didate under section 9057 for use in general election campaign was used for any purpose other than for qualified campaign expenses in connection with that campaign, the Commission shall so notify the candidate and the candidate shall pay an amount equal to three times that amount to the Secretary.

"(3) If the Commission determines that any portion of the payments made to an official political party committee under section 9057 was used for any purpose other than to make campaign contributions to congressional candidates for use in the general election, the Commission shall so notify the official political party committee and the official political party committee shall pay an amount equal to three times that amount to the Secretary.

"(4) Amounts received by a candidate under this chapter may be retained for 60 days after the general election for the purpose of liquidating all obligations to pay qualified campaign expenses which were incurred for the period beginning with the day on which the candidate's nominating process was completed and ending on the day on which the general election is held. After the 60-day period following the election, all remaining Federal funds not yet expended on qualified campaign expenses shall be promptly repaid by the candidate to the Payment Account.

"(5) If the Commission determines that any candidate who has received funds under this chapter, is convicted of violating any provision of this chapter, the Commission shall notify the candidate and the candidate shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury the full amount received under this chapter.

"(c) No nomination shall be made by the Commission under subsection (b) with respect to a campaign more than 2 years after the day of the election to which the campaign related.

"(d) All payments received by the Secretary under subsection (b) shall be deposited by him in the Congressional Election Payment Account.

"SEC. 9059. REPORTS TO CONGRESS, REGULATIONS.

"(a) The supervisory officer shall, as soon as practicable after the close of each calendar year, submit a full report to the Senate and House of Representatives setting forth—

"(1) the qualified campaign expenses (shown in the detail the Commission deems necessary) incurred by a candidate and his authorized committees, and by each official political party committee, who received payments under section 9057;

"(2) the amounts certified by it under section 9056 for payment to each candidate and his/her authorized committees and each official political party committee; and

"(3) the amount of payments, if any, required from that candidate or official political party committee under section 9058, and the reasons for each payment required. Each report submitted pursuant to this section shall be printed as a House or Senate document and made available in sufficient numbers for the general public.

"(b) REGULATIONS.—

"(1) The Commission is authorized to prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions set forth in this chapter. The Commission, before prescribing any such regulation, shall transmit a statement with respect to such regulation to the Senate and to the House of Representatives in accordance with the provisions of this subsection. Such statement shall set forth the proposed regulation and shall contain an explanation and justification of such regulation.

"(2) If either such House does not, through appropriate action, disapprove the proposed regulation set forth in such statement no later than 30 legislative days after the receipt of such statement, then the Commission may prescribe such regulation. The Commission may not prescribe any such regulation which is disapproved by either such House under this paragraph.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'legislative days' does not include any calendar day on which both Houses of the Congress are not in session.

"SEC. 9060. PARTICIPATION BY COMMISSION IN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS.

"(a) APPEARANCE BY COUNSEL.—The Commission is authorized to appear in and defend against any action instituted under this section, either by attorneys employed in its office or by counsel whom it may appoint without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and whose compensation it may fix without regard to the provisions of chapter XX of subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title.

"(b) RECOVERY OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS.—The Commission is authorized, through attorneys and counsel described in subsection (a), to institute action in the district courts of the United States to seek recovery of any amounts determined to be payable to the Secretary or his delegate as a result of an examination and audit made under section 9058.

"(c) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—The Commission is authorized through attorneys and counsel described in subsection (a) to petition the courts of the United States for such injunctive relief as is appropriate to implement any provision of this chapter.

"(d) APPEAL.—The Commission is authorized on behalf of the United States to appeal from, and to petition the Supreme Court for certiorari to review judgments or decrees entered with respect to actions in which it appears pursuant to the authority provided in this section.

"SEC. 9061. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

"(a) REVIEW OF AGENCY ACTION BY THE COMMISSION.—Any agency action by the Commission made under the provisions of this chapter shall be subject to review by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit upon petition filed in such court within 30 days after the agency action by the Commission for which review is sought.

"(b) REVIEW PROCEDURES.—The provisions of chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, apply to judicial review of any agency action, as defined in section 551(13) of title 5, United States Code, by the Commission.

"SEC. 9062. UNLAWFUL USE OF PAYMENTS.

"It shall be unlawful for any person who receives payment under this chapter or to whom any portion of such payment is transferred, knowingly and willfully to use, or authorize the use of, such payment or such portion for any purpose other than for the specific purposes authorized by this chapter.

"SEC. 9063. FALSE STATEMENTS.

"It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly and willfully with intent to deceive to (a) furnish any false, fictitious, or fraudulent evidence, books, or sworn material testimony to the Commission under this chapter or to (b) include in any evidence, books, or information so furnished any misrepresentation of a material fact, or to falsify or conceal any evidence, books, or information relevant to a certification by the Commission or an examination and audit by the supervisory officer under section 9058.

"SEC. 9064. KICKBACKS AND ILLEGAL PAYMENTS.

"It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly and willfully to give or accept any kickback or make any illegal payment in connection with any payments received under this chapter or in connection with any expenditures of payments received under this chapter.

"SEC. 9065. PENALTY FOR VIOLATIONS.

"Any knowing and willful violation of any provision of this chapter is punishable by a fine of not more than $25,000, or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.".

SEC. 3. Section 9006(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby repealed and subsections (c) and (d) are hereby renumbered subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

SEC. 4. If any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the title and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this Act apply with respect to elections which are held after January 1, 1976.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, February 11, 1976*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.—Psalms 33: 12.

Almighty and Eternal God, who didst lead our fathers into this new land and who gave them guidance to create on these shores a great nation, bless to us the glorious heritage of faith and freedom which we have received from them. Now may we prove ourselves a people, mindful of Thy favor, eager to do Thy will, and ready to preserve the democratic spirit of our Republic.

We thank Thee for those who have led us in the past in right and good ways. Particularly do we thank Thee for Abraham Lincoln, for the spirit of his great life, for the example he set before our Nation, and for his dedication to freedom and justice for all. May Thy spirit in him be born anew in us and may we heed his words: "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right; let us strive to finish the work we are in * * * that we may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

In the spirit of Christ we pray. 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.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the following bills reported from the Committee: H.R. 1313, H.R. 2575, H.R. 2740, H.R. 3440, H.R. 8508, H.R. 9617, H.R. 7017, and H.R. 8228.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

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

There was no objection.

HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE HAS COMPLETED ITS WORK AND RECOMMENDATIONS WILL BE FILED TODAY

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

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce to the Members of the House that, pursuant to the various resolutions that have created it and massaged it, the House Select Committee on Intelligence has completed its work and its recommendations will be filed today.

Mr. Speaker, during the period since July 17 we have held 76 hearings, 52 in open session, 24 in closed session, collected over 8,000 pages of transcript in open session, 2,371 pages in closed session.

Of our $750,000 budget we will spend approximately $471,000 and will turn back in $279,000.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE BRIEFING FOR REPRESENTATIVES OF MILITARY-ORIENTED ORGANIZATIONS

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President briefed representatives of military-oriented organizations at the White House. I have reviewed his remarks and consider them significant from the standpoint of our national defense posture. For the benefit of my colleagues I am inserting the text of the President's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE BRIEFING FOR REPRESENTATIVES OF MILITARY-ORIENTED ORGANIZATIONS

Secretary Clements, General Brown, General Scowcroft, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, distinguished guests:

It is awfully good to see you all and to welcome you to the White House. I know that Secretary Kissinger and Secretary Clements and others have briefed you very fully on the elements of our new defense budget and the policies of their respective departments.

Actually, foreign policy and defense policy are both part of a single national policy, the policy that carries out the first duty of the Federal Government, which is to make the United States and its people safe and secure in a very dangerous world.

Throughout our 200 years of independence, we have become the strongest Nation in the history of mankind and, as President, I intend to keep our military strength certain and our powder dry.

But, our world has also become much more dangerous. It is also my duty to do all that I can to reduce the level of danger by diplomatic means, so my policy for national security can be summed up in three words—peace through strength.

