage, his constituents then were largely middle-class Italians in the throes of racial backlash.

He is also proud of having pushed other bills expanding civil rights and cutting restrictions on immigration from certain countries, including those of southern Europe. This helped with his Italian voters. So did his almost single-handed maneuvering while Celler wasn't looking which resulted in Columbus Day becoming a national holiday. It came naturally to him; Peter Rodino is very Italian and proud of it.

ONE EMBASSY BECKONS

It is said that only Rodino could have an administration aide named Francis O'Brien, who is half-Italian. Rodino used to try to persuade President Johnson to appoint the first Italian-American to the Supreme Court. About the only invitations this busy Congressman accepts on the Washington cocktail circuit come from the Italian Embassy.

On almost any Italian or semi-Italian occasion—Columbus Day or a visit by the Italian president or a passel of journalists from Rome—Lyndon Johnson used to invoke the name of Pete Rodino, somewhere between Christopher Columbus, Enrico Fermi, Jack Valenti and Steve Martini. Steve Martini? He was Johnson's barber.

None of this is to suggest that Rodino fails to take his broader responsibilities seriously. He does. He works hard, 14 to 15 hours a day, Monday to Friday, and commutes weekends, as he has done for 25 years, to his home in the 10th Congressional District of Newark.

He runs one of the most important committees of Congress. Judiciary normally proc-

esses about a third of the bills passed by the House, its broad mandate including problems of civil rights, immigration, busing, abortion, amnesty, capital punishment, constitutional amendments, crime and antitrust matters.

MOST SERIOUS SUBJECT

Clearly the subject he takes most seriously now is impeachment, not only because it involves the fate of a president but also "the far larger question of re-establishing and reinforcing the legitimacy of government."

Rodino recalls a recent encounter with a dentist of Italian ancestry at an opera in Newark. The dentist said his father admired the Congressman. The son evidently didn't. He said the impeachment inquiry was "non-sense," that Nixon should not be removed because he "hasn't done anything other presidents haven't done."

"I haven't prejudged this," Rodino said, "but I do feel strongly that certain questions need to be answered."

The dentist looked unimpressed.

Rodino told him of his heavy mail, particularly one letter from the parents of two children, 7 and 11. They said Rodino's committee could help answer the questions their kids were asking.

"What's wrong with our country? Is the President a liar and a crook or isn't he?" The letter continued:

"We're asking these questions for other children as well, who will one day inherit this land, a land they'll either be proud of or still be asking questions about."

"That's a lot of clichés," the dentist said. Rodino concludes: "I guess I couldn't dent his cynicism."

Before his current celebrity, the Congressman from New Jersey's 10th District used to get about 2,000 letters in a four-month period. In the last four months, he says, he has received more than 400,000, the sentiment running about 4 to 1 for impeachment.

It was last spring that Rodino decided he'd better start boning up on the uncharted shoals of impeachment after listening to the President's statements about Watergate.

"I was hoping he would say it all, that perhaps others had acted irresponsibly without his knowledge or that he had made a mistake. At any rate, that he would explain it fully to the country."

"I guess I wanted it to come out all right for him and the country. But I sensed that something was not coming across and that people were still wondering even after his statements. It was a terrible thing to contemplate, that the President could be so questioned."

IT HAD TO COME

It was not a foregone conclusion that Rodino and his committee would get the impeachment question. The Speaker of the House could have turned it over to a special select committee. In Andrew Johnson's time, it began with the "Reconstruction Committee" and wound up in Judiciary.

At any rate, Rodino began his own research, reading the entire record of the Andrew Johnson impeachment, three current books, various legal papers, consulting with experts and reading and re-reading the Constitutional references to impeachment.

"It's more a thought process than research," he says, "because there's so little to guide us. The more I read the more I realized that 'high crimes and misdemeanors' was meant to be flexible. An impeachable offense does not have to be a criminal offense. Most experts agree."

"In my judgment, the writers of the Constitution intended that the people should have another recourse against presidential abuses of power besides the next election. That is why they reposed the awesome power

of impeachment in the body closest to the people, the House of Representatives.

"If they had only criminal offenses in mind, they would have made the punishment fit the crime. They would have provided for criminal penalties. They didn't. They stipulated only removal from office on conviction after impeachment."

As it stands, each member of the committee will make up his own mind as to what is an impeachable offense and, after the evidence is in, vote accordingly.

CONFRONTATION PROBLEM

Other unsettled questions haunt Peter Rodino. He is well aware the Constitution reposes "sole power" of impeachment in the House, but he has made it clear he seeks to avoid direct confrontation with the President. He says:

"If he is asked to testify and he declines, what then? We can subpoena him. And if he refuses to honor the subpoena, he can be found in contempt of Congress. Then what? Do we send U.S. marshals over to the White House to enforce the contempt citation? Will the Supreme Court be called in for judicial review? What happens then to the House's 'sole power'? These are just some of the unanswered questions."

Unanswered, they help explain why Peter Rodino endured "many sleepless nights" in the first few weeks of his impeachment assignment, why he finally ended up in a hospital for a checkup.

He has not, he says, lost sleep over published rumors that the White House is sifting his background for any material that could discredit him.

In New Jersey, the Essex County Democratic organization, which produced Peter Rodino, also gave the world such luminaries as Hugh Addonizio, now in jail for extortion. Addonizio and Rodino were roommates in Washington when both were young Congressmen. Addonizio's trouble came years later as mayor of Newark.