I believe it is far better to seek negotiations with the Soviet Union based on strength than to permit a runaway nuclear arms race and risk a nuclear holocaust.

Under my Administration, the United States is at peace. There are no Americans in battle anywhere in the world today. We have greatly strengthened our essential alliances with Western Europe and with Japan.

The United States has taken a strong and very forthright stand in the United Nations on behalf of our own national interest. We challenged the Soviet Union and Cuba in their intervention in Angola, and if the Congress had stood with us, we could have preserved the opportunity to let the Angolans settle their future among themselves.

We have worked to achieve an unprecedented increase in United States foreign trade, which has insured hundreds of thousands of American jobs. The United States has used its unique position, its position of confidence, on both sides to accomplish a historic breakthrough in peace negotiations between Egypt and with Israel, and continues to seek a just and lasting peace throughout the Middle East.

A strong military presence and decisive action by the United States coupled with the elements of our Pacific doctrine have stabilized international relations in Asia and the Far East. I believe—and believe very strongly—that $112 billion 700 million requested in my fiscal year 1977 defense budget represents the best way to deter war and to keep our country secure.

By maintaining unquestioned military strength, we will negotiate from strength, not from weakness. We will not prevail in this protracted struggle with the enemies of freedom, big or small, by warming over the old rhetoric of the cold war or by fast and fancy gunplay with weapons that can destroy most of the human race.

We will win this struggle, and we are winning it by the patient and painstaking pursuit of our own national interest through continuing my present policy of peace through strength.

Anyone who has ever been in the Armed Forces, especially in wartime, knows that the final objective you gain from that experience, the continuing mission you take with you when you leave the service, is to work for a peaceful world for your children and your grandchildren.

The veterans of all nations will tell you just that. But, as Americans, we have an extra responsibility. We did not seek it, but it was thrust upon us. We cannot escape it, and we will not. Circumstance, destiny, fate, or whatever you call it, the fact is the United States of America is today the world's best and perhaps its only hope of peace with freedom.

Upon our strengths, upon our power, upon our prudence and our perseverance rests mankind's best hope for a better world. Whatever chance there is for permanent peace depends upon America's resolution and national leadership.

I am committed to such a firm and steady course. I am greatly encouraged and pleased by your strong and steadfast support.

I thank you very much.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW, FEBRUARY 12, 1976, TO FILE REPORT ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 801, SUPPLEMENTAL RAILROAD APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the resolution (H.J. Res. 801) making supplemental railroad appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, the period ending September 30, 1976, the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1976, OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 801, SUPPLEMENTAL RAILROAD APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider in the House on Wednesday, February 18, or any day thereafter, the bill (H.J. Res. 801) making supplemental railroad appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, the period ending September 30, 1976, the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

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

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Grange published its legislative policies for 1976, consisting of nearly 200 separate proposals for congressional action. While I commend the entire document to your attention, I would like to take special note of the Grange's resolution on the food stamp program, as follows:

Whereas, the food stamp program was originated to alleviate the cost of nutritious food for those who are not able to buy such food, and

Whereas, the abuses of said program are causing much concern, and are contributing heavily to excessive costs; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Grange support legislation which would tighten eligibility criteria and simplify income determination which would correct abuses and restore the food stamp program to its original intent; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Grange looks with disfavor on granting food stamps to workers away from their jobs, except when such unemployment comes through no choice of their own.

National Grange policies traditionally have mirrored the work ethic and self-reliance of the American farmer who has contributed so substantially to the growth and development of this country. I think it is only fitting, during our Bicentennial Year, that we reflect carefully upon this viewpoint as we move toward meaningful reform of the food stamp program.

KISSINGER IS PRESIDENT FORD'S NO. 1 POLITICAL LIABILITY

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that Gov. Ronald Reagan has seen fit to inject oversimplified foreign policy comments into his New Hampshire Presidential primary campaign.

After reviewing Reagan's first major foreign policy speech, I reluctantly concluded that he sounded more like Senator HENRY "SCOOP" JACKSON, Senator BIRCH BAYH, Sargent Shriver, or "leakproof" Senator FRANK CHURCH. In attempting a political counterattack on the President, I think all of his critics should be cognizant of a few facts.

Now I recognize that it is frequently difficult to combine facts with partisan political oratory, but there are fundamental facts relating to this Nation's foreign policy which cannot be twisted or altered.

Since President Ford took office, we have had peace. That is a fact.

It also is a fact that the President responded to the Soviet challenge in Angola, and if Congress had the backbone to support him, the Russians would have been thwarted in their successful drive for access to important naval ports and substantial mineral deposits in Angola.

It also is a fact that it was the President's leadership role in the Middle East which led to a negotiated settlement and has thus far avoided any further hostilities in that volatile area.

The President believes it is far better to seek to negotiate a cap on the nuclear arms race which would cost this country $20 billion. He believes it is far better to seek peace through negotiations based on strength rather than continuing an arms race which could result in a nuclear holocaust.

However, I must acknowledge that Reagan was right in deriding Secretary of State Kissinger's addiction to his self-proclaimed policy of détente. I have been saying the same thing for some time. As far as I am concerned, Kissinger is President Ford's No. 1 political liability.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 54]

Abzug	Boggs	Chappell
Addabbo	Bolling	Chisholm
Allen	Bonker	Clancy
Ambro	Brooks	Clawson, Del
Anderson, Ill.	Broomfield	Clay
Andrews, N.C.	Burgener	Cleveland
Archer	Burke, Fla.	Collins, Ill.
Barrett	Burlison, Mo.	Conlan
Bauman	Burton, John	Conyers
Bedell	Burton, Phillip	Dellums
Bell	Byron	Dent
Biester	Carter	Diggs
Dodd	Lujan	Ryan
Downing, Va.	McClory	St Germain
Drinan	McCloskey	Santini
Eilberg	McCormack	Sarbanes
Esch	McEwen	Scheuer
Eshleman	Macdonald	Shipley
Fary	Madigan	Shuster
Findley	Matsunaga	Sisk
Flynt	Metcalfe	Smith, Nebr.
Ford, Mich.	Mikva	Snyder
Fountain	Milford	Spellman
Fraser	Miller, Calif.	Staggers
Frey	Mills	Stanton, James V.
Gaydos	Minish	Stark
Gibbons	Mink	Steed
Haley	Mitchell, Md.	Steelman
Hall	Moakley	Steiger, Ariz.
Hanley	Mollohan	Steiger, Wis.
Hannaford	Montgomery	Stephens
Hansen	Moorhead, Calif.	Stucky
Harrington	Mottl	Symington
Harsha	Nichols	Teague
Hébert	Nix	Thornton
Heckler, Mass.	Obey	Traxler
Helstoski	Patman, Tex.	Udall
Henderson	Patterson, Calif.	Ullman
Hinshaw	Pepper	Van Deerlin
Hubbard	Pettis	Vander Jagt
Jarman	Pressler	Vander Veen
Johnson, Pa.	Pritchard	Vigorito
Jones, Ala.	Quie	Walsh
Jones, N.C.	Quillen	Waxman
Karth	Railsback	White
Ketchum	Rees	Whitehurst
Koch	Rhodes	Wilson, C. H.
Landrum	Richmond	Yates
Latta	Risenhoover	Young, Alaska
Leggett	Roe	Young, Fla.
Lehman	Roybal	Young, Tex.
Lent	Ruppe	Zeferetti
Litton		
Long, Md.		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 274 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state for the record that because of a delayed conference, I arrived about a minute after the quorum was closed out a few minutes ago; but I am here on the House floor ready, able, and willing, to participate in all its activities.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, if the acting minority leader will be kind enough to yield, I will be glad to respond.

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the program for the week of February 16, 1976, is as follows:

Monday we will have the reading of George Washington's Farewell Address.

Tuesday is Consent Calendar day and Private Calendar day, and we will consider 15 bills under the suspension of the rules. Votes on suspensions will be postponed until the end of all suspensions.

Under the suspensions we will take up the following:

H.R. 11233, Library Services and Construction Act amendments;

S.J. Res. 154, White House Conference on Handicapped;

H.R. 11045, Rehabilitation Act extension conference report;

H.R. 10229, Endangered Species Act amendments;

H.R. 11455, Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Act amendments;

H.R. 11645, Additional funds for James Madison Library;

H.R. 1313, Rolla, Mo., Airport land restriction;

H.R. 2575, Algona, Iowa, Airport land restriction;

H.R. 2740, Elkhart, Kans., Airport land restriction;

H.R. 3440, Grand Junction, Colo., Airport land restriction;

H.R. 8508, Camden, Ark., Airport land restriction;

H.R. 9617, Alva, Okla., Airport land restriction;

H.R. 7017, airline fares changes notification;

H.R. 8228, emergency locator transmitters; and

H.R. 7824, agricultural census.

On Wednesday we will consider House Joint Resolution 801, supplemental railroad appropriations.

On Thursday and the balance of the week we have scheduled H.R. 5247, local public works, which we are listing because of the possibility of a veto and we would consider overriding it.

At this time it does not appear as though there will be a Friday session, unless some reports come in that we are not aware of at the present time. We have of course asked the chairmen to report as quickly as they possibly can because of the May 15 deadline on legislation, and we do hope that whatever legislation there is will be hitting the floor shortly.

Of course, I said Thursday and the balance of the week we would have the possibility of taking up H.R. 5247, local public works, if there is a veto. However, if the acting minority leader could assure us the President would not veto the bill, then we would not be working on Thursday.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if it would be possible, assuming that the Committee on Rules will report a rule on the so-called black lung legislation, to bring that legislation on the floor the week after next.

Mr. O'NEILL. On what bill is the gentleman inquiring?

Mr. PERKINS. On the so-called pneumoconiosis amendments, the black lung legislation.

Mr. O'NEILL. Has the chairman of the committee written to the chairman of Committee on Rules?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, absolutely, requesing a hearing.

Mr. O'NEILL. All I can say is that normally the chairman has been very cooperative with all chairmen, and I am sure the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor should talk to the chairman of the Committee on Rules about that.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday, February 16, 1976, the clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF BUSINESS UNDER CONSENT CALENDAR RULE ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1976

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, February 17, 1976, it shall be in order to consider business under clause 4, rule XIII, the Consent Calendar rule.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday of next week.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

ALTERNATIVE TO THE PUBLIC WORKS BILL

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

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, with my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS), I have today introduced H.R. 11860, which is an alternative to H.R. 5247, the public works bill which the Congress enacted a little over a week ago and which it is anticipated the President will veto. The bill that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS) and I have introduced uses the funding mechanism of the existing community development program and we believe it is a better means of providing jobs and providing them now. Rather than take the time of my colleagues at this moment to further explain the bill, I will be giving a further explanation of it in the Extensions of Remarks in today's RECORD.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM AND THE BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for some time, I have been curious about the intense interest of the Business Roundtable in the affairs of the Federal Reserve System. Now, the reasons are becoming clear why there have been so many telegrams and telephone calls to help the Federal Reserve block an audit by the General Accounting Office.

My research indicates that—in many instances—the Business Roundtable and the Federal Reserve are one and the same—honeycombed with interlocking personnel.

Not 1 of the 12 Federal Reserve districts has accepted this fat cat lobbying group's influence. They are right in there—on the boards of directors of each of the district banks.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, five of the nine directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York—the most influential in the System—have direct or indirect ties with the Business Roundtable.

This pressure group has managed to put officers and directors of its member corporations all through the System. These are not small businesses I am talking about, but the biggest of the big.

Take a look at the bank in New York—those five directors are from Chase Manhattan, with almost $34 billion in deposits as of December 13, 1975; J. C. Penney, annual sales of $6,200,000,000; Texaco, annual sales of $23,255,000,000; Union Carbide Corp., $5,320,000,000 in annual sales; and Kennecott Copper, annual sales of $1,664,000,000—all member companies of the Business Roundtable.

The interlocks at the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland and its branches are almost as impressive—Federated Department Stores, annual sales of $2,960,000,000; Westinghouse Electric, annual sales of $5,799,000,000; TRW, Inc., annual sales of $2,5000,000,000; IBM, annual sales of $12,675,000,000; H. J. Heinz & Co., annual sales of $1,650,000,000; and the Cyclops Corp., annual sales of $653 million—again, all member companies of the Business Roundtable and all having representatives on the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve banks.

The Richmond Federal Reserve Bank has only attracted representatives from three of the Business Roundtable members—but look at the three—Sears, Roebuck & Co., annual sales of $13,100,000,000; the Exxon Corp., annual sales of $45,021,000,000; and A.T. & T., annual sales of $23,500,000,000.

THE BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE AND THE FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker, in that all-important Federal Reserve Bank of New York resides the portfolio of Government bonds—about $93 billion worth—from which the Federal Reserve System—not the Treasury—draws interest of about $6 billion annually.

This portfolio of bonds is managed by the Federal Open Market Committee in the New York Federal Reserve Bank. Using a select list of securities dealers, the Federal Open Market Committee buys and sells bonds in the open market.

These transactions involve billions of dollars a year—that is right—billions of dollars annually. And sharing in that lucrative business—part of that select list of bond dealers—are the names of Chase Manhattan Bank, almost $34 billion in deposits; Bank of America, $57 billion in deposits; and the First National City Bank, $45 billion in deposits—member corporations of the Business Roundtable.

One day these bond dealers buy and sell Government securities for the Federal Reserve. The next day they are out lobbying with the Business Roundtable to protect themselves and the rest of the Federal Reserve from an audit. It is reasonable to assume that the profits from their bond dealing for the Federal Reserve help pay their massive dues to this lobbying organization.

The big decisions—the really crucial decisions—are made in a high-level committee which goes under the name of the Business Roundtable Policy Committee. This is where the fattest of the fat cats start the influence ball rolling.

And of course, the Federal Reserve influence is right there on the Policy Committee; 11 of the 40 members of that committee have ties with the Federal Reserve—more than one-fourth have links back into the Federal Reserve System.

These ties involve links between the Federal Reserve System and Federated Department Stores; Chase Manhattan Bank; Union Carbide; Kennecott Copper; Westinghouse Electric; IBM; Sears, Roebuck; Exxon; A.T. & T.; Alcoa; and Bank of America.

Mr. Speaker, the link between the Federal Reserve and the Business Roundtable is complete—it encompasses all areas. At this point I want to list the interlocks by Federal Reserve district banks and branches:

COMPARISON OF BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE MEMBERSHIP AND BOARDS OF DIRECTORS OF FEDERAL RESERVE DISTRICT AND BRANCHES

DISTRICT 1—FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF BOSTON

Class B Director—Weston P. Figgins, chairman of the Board, Wm. Filene's Sons Company, Boston, Massachusetts. Filene's is a division of Federated Department Stores, Cincinnati. Federated Department Stores is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable. In addition, Ralph Lazarus, chairman, Federal Department Stores, is a member of the 40-member Business Roundtable Policy Committee.

DISTRICT 2—FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF NEW YORK

Class A Director—David Rockefeller, Chairman, The Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A., New York, New York—Chase Manhattan Bank is a member company of the Business Round-

table. In addition, David Rockefeller, Chairman, Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A., is a member of the 40-member Business Roundtable Policy Committee.

Class B Directors—Jack B. Jackson, president, J. C. Penney Co., Inc., New York—J. C. Penney Co., Inc. is a member company of the Business Roundtable.

Maurice F. Granville, chairman of the board, Texaco Inc., New York, New York—Texaco Inc. is a member company of the Business Roundtable.

William S. Sneath, president, Union Carbide Corporation, New York, New York—Union Carbide Corporation is a member company of the Business Roundtable. In addition, the Chairman of the Union Carbide Corporation, F. Perry Wilson, is part of the 40-member Business Roundtable policy committee.