"FAVORS" FOR MOB

Early in the 1960s the FBI tapped the phone of the late Angelo (Gyp) DeCarlo, a convicted extortionist, and heard DeCarlo claim Addonizio and Rodino had done "favors" for the Mob.

Rodino has repeatedly denied any connection with DeCarlo or the Mob. Herbert Stern, the U.S. attorney who obtained indictment of some 70 New Jersey public officials, has said DeCarlo also was known to claim non-existent political connections. Stern, now a federal judge, said:

"There has never been an inquiry about Rodino, never the slightest anything. In my opinion, he is an honest man and a fine public servant."

The Congressman was born in a crime-ridden area of Newark on Factory Street, where he recalls seeing "shootouts and people killed right in front of our own tenement."

Crime in the streets still haunts Peter Rodino, although he has lived the last 20 years on the white middle-class edge of the North Ward. His wife has been mugged twice in the last three years, once in front of their home, without damage to her sense of humor.

Then or now, it was not a life calculated to inspire poetry. But as a boy he acquired the works of Coleridge, Poe, Byron and Shelley from a neighborhood doctor. As an adolescent, he wrote romantic poetry.

EARLY TO WORK

The Depression sent Rodino to work early and between jobs and night classes he managed a degree from Newark Law School, taking 10 years for five years of schooling.

It was in 1941 that his country first reposed the burden of leadership on Pete

Rodino. As an army enlistee, he was put in charge of the bus tokens that would take him and a group of draftees from Newark to Fort Dix.

He was decorated for combat in Italy, where he saw the dangers of Communism and came home worrying about it. His speeches against the spread of Communism caught the attention of local polls in the 10th district. In 1946, he ran for Congress against Rep. Fred Hartley, co-author of the Taft-Hartley Labor Relations Act, and lost by 5,000 votes.

Two years later, with Hartley retired, he won and has been winning ever since, largely as a result of personalized attention to his Italian constituents.

In 1972, he was redistricted, his constituents going suddenly from 7 to 43 percent black. But he managed because of his civil rights record, to prevail in the Democratic primary, which is tantamount to election, over three Black rivals.

This year, however, promises to be tougher. He already has a white rightist opponent opposing him for the primary and on the other side there's talk the Blacks may unite behind one Black candidate. He still thinks he can win if only the impeachment inquiry leaves him enough time to campaign this spring.

The impeachment job also helps. It has brought him more attention than all his 25 years in Congress.

"I get goose pimples," said Mrs. Vincent Palumbo, chairwoman of the Peter W. Rodino Ladies Auxiliary in Newark, "everytime I hear his name on TV. Now he belongs to the country."

THE NATIONAL LAND USE PLANNING BILL

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important bills before the House this year—if it is allowed to come before the House—is the national land-use planning bill.

Opponents of H.R. 10294 have showered Congress with misinformation and organized objections that overlook the chaotic way in which localities now make land-use decisions that our children may have to pay for.

I have here a letter from a constituent who, in a microcosm, outlines many of the pressures faced by local residents and planning commissions. The land-use planning bill would help States to encourage local planning and meet the sort of basic problems described here.

I ask that the letter be reprinted at this point:

MAPLE FALLS, WASH.

DEAR LLOYD: I am writing to you about these large land developments in rural Whatcom County. You see after the paper mill shut down in Everett, my family and myself moved up to my mother in law's farm to help her out and make things easier for her as she is getting on in years. Now we are about to get pushed out by development. I know you can't stop progress but enough is enough.

We live 25 miles north of Bellingham 10 miles south of the Canadian border. Just north of us for 3 miles is 3 big developments. Paradise Lake, Paradise Forest Estates and Camper's Paradise. Now they are trying to put in a fourth one Peaceful Valley which

would have us on 3 sides. This is out in the country and there is no garbage service, only a small volunteer fire dept. Little or no law enforcement, when this development is finished, there could end up with 10,000 people out here in the summer time. That will make this community the second largest in Whatcom County.

Now here is the bad part, 95% of these will be Canadian so we don't get any road tax from them and that will be left for us to pay. These will be class C lots so they will have septic tanks, that's an awful lot of sewage to be running through our water supply, when this is all done it will ruin the whole Columbia Valley as far as hunting and fishing is concerned.

We are all against it in the community but it seems there is little we can do about it. We have taken up petitions. We have went to all the hearings at the planning commission. We have all voiced our disapproval, but we are afraid they are going to let them continue.

Do you understand our problem? If so, is there any way you can help us. You have helped me in the past and you are the only one I could think of to help us now. The community has even hired a lawyer to do our talking for us, but he can only do so much.

All this developer wants is money and cares nothing for what is apt to happen out here when he is through selling our valley to the Canadians.

Now if you can help to stop this would you please let us know before Tuesday the 26th as the planning commission is meeting again that day.

Thank you again.

As ever,

RICHARD COOPER.

GENERAL ABRAMS EXPLAINS NEED FOR STRONG DEFENSE

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, recently the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Gen. Creighton Abrams, made an important and informative address at a meeting of the Fort Dix Chapter of the Association of the U.S. Army. In his remarks, General Abrams asked and answered such questions as "Why do we need all the capability we've been asked to pay for?", "Isn't détente a good reason to reduce our fighting strength; isn't more strength just provocative?", "Isn't the threat to our country diminishing now; don't we get a peace dividend?", and "Above all, can't we get what we need in the way of defense at lower cost?"