Class C Director—Frank R. Milliken, president, Kennecott Copper Corporation, New York, New York—Kennecott Copper is a member company of the Business Roundtable. In addition, Mr. Milliken is a member of the 40-member Business Roundtable policy committee.

DISTRICT 3—FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF PHILADELPHIA

Class B Director—Harold A. Shaub, president, Campbell Soup Co., Camden, New Jersey. The Campbell Soup Company is a member company of the Business Roundtable.

DISTRICT 4—FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF CLEVELAND

Class B Director—Charles Y. Lazarus, Chairman of the Board, and chief executive officer, the F.&R. Lazarus Co., Columbus, Ohio, a division of Federated Department Stores, Cincinnati. Federated Department Stores is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable. In addition, Ralph Lazarus, chairman, Federated Department Stores, is a member of the 40-member Business Roundtable Policy Committee.

Class C Directors—Robert E. Kirby, chairman and chief executive officer, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Westinghouse Electric Corporation is a member company of the Business Roundtable. In addition, Mr. Kirby is a member of the 40-member Business Roundtable policy committee.

Horace A. Shepard, chairman of the Board, Chief Executive Officer, TRW, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio. TRW, Inc. is a member company of the Business Roundtable.

Cincinnati branch of Cleveland Bank

Appointed by Board of Governors—Clair F. Vough, Vice-President, International Business Machines, Inc., Lexington, Kentucky. IBM is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable. In addition, the Chairman of IBM, Mr. Frank T. Cary, is a member of the 40-member Business Roundtable Policy Committee.

Pittsburgh branch of Cleveland Bank

Appointed by the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland—R. Burt Gookin, Vice Chairman and C.E.O., H. J. Heinz Company, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. H. J. Heinz Company is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable.

Appointed by Board of Governors—W. H. Knoell, President, Cyclops Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania—Cyclops Corporation is a member company of the Business Roundtable.

DISTRICT 5—FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF RICHMOND

Class B Director—Osby L. Weir—retired General Manager, Metropolitan Washington-Baltimore Areas, Sears, Roebuck and Company, Bethesda, Maryland. Sears, Roebuck and Co., Chicago, Illinois, is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable. In addition, Mr. Arthur M. Wood, Chairman, Sears, Roebuck and Co., is a member of the 40-member Business Roundtable Policy Committee.

Baltimore branch of Richmond Bank

Appointed by Board of Governors—I. E. Killian, Manager, Eastern Region, Exxon Company, U.S.A., Baltimore, Md—The Exxon Corporation is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable. In addition, Mr. Clifton Garvin, Exxon Corporation, is a member of the 40-member Business Roundtable Policy Committee.

Charlotte Branch of the Richmond Bank

Appointed by Board of Governors—Charles W. DeBell, general manager, North Carolina Works, Western Electric Company, Inc. Winston-Salem, N.C., Western Electric Company is a subsidiary of the American Telephone & Telegraph Company. AT&T is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable. In addition, Mr. John D. deButts, Chairman, American Telephone & Telegraph Company, New York, New York, is the co-chairman of the 40-Member Business Roundtable Policy Committee.

DISTRICT 6—FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF ATLANTA

Class B Directors—Robert T. Hornbeck, manager, Tennessee Operations, Aluminum Company of America, Alcoa, Tenn.—Aluminum Company of America is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable. In addition, Mr. John D. Harper, Chairman, Aluminum Co. of America, is the chairman of the 40 member Business Roundtable Policy Committee.

DISTRICT 7—FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF CHICAGO

Class C Director—M. Leo H. Schoenhofen, chairman of the board, Marcor, Inc., Chicago, Illinois. Marcor, Inc. is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable.

Detroit Branch of the Chicago Bank

Appointed by Board of Governors—Tom Killefer, vice-president, finance, general counsel, Chrysler Corporation, Detroit, Mich. Chrysler Corporation is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable.

DISTRICT 8—FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF ST. LOUIS

Class B Director—Tom K. Smith, Jr., Group Vice President, Monsanto Company, St. Louis, Mo. Monsanto Company is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable.

DISTRICT 9—FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF MINNEAPOLIS

Class C Director—James P. McFarland, chairman of the board, General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minnesota. General Mills, Inc. is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable.

Stephen F. Keating, Chairman of the Board, Honeywell, Inc., Minneapolis, Minnesota. Honeywell, Inc. is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable.

DISTRICT 10—FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF KANSAS CITY

Class C Director—Robert T. Person, chairman of the Board, and president, Public Service Company of Colorado. Public Service Company of Colorado is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable.

DISTRICT 11—FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF DALLAS

Class B Director—Stewart Orton, president, Foley's Inc., Houston, Texas, Foley's is a division of Federated Department Stores, Cincinnati. Federated Department Stores is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable. In addition, Ralph Lazarus, chairman, Federated Department Stores, is a member of the 40-member Business Roundtable Policy Committee.

Class C Director—John Lawrence, chairman of the Board, Dresser Industries, Inc., Dallas, Texas. Dresser Industries is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable.

DISTRICT 12—FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF SAN FRANCISCO

Class A Director—A. W. Clausen, president and chief executive officer, Bank of America NT&SA San Francisco. The Bank of America is a member company of the Business Roundtable. In addition, Mr. Clausen is a member of the 40-member Business Roundtable Policy Committee.

Class B Director—Charles R. Dahl, president and chief executive officer, Crown Zellerbach Corporation, San Francisco, California. Crown Zellerbach Corporation is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable.

Malcolm T. Stamper, president, The Boeing Company, Seattle, Washington. The Boeing Company is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable.

Class C. Director—Cornell C. Maier, president and chief executive officer, Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corporation, Oakland, California. Kaiser Industries Corporation is a member corporation of the Business Roundtable.

FED TAKES AIM AT THE AUDIT BILL

Now, with this nice cozy relationship, it is little wonder that when Dr. Arthur Burns, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, calls, the Business Roundtable listens. And Dr. Burns is opposed to any efforts to have the General Accounting Office audit the Federal Reserve System.

Back in 1973, when the House Banking and Currency Committee reported out a bill which would have provided a full-scale audit of the Federal Reserve System by the General Accounting Office, Dr. Burns went to work. The full Banking Committee reported this bill favorably on October 4, 1973. On October 12, I requested a hearing at the Rules Committee.

Then Dr. Burns went to work. Thanks to a public-spirited citizen who shall remain anonymous, we learned of the Tinkers to Evers to Chance moves that Dr. Burns started. The following correspondence shows a Burns' call to Manufacturers Hanover who then called John Lee of the New York Clearing House who then distributed a Business Roundtable mailgram in an effort to "help the Fed repel a bill sponsored by Mr. Patman that would require full GAO audits of the Federal Reserve System." This happened on October 18 and October 19.

On October 24, the House Rules Committee deferred action. On October 30, the House Rules Committee again deferred action. On November 6, the House Rules Committee tabled a motion to reconsider the bill.

Among the many telegrams that were coming in on this legislation, several puzzled us. We just could not understand why some of these companies were bothering about a bill that was so far out of their bailiwick. I received a telegram on October 26, 1973, in opposition to the bill from American Metal Climax, Inc., with annual sales of $1,200,000,000. Now that we have been able to get a look at the Business Roundtable membership, I find that AMAX, Inc.—the parent company of American Metal Climax, Inc.—is a dues-paying member corporation of the Business Roundtable.

Only after I started to uncover and make public some of the lobbying tactics used by Dr. Burns—and after repeated requests on my part to the Speaker of the House—did the House Rules Committee, on February 5, 1974—finally grant a rule which would provide the Members of the House an opportunity to work their will on this bill.

Sure enough, on February 14, the tele-

grams started going out again. A. W. Clausen, chief executive officer of the Bank of America—the largest bank in the world—who sits on the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco and who, incidentally, sits on the 40-member Policy Committee of the Business Roundtable, started wiring Members of Congress. Since they had not succeeded in killing the bill in the Rules Committee, Dr. Burns and his friends now wanted the legislation weakened through amendments.

Through the rest of the spring until the bill came up on the House floor on May 30, 1974, the lobbyists were at work. Mr. Clausen started telephoning Members. The Republican Policy Committee of the House unanimously opposed the bill on May 27, 1974. Representatives of Crown-Zellerbach Corp.—annual sales of $1,766,000,000—contacted the House Democratic leadership in opposition to the bill. A representative of the Caterpillar Tractor Corp.—annual sales of $4,082,000,000—telephoned the Banking Committee in regard to the bill. At the time, as I pointed out before, the interests of these corporations in a bill to audit a bank regulatory agency seemed somewhat peculair. Now, with the list of Business Roundtable membership in hand, it is possible to see the link. Both Caterpillar Tractor and Crown Zellerbach are member companies of the Business Roundtable. In addition, the president and chief executive officer of the Crown Zellerbach Corp., Mr. Charles R. Dahl, is a class B Director of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

I am sure that many Members felt these calls, letters, and telegrams from busy executives of major corporations were sincere expressions of alarm from public-spirited citizens. Few of us realized at that time the tight interlock between the personnel of the Federal Reserve's 12 district banks and branches and the Business Roundtable. Perhaps if we had been fully apprised, the results would have been different.

On May 30, 1974, the House of Representatives adopted the weakening amendment sought by Dr. Burns. The legislation was not considered in the Senate at all that year.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I would like to place copies of 1973 and 1974 telegrams on the audit bill; the Business Roundtable mailgram and background; and a Jack Anderson column which appeared in the Washington Post of December 12, 1973:

OCTOBER 23, 1973.

Re H.R. 10265.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge that you give careful attention to the dissents to the committee report and vote against any provision authorizing the GAO to review "The results of the programs and activities of the system, including the extent to which its established objectives are being achieved". The Comptroller General admits that the GAO is unqualified to make such reviews and any effort to do so would abrogate the long standing tradition that the operations of the Federal Reserve System should be independent of political pressure.

IAN MACGREGOR,
Chairman, American Metal Climax, Inc.

WHIRLPOOL CORP.,
Benton Harbor, Mich., October 26, 1973.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We wish to express our active concern to H.R. 10265 which provides for audits of the Federal Reserve by the General Accounting Office. With an annual audit by independent public accountants, examination by GAO is unnecessary and would be a wasteful expenditure of time and money.

Particularly objectionable is the provision that the GAO would have responsibility for an audit of results and a determination if board actions meet those objectives for which the board was established and has been maintained. This provision injects the GAO into the monetary and economic policy areas, areas in which they have no expertise and no responsibility for the development of such expertise.

Close scrutiny of results by the GAO would weaken the independence of the board and make more difficult its making those objective and long range decisions which in the expert opinion of the board are in the best interests of the many elements of the economy.

WALTER A. HOLT,
Vice President, Finance, and Treasurer.

BANK OF AMERICA,
San Francisco, Calif., February 14, 1974.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I have been informed that a bill providing for an audit of the Federal Reserve System by the General Accounting Office (H.R. 10265) will be brought to the floor of the House of Representatives this week. As a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, I have considered this proposal and urge that you oppose it for the following reasons:

Forty years ago the Congress decided to remove the Federal Reserve System from surveillance by the General Accounting Office in order to provide for independence of judgment on the part of the Board of Governors in carrying out the responsibilities delegated to the Board by the Congress. The present structure, with regional initiative by the Reserve Banks and central oversight by the Board of Governors, has served the country well through the years.

It is important to retain a balance of public and private elements in the system. The contributions derived from the private sector experience of the Reserve Bank directors are essential to this balance. Members of the boards of the Reserve Banks bring an intimate knowledge of developments in the economy to bear on the decisions. A post-audit by the Comptroller General of the United States might well impair the independence of their contribution.

The Federal Reserve Board's operation is already thoroughly audited by an independent certified public accountant and the results are reported to Congress.

I urge you to speak and to vote against passage of H.R. 10265. The establishment and implementation of a sound monetary policy can best be accomplished by an independent agency which is relatively free from the ebb and flow of public opinion.

Sincerely,

A. W. CLAUSEN,
President, Bank of America N.T. & S.A.

OCTOBER 19, 1973.

Mr. John Lee of the New York Clearing House called: Had a call from Gabriel Hauge of Manufacturers Hanover Trust. Mr. Hauge had a call from Arthur Burns, Chairman of Fed. Mr. Burns asked Mr. Hauge if he could muster some support in New York to help the Fed repel a bill sponsored by Mr. Patman that would require full GAO audits of the Federal Reserve System. More specifically, Mr. Burns called to our attention that there is an amendment to Mr. Patman's bill known as the Ashley-Stanton amendment. This amendment is acceptable to the Fed and the Fed would like us to assist in any way we can to get the New York delegation to the House to vote for the Ashley-Stanton amendment.

GORDON T. WALLACE,
Irving Trust Co.,
New York, N.Y.

The work of the Federal Reserve System is of great importance to the monetary and economic policies of the nation and, of course, to American business. Traditionally, it has been insulated from short run political and economic pressures. Now an attempt is being made to change this.

On 9/13/73 Representative Wright Patman introduced a bill, H.R. 10265, which was referred to the House Banking and Currency Committee of which he is chairman. It was reported with amendments on 10/12/73 over the vigorous protests of some members of both parties.

The bill proposes that the General Accounting Office, an agency of Congress, audit the activities of the Federal Reserve System including reviews of the results of the system's programs and activities as well as the extent to which its objectives are being achieved.

The arguments against this proposal are well spelled out in the dissents to the Banking Committee Report No. 93-585 which along with a copy of H.R. 10265, is being mailed to you today.

The dissents tell the story. Coupling the needed extension of $5 billion of treasury borrowing power which expires 12/31/73 with the Patman audit proposals creates an unusual legislative situation from the standpoint of any veto.

I am writing to a number of Representatives expressing my views regarding this unwarranted effort to curtail the independent judgment of the board. A copy of my letter and the list of Representatives to whom I am writing are enclosed with this mailgram.

It is important that businessmen be heard on this issue. The timing of any views expressed is urgent because the matter is expected to be considered by the Rules Committee on Tuesday, 10/23 and by the full House on 10/24.

It may be that members of the Banking Committee who dissented will offer amendments limiting the auditing scope of the Patman bill. This would be helpful.

JOHN D. HARPER,
Chairman, The Business Roundtable.

Re H.R. 10265—John Harper's views.

DEAR MR. ———. The Patman-sponsored bill (H.R. 10265) to provide for an audit of the Federal Reserve Board and its banks and branches, including monetary policy decisions, should be opposed as seriously interfering with the work of the board and eroding its independence. By their very nature the activities for which the Federal Reserve has responsibility are highly skilled and of such a confidential nature that an audit type of exposure would be seriously counter-productive. This applies especially to policy discussions and transactions which are hardly a subject for auditing even though the results may be criticized.

In the business community the work of the Federal Reserve Board is considered to be ably conducted. A detail examination of its activities by the Comptroller General, probably with outside accountants and economists, would consume time of board personnel which should be devoted to the board's work. It would undoubtedly involve a platform for expressing opinions and second-guessing with respect to board policies and would generally interfere with the work of the board. Currently the board's positions are publicly detailed. We note the many visits to Capitol Hill by the chairman and other board members to make reports. The Federal Reserve System's current actions are broadly carried in the press, its policy decisions are made public within three months and minutes of deliberations are made public after five years.

The bill is an unwarranted effort to curtail the independence of the board by subjecting it to further congressional and executive political pressures and restraints. It should be defeated.

THE BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE,
October 18, 1973.

To: Members of the Business Rountable

The attached documents were referred to in John Harper's night letter sent you today.

JOHN POST.

[Attached was a copy of the Banking Committee's legislative repartee]

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 12, 1973]

BURNS OPPOSED GAO AUDIT OF FED

(By Jack Anderson)

Pipe-puffing Arthur Burns, chairman of the powerful Federal Reserve Board, doesn't want to open his books to government auditors.