Because of the current debate on defense spending, I believe General Abrams' speech will be highly informative reading for my colleagues and the American people. He goes right to the heart of the matter and explains in layman's terms America's strength in relation to Russia and why we must not relax our guard while trying to provide the most economical defense posture possible. His remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY GEN. CREIGHTON A. ABRAMS, FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 1974

It's that time of year again. Budget time. A time when the American people and their

representatives ask really basic questions about the things the government might do with their money. And high on the list of things to be questioned is the cost of military capabilities. So the questions begin:

Why do we need all the capability we've been asked to pay for?

Isn't détente a good reason to reduce our fighting strength; isn't more strength just provocative?

Isn't the threat to our country diminishing now? Don't we get a peace dividend?

And, above all, can't we get what we need in the way of defense at lower cost?

These questions are important, and they deserve answers. They are important not only to the American people in general, and not only to the elected representatives who have a chance to ask them directly—they are also important to us in the Army. We also are concerned with our capability, with our ability to respond to any likely challenge—and with what our capability will cost, especially in the volunteer Army environment.

But certain facts are clear. They provide the backdrop for our capability.

We are a global nation. Our well-being as a nation depends upon our access to the rest of the world—our freedom of action. We are not self-sufficient now, and we could not become self-sufficient in the life-time of any one of us here. And even if we as a nation could arrange our lives and interests to survive by ourselves, what kind of nation would we be? A weakened, shrivelled and mean land at best. So we need to be concerned about our well-being around the globe.

The major military challenge to our global interests is the Soviet Union. It is the only other truly global military power. And so we must gauge our ability to maintain freedom of action in terms of the Soviet Union, and in terms of the challenges that Soviet global interests and actions pose for us.

This is not saber-rattling. This is not warmongering. And above all, this is not some kind of idle scare tactic. It is the most reasoned, responsible position I know for having our military strength up to par. If we fail to meet the challenges as they arise—and since World War II they have arisen several times, and in various places around the globe—we will not simply lose some kind of abstract world leadership or national greatness. We will lose some of the freedom of action our Nation requires to flourish. So we must be prepared to meet the challenge.

The Soviet Union is not reducing its military power. On the contrary, every responsible estimate shows that they are building, increasing and extending their power at an impressive rate, in ways that are important to our country and our Army.

The size of their ground forces has increased dramatically.

Their weapons and equipment are first-rate, and increasingly sophisticated.

They have made technological progress which is closing the technological lead we have enjoyed for many years.

They are capable of conducting warfare at any level, from major nuclear war to situations short of actual combat.

They are increasing their military influence in the world by providing extensive military aid to a large number of countries, including many less developed countries.

These are not wild guesses, and they are not cheap shots to manufacture a threat. The threat is not gossamer—it is steel.

Look at the facts, the hard facts, on which we have to base our own capability. The Soviet Union within the past decade has increased its force to more than 165 divisions, an increase of about 10 percent. That's a fact. The number of men under arms in

their ground forces is greater by about 20 percent than a decade ago. That's a fact, too. These are full-fledged military combat forces, able to wage an effective fight on today's battlefield.

This Red Army is no peasant army, no horde of cannon fodder. The image of the Soviet Army as a huge mass of men and women, simply equipped, and organized to achieve victory by expending masses of manpower is a false image. The Soviet Army is equipped with weapons and systems which have sophisticated capabilities, the best that their modern technology can provide. I can tell you with confidence that when they build a new piece of equipment, their cost-effectiveness analysis starts and ends with effectiveness. They are not simply turning out a high volume of cheap equipment. Conclusions I have read recently about "proliferation over sophistication" in the recent Mid East war have been based on uninformed observations. It is not proliferation over sophistication but proliferation and sophistication that the Soviet Union is bringing to bear. While their equipment might not incorporate what we would call the latest in technology, the Soviets do make full use of all the technology available to them. The sophisticated equipment they shipped to the Mid East showed an increasing momentum in technology—and represents a large dividend on their investment in technology and technical education. You don't need a major classified study to see that. You can see it everywhere the Soviet Armed Forces show themselves: their ground weapons, their aircraft; their ships; their rockets.

We have seen a growth in real sophistication in Soviet weaponry and equipment in recent years—expensive sophistication. For instance, their tanks are very effective, very modern, and very expensive weapons systems. Among other features, they all have an underwater fording capability built right in—even in the tanks they exported to the Mid East. For us to provide our tank fleet with this capability would cost in the neighborhood of 150 million dollars—just for that single capability. Their tanks have auxiliary, automatic and backup features that ours do not have. We call it gold plating; they call it a military requirement. For us to provide even part of these capabilities—without changing the existing fighting characteristics of the tank—we would have to spend thousands of dollars more per tank. In fact, one estimate of what it would cost to add all the extra Soviet tank features onto the US tank fleet—in effect to make them equivalent in all features—is two billion dollars. That is what the add-on cost would be for us for our smaller tank force.

We see this sophistication elsewhere, too. A few years ago the Soviets paraded a new infantry fighting vehicle. Ours is still under development. But from everything we can learn, their infantry fighting vehicle is the last word in technology. It has many features we would call "gold plating" in our terms, but which are "requirements" in their terms.

And the same is true of their trucks, their ammunition and so on. They spend very heavily to gain even a small advantage, to incorporate nice-to-have features which we forgo, because of the cost. The point is, the Soviet leaders do not consider the cost in the same way we do. They simply meet the specified requirement in the best and most advanced way available, and worry about the cost in other ways—in the quality of life, which I will talk about in a moment.