When House Banking Committee Chairman Wright Patman introduced legislation to subject the Fed's fiscal operations to government audit, therefore, Burns quietly got on the phone to top bankers and urged them to bring pressure on Congress to kill the bill.

Competent sources have told us about Burns' telephone campaign and have supplied us with documentary evidence of one key call Under the massive assault by Burns and the bankers, the bill was successfully blocked.

The bill was the outgrowth of charges that the Fed was more interested in protecting the bankers than the public. Burns was absolutely opposed to allowing the General Accounting Office to scrutinize the Fed's books.

We have now obtained an internal memo detailing some of his backstage maneuvering. Dated "10/10/73 4:40 p.m.," it tells of a telephone message from John Lee of the New York Clearing House, a link between local banks and the Federal Reserve System.

The memo states that Lee "had a call from Gabriel Hauge (board chairman) of Manufacturers Hanover Trust. Mr. Hauge had a call from Arthur Burns, chairman of Fed. Mr. Burns asked Mr. Hauge if he could muster some support in New York to help the Fed repel a bill sponsored by Mr. Patman that would require full GAO audits of the Federal Reserve System."

Bankers, no matter how they feel about the Fed, are particularly vulnerable to its pressures. Dr. Burns had no difficulty mustering support to beat back the audit.

A spokesman for Burns said that Burns remembered the conversation with Hauge and that Burns "undoubtedly did mention" the bill, but did not "recollect the tone of the conversation" about lobbying.

Hauge agreed the audit bill "must have been part of the conversation." But like Burns, Hauge could not recall the references to lobbying. Hauge said he has opposed an audit of the Fed for many years.

Rep. Patman has charged over the past few months that Burns and the Fed mounted "an unprecedented effort" to sabotage the audit bill. Our discovery of the memo on the exact course of the campaign, however, is the first substantive evidence to back up Patman's charge.

We have also uncovered a Mailgram, sent to business leaders on Oct. 18 by John Harper, chairman of The Business Roundtable, an organization of big businessmen.

"It is important businessmen be heard on this issue . . ." Harper told his members. "By their very nature the activities for which the Federal Reserve has responsibility are highly skilled and of such a confidential nature that an audit type of exposure would be seriously counter-productive.'"

Over the years, the GAO has conducted hundreds of investigations of classified operations without breeching any secrets. This was a fact the big money chose to ignore.

Again, in this Congress, the legislative committee has reported out a bill—H.R. 7590—to provide for a full-scale audit of the Federal Reserve System, and again it has been stalled in the House Rules Committee.

Along with other Members, I have been very curious about this organization—the Business Roundtable—which seems to sweep out of the night, kill public interest legislation, and then disappear. Our curiosity has been piqued by its clout, its aim and the size of the corporations it represents.

The Business Roundtable is described this way in the New York Times of November 16, 1975:

The organization is the Business Roundtable, whose 158 corporate members range, alphabetically from the Allis Chalmers Corporation to Xerox Corporation. Its members include the three largest banks, seven of the largest oil companies, the largest steel companies, major retailing organizations and many of the largest utilities, including American Telephone and Telegraph Company.

The Busines Roundtable has an annual budget of "around $1.5 million," according to its executive director, John Post, although most expenses of its lobbying campaigns are borne (by companies) who send their executives to Washington to talk to members of Congress.

The money to run the Roundtable comes from the corporate members' dues, which range from $2,500 to $35,000 a year, depending on the size of the company, according to Mr. Post.

According to testimony submitted to the Subcommittee on Antitrust Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate on July 18, 1975, the Business Roundtable has 158 member companies and a 40-member policy committee, whose members are drawn from the companies. The membership currently stands at 164 companies. A list of the policy committee and the member companies is attached at the end of these remarks.

On January 15, 1975, Hobart Lewis, chairman and editor in chief of Reader's Digest, wrote to all Members of Congress informing them of an upcoming series of monthly ads on "economic education" prepared jointly by the Business Roundtable and researchers and writers from Reader's Digest. The Reader's Digest goes into more than one out of every four homes in America. Now that is clout.

Here is the way the National Journal describes the Business Roundtable in its April 27, 1974, edition:

[From the National Journal, Apr. 27, 1974]

THE BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE—KNOWING WHO'S DOING WHAT

The suite of offices is small: an outer room for the receptionist and an inner room for the staff (of one). There is nothing pretentious about the appointments. But the suite houses what could become the most potent business interest group in Washington, D.C.: The Business Roundtable.

Unlike the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) or the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the roundtable is selective about its membership. Only chairmen or chief executives of the country's biggest companies need apply.

The roundtable exists as a vehicle for these top executives to get involved personally in government activities which could affect their businesses.

The roundtable's method of operating is different from some other business lobbies. It picks and chooses its issues and its Washington representative, John Post, spends most of his time tracking issues which could be important to the members.

On those issues on which he thinks the roundtable can have an impact, Post tries to persuade the executives themselves to travel to Washington to make their case directly to the policy makers.

But Post is careful not to over-expose executives or to waste their clout on hopeless cases. He said that while he had been following the Federal Trade Commission's line of business proposal, he does not think the roundtable will take a direct role in the issue, particularly now that the authority to review the FTC's draft questionnaire has been taken from the Office of Management and Budget and vested in the General Accounting Office.

"If (Roy L.) Ash (director of OMB) had gotten involved in it, we might have had one (executive) try to talk to him about it," Post said. "But I wouldn't have them see Elmer B. Staats (comptroller general) about it."

ROUNDTABLE HISTORY

The roundtable, which has been around Washington for little more than a year, is an outgrowth of two organizations, the Labor Law Study Committee, formed in 1965 through the efforts of Roger M. Blough, former chairman of the board of U.S. Steel Corp., and the Construction Users Anti-Inflation Roundtable, a group of about 130 companies who "buy" construction, which was organized in the late 1960s when construction prices started rising steeply.

The central theme of the roundtable, Post said, is the effort of chief executives to strengthen the voice of business in society.

"The concept, as explained to the chief executives," Post said, "is that 'You have to know more about Washington, and you have to get involved.' "

The roundtable now has about 150 members, Post said, and each company pays a separate fee based on a formula which takes into account gross revenues and stockholder equity. The fees range from $2,500 to $35,000 annually.

The group takes few positions as a body. Instead, it concentrates on bringing the right executive to the right place at the right time.

"We want to be low key and helpful," Post said. "It's a matter of knowing who's doing what and only getting involved in it if some help is needed."

Congressional staff members who have had contact with Post say he is good at his job. "Post kept in closer touch on wage-price controls than anybody else I dealt with," said one Senate staff member who asked not to be identified. "He was very knowledgeable about every development that occurred. If there was discussion between offices on a new draft of a bill, he knew about it."

Post convinced four chief executives to

testify before the subcommittee of the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee, which was drafting controls legislation. He also arranged for the four men to meet privately with the subcommittee chairman, Sen. J. Bennett Johnston Jr., D-La., to make their case directly.

Convincing management: Post admitted, when asked directly, that one problem he has had is convincing chief executives of even the largest companies in the country that what the government does affects their operations.

"Many of them don't realize they're entitled to state their own opinions," Post said. "But we're getting more and more of them to come and testify."

He said that many U.S. business executives tend to rely on the NAM or the Chamber of Commerce to carry their fight. "But if the oil companies have learned anything," Post said, "it's that they can't put everything on Frank N. Ikard's shoulders." (Ikard is the president of the American Petroleum Institute.)

Finding a niche: This has made roundtable relationships with the chamber and the NAM somewhat uneasy. Although all three worked together on several recent issues, including wage-price controls, officials at the chamber and the NAM expressed some puzzlement at the role of the roundtable.

Several meetings have been held between Post and officials of the other two groups to work out a better relationship.

One NAM official, who would not speak for attribution, said he also had been told that some members of the roundtable were not pleased at the expanding role of the group.

Registering: This expanded role has inevitably brought more public attention on the roundtable's activities, and that has forced Post to change one aspect of his approach.

For example, he never has registered as a lobbyist, and when NJR asked him why, he said, "That's a question I kept asking my lawyer."

Post said his lawyer had tried to convince him that he did not engage in enough "lobbying" to be registered, but he said he had asked the lawyer to file the papers recently, "just so the question doesn't keep coming up."

One Senate staff member, who has dealt with Post, said that while the roundtable works like most other business lobbying groups, "It is easy to assume that they speak for business. In fact, they speak only for big business."

Policy Committee: According to roundtable stationery, the following chief executives form the group's Policy Committee: John D. Harper of Aluminum Co. of America; Blough; Fred J. Borch of General Electric Co.; Bert S. Cross of 3M Co.; John D. deButts of American Telephone and Telegraph Co.; Richard C. Gerstenberg of General Motors Corp.

Also, Shearon Harris of Carolina Power and Light Co.; J. B. Jackson of J. C. Penney Co. Inc.; J. K. Jamieson of Exxon Corp.; Reginald H. Jones of General Electric Co.; C. B. McCoy of E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Co.; David Packard of Hewlett-Packard Co.; J. Stanford Smith of the American Newspaper Publishers Association.

Also, Benjamin F. Biaggini of Southern Pacific Co.; Ronald C. Burnham of Westinghouse Electric Corp.; Henry Ford II of Ford Motor Co.; Robert S. Hatfield of Continental Can Co.; Brooks McCormick of International Harvester Co.; John G. McLean of Continental Oil Co.; Louis W. Menk of Burlington Northern Inc.

Also, Frank R. Milliken of Kennecott Copper Corp.; Shermer L. Sibley of Pacific Gas and Electric Co.; Donald B. Smiley of R. H. Macy and Co. Inc.; Edgar B. Speer of U.S. Steel Corp.; J. E. Swearingen of Amoco Production Co. (Standard Oil of Indiana); O. Pendleton Thomas of B. F. Goodrich Co.; C. C. Tillinghast Jr., of Trans World Airlines Inc.; Lynn A. Townsend of Chrysler Corp.

Also, Maurice J. Warnock of Armstrong Cork Co.; Thomas F. Willers of Champion International Corp.; F. Perry Wilson of Union Carbide Corp.; J. Robert Wilson of Kansas-Nebraska Natural Gas Co.; T. A. Wilson of Boeing Co.; and Arthur M. Wood of Sears, Roebuck and Co.

SOME OTHER TARGETS OF THE BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE:

The Fed audit bill has been a favorite target—it is stalled in the Rules Committee. The Business Roundtable has also been successful in stalling a major antitrust improvement in the House Rules Committee and having this Judiciary Committee bill "indefinitely postponed."

Eileen Shanahan described the legislation in the New York Times of November 16 this way:

The legislation killed 10 days ago by the lobbying of business Rountable members, together with the efforts of a few nonmember corporations, would have given the attorneys general of the 50 states authority to sue violators of antitrust law on behalf of the citizens of their state and to collect money damages.

The damages, which could run to many millions of dollars in some cases, would have been three times the amount of any overcharges that had resulted from company actions, such as price-fixing agreements, that had been found to be illegal.

The money would have been paid back to the persons injured by the illegal actions, insofar as they could be identified, and any left-over money would have been kept by the state to use for valid public purposes related to the injury inflicted on the state's citizens.

For example, damages collected from drug companies might have been used to finance public health services.

An unusual aspect of the Rountable's successful lobbying against this bill is that the measure was killed in the House Rules Committee, after its corporate opponents had succeeded in having the measure amended, but not in stopping it, in the House Judiciary Committee.

Very early in the first session of the 94th Congress, the Business Roundtable took aim at the Consumer Protection Agency legislation and, using all kinds of misleading devices—including a questionable poll—apparently affected the vote margin in the House. Consumer protection—like the audit bill—was high on the Business Roundtable's "Enemies List".

The Congressional Research Service—a division of the Library of Congress—made the following statement about the Business Roundtable-contracted poll:

On the basis of our examination, and for the aforementioned reasons, we conclude that the Business Roundtable study does not appear to present conclusive evidence that the public is opposed to the creation of the Consumer Advocacy Agency.

The public may favor the Consumer Advocacy Agency or oppose it, but it is not possible to use the . . . poll to arrive at a final conclusion on this matter.

Back in 1974, I remember that the Business Roundtable lobbied hard against the Federal Trade Commission when that agency attempted to upgrade its information-gathering about major corporations.

In the fall of 1975, the Business Roundtable took up the fight to kill the common situs picketing bill and apparently leaned heavily on President Ford.

In fact, on November 11, 1975, David Packard—who resigned in October as President Ford's chief campaign fundraiser—and who is the chief executive of Hewlett-Packard Co., a major defense contractor—with annual sales of $884,000,000—wrote to President Ford that the legislation was "causing a great deal of concern among all segments of business and industry."

According to the Washington Star of November 18, 1975, Packard told the President "Among those strongly opposed to the picketing bill are members of the prestigious Business Roundtable."

The Hewlett-Packard Corp. is a member company of the Business Roundtable. Mr. Packard is on its 40-member policy committee.

Whatever the merits of this legislation, it is a matter of record that the Business Roundtable position did prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose the right of the fat cats to lobby. But, I think it is important that this activity be out in the open so the public will know what is happening to its business.

THE BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE AND THE GAO AUDIT BILL

The bill to provide for a GAO audit of the Federal Reserve System—H.R. 7590—was reported out of the House Banking, Currency and Housing Committee in June 1975, after 700 pages of testimony in the Domestic Monetary Policy Subcommittee. The bill has 120 cosponsors—elected representatives. But they are not getting a chance to vote for this bill on the House floor because the bill is "indefinitely postponed" in the House Rules Committee. Why?

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the lobbying pressures which surround these audit proposals—pressures that crop up every time we get serious about checking on the Federal Reserve. We have seen the Business Roundtable footprints as well as those of other huge corporations and banks. The Boeing Co., annual sales of $3,730,000,000; Dresser Industries, annual sales of $1,390,000,000; the American Bankers Association, and a host of others have been weighing in with opposition to the audit.

Meanwhile the newspapers continue to be filled with stories about problem banks, severe regulatory problems, and the Congress sits here and twiddles its thumbs. We do not even have the most basic information about what these agencies do and that is because the lobbyists continue to prevail on these audit proposals.

Mr. Speaker, later I plan to insert in the RECORD the Business Roundtable membership submitted to the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee and updated by my staff this past week.

FEDERAL CRIMINAL VICTIMS AND WITNESSES ASSISTANCE ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSSO), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, today I am

introducing the Federal Criminal Victims and Witnesses Assistance Act. During the past 4 months the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice of the Committee on the Judiciary has conducted extensive hearings on victims of crimes legislation. Despite the importance of focusing on the victim, I had the feeling throughout the process that we were neglecting another important consumer of the criminal justice system—the witnesses in criminal cases. Thus, my bill attempts to rectify some of the problems that confront both groups when they become involved in the criminal justice system.

The need for legislation is clear, particularly in the case of the victim. It is the victim that, unfortunately, has become the forgotten person in the criminal justice system. After the headline "City Dweller Beaten and Robber, Hospitalized," we fail to hear any more about his or her plight. And yet it is the tragic aftermath of that crime that may leave lasting scars. Perhaps the individual's insurance policy does not cover this type of injury and the medical bills are paid out of his pocket. If the injuries are severe, more money will be lost because of time off from work. Ironically, the criminal may be released from jail, sometimes without posting bond, long before the victim leaves the hospital.

The victims, who pay taxes for protection, must pay once again when that protection fails them. And when they reach court, if they have the courage and stamina to confront the complicated and lengthy process, they may be even further victimized by the system that was supposedly designed to serve and protect them.