So the Red Army is well equipped and expensively equipped, and takes full advantage of every technological edge they can develop. It is against this force that we must measure our own capabilities.

The Soviet force is a global force, capable of fighting in areas far from her borders. And that fighting can be a major nuclear war, or a large conventional war, or a limited war of lesser total violence—conducted at a selected place with limited forces. So we are not dealing with an army that can only march across its borders in Europe; it is not an army that can only influence the action through allies or client states; nor is it an army that relies on ponderous ground formations. We are talking about a flexible force that can be projected around the globe, that can threaten our country's freedom of action in either hemisphere.

But the global influence of the Soviet military power isn't just a matter of where the Red Army is. It's also a matter of where Soviet military aid goes—and where the heavy-handed influence that almost invariably accompanies this aid is felt. If we look at the record for the past two decades or so we can see that the Soviet Union has exported nearly ten billions of dollars worth of military aid—by their own estimates. Almost a third of this total amount has been provided in the past three years. Now the value of this aid—say three billions in the past three years as a convenient approximation—is what the Soviet Union claims to have provided. But if we look carefully at that amount—three billions—we find that it is a grotesque understatement. This understatement is based on the fact that their currency, the ruble, is not a convertible currency. It is not traded on the international money market. It has no fixed value. So in effect, the Soviet Union can estimate three billions, or ten billions for that matter, and there is no apparent way of determining just how that dollar value was computed. But if we just take a simple comparison of how much that aid would have cost if we had provided it—that is, if the U.S. had provided equivalent material—the total value in the past three years would not have been about three billions, but several times three billions.

Now I single this out to make two points. First, the Soviets are spreading their military power and influence lavishly, by our standards. And secondly, by putting their price estimates so low, they succeed in making our more modest efforts look like warmongering. So they can have their cake—by putting their hooks into many other nations—and eat it too—by making us appear like the merchants of death.

The equipment they are exporting to other nations is not cast-off. In many instances, they provide top-of-the-line weapons—tanks, aircraft, missiles, the works. They provide their client states with much the same level of sophistication as I have already described in the Red Army—and with the equipment go the trainers, and the advisors, and the political officers and the rest.

What I've been talking about, really, is just another facet of the Soviet Union's efforts to spread its influence in the world. If that means the Soviet people have to raise and support a few more divisions—so be it. If that means they have to buy more sophisticated tanks and missiles—so be it. If that means shipping more equipment abroad to gain influence over another nation—so be it. They pay the price . . . a massive price.

We all recognize some of the differences between our own Nation's economic system and the Soviet Union's. In the Soviet system, the Party exerts direct influence on the government—and the Party has traditionally been oriented toward military strength. So the Party declares that a military requirement exists, the government responds by fulfilling the requirement—and the rest of the country bends to the task. The people pay the cost. And the cost is horrendous in relation to what we pay for military strength.

I'm no economist, but I've read some about what the military costs the people of the Soviet Union. It's hard to know how much their military really costs because in the Soviet Marxist system, the rules of cost and price, of value and price, as we understand them, are distorted. Their government can establish these relationships. So we find some interesting anomalies. A Russian in a major city can ride on one of the finest, most beautiful and elaborate subway systems in the world—for pennies. He gets much more than his money's worth. It's a kind of subsidy. But he might have to pay a dollar for a cucumber or ten dollars for a chicken. They tell me that in certain seasons a southern farmer can pack up a few suitcases with fresh vegetables, fly three thousand miles to a northern city, sell his vegetables, pay for the trip and still show a tidy profit. In that same city where vegetables sell for such high prices, public utilities are, by our standards, dirt cheap. So if we accept the fact that price and value in their system aren't related in the same way as in ours, we have to measure the costs of their military forces in some way other than dollar-equivalents. A ruble-to-dollar kind of relationship would be misleading.

So we look at other measures, measures of the quality of life for the citizen. If the government allocates resources to the military, they cannot be allocated to housing, which is also a government responsibility. As a result, the Soviet Union is desperately short of housing. And for comparative purposes, their definition of adequate housing space, per person, is about what we furnish our privates in the barracks—and they still haven't met the standard. That's the real cost to the Soviet Union, and to its people. Spartan living. Tight food supply. Few consumer goods. And I have not even raised the matter of cost to the human spirit.

If we look at the Soviet Army's equipment today, and try to price it in terms of our own dollars—with all the problems of conversion smoothed out, and with assumptions and caveats and so on—we would probably find that it would cost almost as much for their army—in US dollars—as ours does. I'd guess they're roughly equivalent. Now that army has been raised and is being supported by a nation which has less than half the productive capacity of the United States. So the real cost to them is really very heavy—far higher than anything we can contemplate here in the United States.

The Soviet government claims to be spending about nine percent of their State Budget on defense. But that figure is one of those artificial numbers that comes from a controlled economy and a currency of no clearly established value. The actual cost to the people could well be up to three or even five times that. We're not exactly sure, and we don't need to worry about precision. All we need to know is, if they see a requirement for more military spending, they spend—and the people pay. And their costs must be at least equal to our own, and must be borne by an economy with less than half the productivity of our own. They pay the price for a large force, for a well-equipped, sophisticated force, and for military aid around the world.

We must be willing to meet these real challenges. We must, as a nation, be willing to pay the modest price today to maintain an adequate force, so that we do not have to pay exorbitantly later—for that high cost will include many lives. We must maintain our global perspective, for our country cannot be strong and healthy—nor can any other nation—unless it has the freedom to move about and prosper in the world.

So we must be strong. We must have an Army of the proper size. It must be well-organized and highly disciplined—lean . . .

hard . . . and powerful. It must be equipped to respond effectively anywhere on the globe that our country's well-being is threatened. It must be a flexible and ready force.

We can do the job economically, but not cheaply. We must be strong in our determination to secure this Nation, but we cannot do the job as a continental Army. We must insure that our Nation survives, but we cannot be satisfied merely with survival. We must also guarantee the freedom and well-being of our Nation in the world, today and for the generations to come.

CANADA'S NEW FOREIGN INVESTMENT POLICY

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of concern in the United States over the new Canadian Foreign Investment Review Act enacted December 12, 1973. The law is principally aimed at U.S. companies which by far are the largest foreign investors in Canada.

Recently the Canadian Embassy in Washington issued a report which outlines the new law's requirements and explains the reason why their Government thought that its passage was important. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs I am aware of the serious concern voiced by many U.S. citizens over Canada's new policy and I am certain that many in the House will find the following Canadian report informative:

(Canada Report, Canadian Embassy, Washington, D.C., Mar. 22, 1974)

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

"These policies are not, by any means, aimed at cutting Canada off from foreign direct investment. Such investment has played an important role in our past economic development. We recognize that foreign investment will continue to make an important and necessary contribution to our future economic growth. . . . Given the present degree of foreign control of the Canadian economy, it seems reasonable to insist that future foreign investment be to Canada's benefit as well as to the investor's benefit." The Honourable Alastair Gillespie, Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, before the Economic Club of Detroit, February 11, 1974.

THE FOREIGN INVESTMENT REVIEW ACT

The Canadian Government, in recognition of the extent to which control of Canadian industry, trade and commerce has been acquired by non-Canadians, has passed legislation to review new foreign investment.

The Foreign Investment Review Act, which was passed December 12, 1973 gives the Canadian Government the legal authority to review:

1. foreign acquisitions of control of Canadian firms with assets valued at more than \$250,000 or with revenues exceeding \$3 million;
2. establishment of new businesses by foreigners not already doing business in Canada;
3. opening of a new business by an existing foreign controlled firm in an unrelated line of activity.

The act does not provide for the review of expansions of existing foreign controlled businesses or for the review of the establishment of new businesses which are related to a business already being carried on in Canada by a foreign investor.

The purpose of the act is not to deter foreign investment, but rather to ensure that foreign investments will be of significant benefit to Canada.

Nearly sixty percent of manufacturing in Canada is foreign controlled; in some manufacturing industries such as petroleum and rubber products foreign control exceeds ninety percent. Sixty-five percent of Canadian mining and smelting is controlled from abroad. Approximately eighty percent of foreign control over Canadian manufacturing and natural resource industries rests in the United States, which now places in Canada over twenty-seven percent of its total investment abroad. In the United States, by way of comparison, foreign direct investment expressed as a percentage of gross private domestic investment in 1972 was of the order of thirteen percent.

"SIGNIFICANT BENEFIT" CRITERIA

The question of "significant benefit" to Canada is carefully defined by five specific assessment criteria listed in the new legislation.

The five significant benefit assessment factors are:

1. The effect of the proposed investment on the level and nature of economic activity in Canada, including employment;
2. The degree and significance of participation by Canadians in the business enterprise and in any industry or industries in Canada of which it forms a part.
3. The effect of the proposed investment on productivity, industrial efficiency, technological development, product innovation and product variety in Canada;
4. The effect of the proposed investment on competition within any industry or industries in Canada; and
5. The compatibility of the investment with national industrial and economic policies, including those enunciated by the provinces.

Where a proposed foreign investment does not, in its proposal, offer significant benefit to Canada, the government may discuss the proposal with the investor with a view to upgrading the benefits his company offers.

Acceptance of the proposal will therefore be dependent on establishing significant benefit to Canada.

OPERATION OF REVIEW AGENCY

All decisions to accept or reject investment proposals will be made by the Cabinet, upon a recommendation from the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. The Minister will receive his advice from the newly formed Foreign Investment Review Agency.

Richard Murray, a Canadian businessman who recently retired as managing director of the Hudson's Bay Company, has been named Commissioner of the Foreign Investment Review Agency. Mr. Murray, a former member of the Economic Council of Canada, previously held several corporate directorships which were relinquished upon the assumption of his present responsibilities as Commissioner.

The prospective investor is assured of a response within 60 days after filing his notice.

During that period the government must either approve the request or seek additional information or discussion. The investment is automatically permitted at the end of 60 days if the government fails to act.

As a safeguard to the potential investor, the Minister cannot recommend refusal of any proposal without giving the investor the opportunity to present his case himself or through a spokesman.

Another major safeguard is that the governmental decision, except on the question of significant benefit, can be brought before the courts. Such questions that might be reviewed include the Minister's judgment on

whether the company is foreign controlled and subject to the review process; whether the investor has in fact acquired control; whether the acquisition is of a Canadian business; and in the case of the establishment of a new business, whether it is related to an existing operation.

THE ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

"Canada has, however, paid a high price for the high degree of foreign ownership in our economy. Part of this price has been that Canadians have become too accustomed to expecting others to do our research, product innovation and market development, and too accustomed to others telling us what we might do . . .", the Honourable Alastair Gillespie, Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, explained in a February speech in Detroit.

"And while Canadians will continue to welcome and work with the advantages that can accompany foreign investment, such as technology and management, we are determined that Canadians will decide and fully participate in their own economic future."

In his address to the Economic Club of Detroit, the Minister said the Canadians expect that future investors will benefit by coming into Canada, "but we insist that Canadians will also benefit, significantly."

He cited the American automotive industry investments in Canada as one example of beneficial foreign investment. The Automotive Agreement, Mr. Gillespie explained, "has worked to the benefit of both countries," not only in terms of substantial economic returns to the investor but also in terms of jobs, increased productivity, efficiency and product variety.

Mr. Gillespie said that Canadians recognize that foreign investment will continue to make an important and necessary contribution to future economic growth, but "that the foreign dominance had created the tendency for Canadians to expect others to do the research, product innovation and market development."

"Canadians are determined to decide for ourselves what we should do, and then do it," the Minister continued. "We have the competence, a growing confidence, and a quiet determination to build a distinctive and self-reliant country."

In emphasizing the government's determination that Canadians will decide and fully participate in their own future, Mr. Gillespie said:

"We are going to have to overcome such problems as the sourcing of components and access to export markets. In too many cases, the senior officers of our leading firms—subsidiaries of foreign parents—do not have the freedom to choose where to source the components for their products, what product to make, or where it will ultimately be sold."

The Minister told his Detroit audience that the Canadian approach to foreign investment policy rests on two pillars—tax measures, investment aids, research and development incentives and support for small business to improve the performance of industry in Canada; and second, legislation aimed at establishing by law that at least a large proportion of the firms in certain key sectors of the economy be Canadian owned and controlled.

In the past 10 years such sectors of the economy as chartered banks and other financial institutions, broadcasting and newspapers have been affected by special regulations to protect these special vital national interests.

The new Foreign Investment Review Act represents an important initiative. It applies across the entire economy and will involve a case-by-case examination of individual new projects.

FOREIGN CONTROL OF KEY CANADIAN INDUSTRIES

Industry	Percent U.S. control	Percent total foreign control
Food and beverages	26	35
Textiles, clothing, etc.	31	38
Paper, allied fields	31	42
Primary metals	35	43
Metal fabricating	40	47
Metal mining	58	62
Electrical products	57	65
Machinery	67	75
Mineral fuels	65	83
Transport equipment	75	85
Chemicals, rubber, petroleum, and coal	70	93
Total manufacturing	45	59
Total mining	58	68

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. CORMAN, for today, on account of official business.

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for today, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CONLAN (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for the week of April 1, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LENT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WALSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GOLDWATER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BAUMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYMAN, for 30 minutes today, Tuesday, April 2, 1974.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MEZVINSKY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. DENT, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LENT) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in 10 instances.

Mr. VEYSEY.

Mr. KEMP in three instances.

Mr. BELL.

Mr. HUNT in two instances.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. STEELMAN.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in three instances.

Mr. SYMMS.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in five instances.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. ARCHER.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. LOTT.

Mr. SMITH of New York.

Mr. MARAZITI.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. BUCHANAN in three instances.

Mrs. HOLT in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MEZVINSKY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WALDIE in five instances.

Mr. DRINAN.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in 10 instances.

Mr. CONYERS in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in 10 instances.

Mr. MCKAY.

Mr. HARRINGTON in 10 instances.

Mr. GUNTER.

Mr. DIGGS.

Mr. STOKES in five instances.

Mr. OBEY in six instances.

Mr. FORD in three instances.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. MURTHA.

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. LEGGETT.

Mr. GINN.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2348. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code to transfer the functions of the Clerk of the U.S. District Court for the District of the Canal Zone with respect to the issuance and recording of marriage licenses, and related activities, to the civil affairs director of the Canal Zone Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2835. An act to rename the first Civilian Conservation Corps Center located near Franklin, N.C., and the Cross Timbers National Grasslands in Texas in honor of former President Lyndon B. Johnson; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 2844. An act to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as amended, to provide for collection of special recreation use fees at additional campgrounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of

the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 12341. An act to authorize sale of a former Foreign Service consulate building in Venice to Wake Forest University;

H.R. 12465. An act to amend the Foreign Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations for the fiscal year 1975; and

H.J. Res. 941. Joint resolution making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, for the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 2, 1974, 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:

2106. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a proclamation increasing the rate of duty on imports of certain radial ball bearings, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 1981(a)(2), (H. Doc. No. 93-249) to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

2107. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting notice of a delay in the submission of the 1973 annual report on enforcement of the Federal Laboratory Animal Welfare Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2108. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting the annual report on the adequacy of pay and allowances of the uniformed services, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 1008 (a), together with a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37, United States Code, to refine the procedures for adjustments in military compensation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2109. A letter from the Chairman, Cost Accounting Standards Board, transmitting a Cost Accounting Standard proposed to be promulgated by the Board, entitled "Part 407 Use of Standard Costs for Direct Material and Direct Labor", pursuant to 50 U.S.C. App. 2163(h)(3); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2110. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report on the 1974 summer youth jobs program, pursuant to section 605 (c) of Public Law 93-203; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2111. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to provide authority to assist training of disadvantaged students for the legal profession; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2112. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a report on deliveries of excess defense articles during the second quarter of fiscal year 1974, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2321 b(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2113. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed amendment to a concession contract authorizing the continued provision of accommodations, facilities, and services for the public at the Overton Beach site of Lake Mead National Recreation Area for a term expiring December 31, 1976, pursuant to 67 Stat. 271 and 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2114. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting the final determinations of the Commission in dockets No. 13-K, *James Strong, et al., as the representative and on behalf of all members by blood of the Chippewa Tribe, including all descendants of the Chippewa Members of the United Nation of Indians, Plaintiffs, v. The United States of America, Defendant*; No. 18-P, *Red Lake, Pembina and White Earth Bands of Chippewa Indians, et al., Plaintiffs, v. The United States of America, Defendant*; and No. 40-I, *Robert Dominic, et al., as the representative and on behalf of all members by blood of the Ottawa Tribe of Indians, Plaintiffs, v. The United States of America, Defendant*, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2115. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the publication "Federal and State Commission Jurisdiction and Regulation of Electric, Gas, and Telephone Utilities, 1973"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2116. A letter from the Director of Federal Affairs, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, transmitting the financial report of the Corporation for the month of November 1973, pursuant to section 308(a)(1) of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2117. Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212 (a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1192(a)(28)(I)(ii)(b)), to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2118. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(6)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2119. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, requesting the withdrawal of a case involving the suspension of deportation of Mohsen Shakerin, previously transmitted pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2120. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service of Justice, requesting the withdrawal of a case involving the suspension of deportation of Juan Escarpita-Tena, previously transmitted pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2121. A letter from the Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus revising the previously approved prospectus for alterations to the Federal Building-Post Office-Courthouse at Missoula, Mont., pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606; to the Committee on Public Works.

2122. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the first annual report on the performance of the Department of Labor and its affiliated State employment service agencies in providing job counseling, training, and placement services for veterans, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 2007(b); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2123. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a followup report on progress in improving the management of Government owned and

leased real property overseas by the Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on Thursday, Mar. 28, 1974, the following report was filed on Mar. 29, 1974]

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 13163. A bill to establish a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted April 1, 1974]

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Select Committee on Small Business. Report on small business problems involved in the marketing of grain and other commodities (Rept. No. 93-963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 18836. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from imposing certain seatbelt standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 18837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate, in the case of any oil or gas well located outside the United States, the percentage depletion allowance and the option to deduct intangible drilling and development costs, and to deny a foreign tax credit with respect to the income derived from any such well; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY (by request):

H.R. 18838. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to extend for 4 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's loan, guarantee, and insurance authority, to clarify its authority to maintain fractional reserves for insurance and guarantees, and to amend the National Bank Act to exclude from the limitations on outstanding indebtedness of national banks liabilities incurred in borrowing from the Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 18839. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the International Economic Policy Act of 1972, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 18840. A bill to further amend and extend the authority for regulation of exports; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 13841. A bill concerning the coverage of certain Indiana State employees under section 218 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FISHER, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina):

H.R. 13842. A bill to establish a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within

the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 13843. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the vocational rehabilitation subsistence allowance, educational assistance allowances, and the special training allowances paid to eligible veterans and persons under chapters 31, 34, and 35 of such title; to improve and expand the special programs for educationally disadvantaged veterans and servicemen under chapter 34 of such title; to improve and expand the veteran-student services program; to establish a veterans education loan program for veterans eligible for benefits under chapter 34 of such title; to promote the employment of veterans and the wives and widows of certain veterans by improving and expanding the provisions governing the operation of the Veterans Employment Service and by providing for an action plan for the employment of disabled and Vietnam era veterans; to make improvements in the educational assistance program; to recodify and expand veterans' reemployment rights; to make improvements in the administration of educational benefits; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH (for himself, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. MANN, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. BAUMAN, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. ROBISON of New York, and Mr. MALLARY):

H.R. 13844. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 13845. A bill to make use of a firearm to commit a felony a Federal crime where such use violates State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 13846. A bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1969, to provide a formula to control the exports of wheat, soybeans, and corn from the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13847. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings which (subject to further increases under the automatic adjustment provisions) is permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder, and to revise the method for determining such amount; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 13848. A bill to establish a contiguous fishery zone (200-mile limit) beyond the territorial sea of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUNTER:

H.R. 13849. A bill to amend the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968 to meet the needs of runaway youths and facilitate their return to their families without resort to the law enforcement structure; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 13850. A bill to amend chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, to grant eligibility for retired pay to certain Reservists who did not perform active duty before August 16, 1945, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 13851. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 for the purpose of improving public park and other public recreational facilities by authorizing donations of Federal surplus supplies and equipment to State and local public recreational agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California (for himself, and Mr. McFALL):

H.R. 13852. A bill to provide for the preservation of critical scenic, environmental, and outdoor recreational values of Lake Tahoe Basin in California and Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KYROS (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ASPIN, and Mr. DELLENBACK):

H.R. 13853. A bill to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit smoking aboard certain aircraft operating in air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H.R. 13854. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and the Interstate Commerce Act in order to authorize reduced rate transportation for handicapped persons and for persons who are 65 years of age or older; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 13855. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat adoption fees in the same manner as medical expenses for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 13856. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the deductions for intangible drilling and development expenses and for depletion to geothermal resources; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 13857. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code to remove the expiration date provided in Public Law 92-140 which authorized the creation of a limited copyright in sound recordings for the purpose of protecting against unauthorized duplication and piracy of sound recordings; to increase the criminal penalties for piracy and counterfeiting of sound recordings; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 13858. A bill to require the establishment of an agricultural service center in each county of a State as part of the implementation of any plan for the establishment of such centers on a nationwide basis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 13859. A bill to amend section 1861 (a) (2) of the Social Security Act to redefine "spell of illness" under medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (for himself, and Mr. GRAY):

H.R. 13860. A bill to direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to transfer the Old Post Office Building located in the District of Columbia to the National Endowment for the Arts; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 13861. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from imposing certain seatbelt standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAUMAN (for himself, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FISH, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MANN, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, and Mr. WAGGONER):

H.R. 13862. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to guarantee a trial by jury for any person charged with a violation of the provisions of that act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 13863. A bill to provide standards of fair personal information practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13864. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to prohibit the disclosure of an individual's social security number or related records for any purpose without his consent unless specifically required by law, and to provide that (unless so required) no individual may be compelled to disclose or furnish his social security number for any purpose not directly related to the operation of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 13865. A bill to require that certain bills and joint resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives or received by the House from the Senate be printed with a "fiscal note"; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 13866. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 to tax the income of certain elected or appointed officers of the Government of the United States who are domiciled in States which impose income taxes and whose incomes are not taxed by such States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mr. McFALL):

H.R. 13867. A bill to provide for the review of increases promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior on November 1, 1973, in rates for electric power sold at five Bureau of Reclamation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH:

H.R. 13868. A bill to establish a Federal Petroleum Commission to provide for price regulation of major oil companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.J. Res. 962. Joint resolution to designate the third week of September of each year as "National Medical Assistants' Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 963. Joint resolution to designate the third week in April of each year as "National Coin Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. Con. Res. 452. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document of the hearings and panels of the Select Committee on Committees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HANRAHAN (for himself, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. GROVER, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. RODINO, Mr. BELL, Mr. WHALEN, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT):

H. Con. Res. 453. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the imprisonment in the Soviet Union of a Lithuanian seaman who unsuccessfully sought asylum aboard a U.S. Coast Guard ship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 or rule XXII,

Mr. CEDERBERG introduced a bill (H.R. 13869) for the relief of Carl C. Strauss and Mary Ann Strauss, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

400. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to pension rights of private employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

401. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to an accounting of Americans missing

in action in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

402. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, relative to an accounting of Americans missing in action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

403. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

404. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the International Point Roberts Board; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

405. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California relative to parking regulations promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

406. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to protection for the Massachusetts fishing industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

407. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to fisheries resources; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

408. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers lakeshore management plan; to the Committee on Public Works.

409. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the construction of a new bridge between Clarkston, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works.

410. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to tax exemptions of religious institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—Monday, April 1, 1974

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Hon. J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, JR., a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L.R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in this holy season may the spirit of the self-giving Saviour search our hearts, restore our souls, and redeem us from the lower life of sin to the higher life of love. Give us strength and wisdom for the tasks of each day. Help us amid our work not to forget the meaning and discipline of these searching days, but by self-denial, prayer, and meditation to prepare our hearts for deeper penitence and a better life. And may the peace of God which passeth all understanding keep our hearts and minds in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1974.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, JR., a Senator from the State of Louisiana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. JOHNSTON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 29, 1974, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all com-

mittees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSTON) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION AND EDUCATION ASSISTANCE ACT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 733, S. 1017.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

S. 1017 to promote maximum Indian participation in the government and education of the Indian people; to provide for the full participation of Indian tribes in certain programs and services conducted by the Federal Government for Indians and to encourage the development of the human resources of the Indian people; to establish and carry out a national Indian education program; to encourage the establishment of local Indian school control; to train professionals in Indian education; to establish an Indian youth intern program; and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act".

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress, after careful review of the Federal Government's historical and special legal relationship with, and re-

sulting responsibilities to, American Indian people, finds that—

(1) the prolonged Federal domination of Indian service programs has served to retard rather than enhance the progress of Indian people and their communities by depriving Indians of the full opportunity to develop leadership skills crucial to the realization of self-government, and has denied to the Indian people an effective voice in the planning and implementation of programs for the benefit of Indians which are responsive to the true needs of Indian communities; and

(2) the Indian people will never surrender their desire to control their relationships both among themselves and with non-Indian governments, organizations, and persons.

(b) The Congress further finds that—

(1) true self-determination in any society of people is dependent upon an educational process which will insure the development of qualified people to fulfill meaningful leadership roles;

(2) the Federal responsibility for and assistance to education of Indian children, Indian adult education, and Indian skills training has not affected the desired level of educational achievement or created the diverse opportunities and personal satisfaction which education can and should provide; and

(3) parental and community control of the educational process is of crucial importance to the Indian people.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. (a) The Congress hereby recognizes the obligation of the United States to respond to the strong expression of the Indian people for self-determination by assuring maximum Indian participation in the direction of educational as well as other Federal services to Indian communities so as to render such services more responsive to the needs and desires of those communities.

(b) The Congress declares its commitment to the maintenance of the Federal Government's unique and continuing relationship with and responsibility to the Indian people through the establishment of a meaningful Indian self-determination policy which will permit an orderly transition from Federal domination of programs for and services to Indians to effective and meaningful participation by the Indian people in the planning, conduct, and administration of those programs and services.

(c) The Congress declares that a major national goal of the United States is to provide the quantity and quality of educational services and opportunities which will permit Indian children and adults to compete and excel in the life areas of their choice, and to achieve the measure of self-determination essential to their social and economic well-being.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this Act, the term—

(a) "Indian" means a person who is, a member of an Indian tribe;