In 1968 the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Crime recommended a compensation program for victims. But today only one-fourth of the States have established any form of a compensation program. The programs that do exist vary widely in their eligibility requirements and compensation and in the procedures for filing for reimbursement. According to a recent survey conducted by the National District Attorney's Association, more than 60 percent of the victims did not even know that State compensation was available. Even more indicative of the restrictive reimbursement qualifications was the fact that more than 70 percent of the applicants failed to receive compensation. Thus, only 10 percent of all victims received any form of compensation.

My bill attempts to establish generally uniform requirements and procedures to insure that all victims, regardless of where they live, will receive appropriate compensation.

The bill includes a "bill of rights" for the victim, as suggested by the National District Attorney's Association, and it is already in use in some places. The victim will be informed of his rights just as the accused are made known of their rights by the police.

A printed card could be given to the witness that tells him or her that they have the right as a victim of crime to be free of intimidation, to be told about available compensation for court appearances and of compensation for injuries. They also have the right to be informed of social service agencies which may be of assistance and they are entitled to assistance by the criminal justice agencies.

A Federal Victims Compensation Commission as well as a grant program for the States will be set up. The Commission will process the applications of victims who have been physically injured during the commission of a specified Federal crime. The Federal Government will pay them directly.

Under the grant program, States must file their plan for compensation with the Department of Justice for approval. If the plan is approved, the Federal Government will finance 50 percent of the State's payment to the victim.

In the bill the authorization for the State grant program is twice the amount allocated for the Federal Commission. This reflects statistics from the Justice Department indicating that most victims would be compensated through State programs. In order to receive compensation the victim must cooperate with law officials.

The witness is often the victim himself, so we are not talking about an entirely different problem. But regardless of who the witness is, in my work in the past as an assistant State's attorney I saw far too many conscientious people who agreed to be witnesses in the criminal justice system become disillusioned with it. They are often subject to numerous trial delays, unexpected changes in trial dates, inconvenient court locations, and parking problems, for example. I have seen many cases dismissed because the witness finally says, "I have had it." Since witnesses sacrifice their time, perhaps their own safety, and a number of days pay in order to involve themselves in the system, they deserve better treatment.

Under this proposal, funds will be allocated to set up witness assistance centers to provide information on trial dates, parking facilities, transportation to court, and other items that will encourage witnesses to assist in a criminal trial.

Federal Witness Assistance Bureaus will be set up in every U.S. attorney's office and the Federal Government will provide 50 percent of the funds if a State wants to establish its own witness assistance center. In order to qualify for the funds States will submit their plan to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for approval.

At present many States fail to reimburse witnesses for their time. If there is a witness fee, it is nominal. Under this bill, reimbursement will be increased in Federal cases to roughly a day's pay: $25 for a fee as well as $20 per diem. To encourage States to establish adequate witness fees, the bill calls for the Federal Government to pay one-half of the amount that a State program pays material witnesses in a criminal trial.

This type of legislation is long overdue. At present, studies indicate that only two of every five crimes are even reported. Too many people have given up on the criminal justice system. We have got to get them involved again if we are to make any headway in our battle against crime. For no matter how much we improve the courts, increase the number of prisons, or crack down on the lawbreakers, our hands are tied without people willing to prosecute and serve as witnesses. When they do so, they deserve every consideration and the complete cooperation of their Government.

A summary of my bill follows:

SUMMARY OF THE FEDERAL CRIMINAL VICTIMS AND WITNESSES ASSISTANCE ACT

Section 2. Findings.

TITLE I

Part A—Federal Victim Compensation

Section 101. Victims Compensation Commission.

(a) Establishes the Commission. Three members, one of whom must be a lawyer. Members are appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b)–(f) Administrative items such as the seal, place of business, etc.

Section 102. Administration. These are the internal workings of the Commission. Power to appoint an Executive Director and General Counsel; promulgate rules and regulations; have liaisons with other federal agencies, and rent buildings for office space.

Section 103. Compensation of Victims.

(a) Commission shall order payment of compensation to a victim or intervenor for personal injuries or to the family of an intervenor or victim in case of death.

(b) Commission shall determine the amount of compensation.

(1) of an intervenor by figuring his net loss (defined on page 21) excludes pain and suffering explicity;

(2) of a victim by computing his pecuniary loss (defined on page 21 and 22); all reasonable medical expenses; loss of past and future earnings, not to exceed $150 per week. Funeral expenses are also compensable.

(c).

(d) Commission can withhold payments until the victim has expended his liquid assets.

(e) Commission can speed up the process for a needy victim and give him/her advance payments.

(f) Judgment is not subject to execution or attachment.

(g) Victim retains his right of action against the criminal.

(h).

Section 104. Limitations on Compensation.

(a) Claim must be filed within one year of injury or the victim forfeits his right to recovery unless the Commission finds good cause.

(b) Minimum pecuniary loss of $100 necessary for a recovery.

(c) Victim must report the crime to the police within 72 hours.

(d) Maximum recovery possible is $50,000.

(e) The Commission is authorized to reduce or rescind any order for compensation if the victim fails to cooperate with law enforcement officials.

(f)–(g) Criminals and accomplices cannot recover the injuries.

Section 105. Procedures.

(a) Commission is authorized to receive claims.

(b)–(g) power to issue subpeonas, etc.

Section 106. Crimes.

(a) Commission is authorized to compensate people who have been injured on federal property, or the crime is punishable under a federal statute.

(b) List of crimes.

(c) Cannot receive compensation for car, motorboat or aircraft accidents.

(d) A crime is considered committed even if the defendant lacks capacity.

Section 107. Compensation of Commission members.

Section 108. Definitions. Some of the definitions are very important, especially Nos.

5, 7, 13, 14, 15 (mental distress was included for rape victims who need psychiatric help, the bulk of their medical bills).

Section 109. Victims' Bill of Rights.

Part B—State Programs

Section 110. LEAA program authorized to make grants to qualified states.

Section 111. Grantee Eligibility. What a state must do to qualify for matching funds. (List on page 25.)

Section 112. Federal government will supply 50% of the state's payment to an eligible victim.

Section 113. Evaluation of State Programs. LEAA shall evaluate each qualified state program each year.

Part C—Authorization and Termination of Program

Section 114. (a) Federal Program.

(1) First year—$10 million.

(2) Second year—$15 million.

(3) Third year—$20 million.

(b) State Program:

(1) First year—$20 million

(2) Second year—$30 million

(3) Third year—$40 million

Section 115. Program is authorized thru September 30, 1979. This was put in to insure that the program will be properly evaluated by Congress before it becomes entrenched in the bureaucracy and goes on spending into eternity.

TITLE II

Part A—Federal witness assistance

Section 201. Establishment of Bureaus. In every U.S. Attorney's Office there will be a Bureau with no more than 3 people. These people will work in the Bureau full-time.

Section 202. Bureaus to Create Programs. Each Bureau must create a witness assistance program to encourage people to testify in court. (Take note of model program already tested by LEAA.)

Section 203. Justice Department Approval of Programs. Before implementation of any program the Bureau must submit its plans to the Department.

Part B—State program

Authorized to make grants and provide technical assistance to the States to enable the States to establish witness assistance programs.

Section 205. Grantee Eligibility. State Attorney General may submit a plan to the LEAA Administrator. Can be for his state alone.

Section 206. Grants to be made. When the Administrator approves a plan, he shall make grants to the State that submitted the plan. 50% funding level to cover the States total cost of establishing and operating the program.

Section 207. Evaluation. Administrator shall evaluate each plan annually.

Part C—Authorization and termination of Title II programs

Section 208. Such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Title.

Section 209. Both federal and state programs will terminate on September 30, 1979.

TITLE III

Witness fees

Section 301. Increasing federal fees. (See last page of bill; it is self-explanatory.)

Section 302. Grants for State Fee Increases. LEAA Administrator is authorized to make grants to states that compensate witnesses. Must be at same level as federal compensation.

SUMMARY OF BILL CLARIFYING THE SOCIAL SECURITY TAX STATUS OF MEMBERS OF CERTAIN MISSION SOCIETIES

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, the status of members of certain mission societies under the Federal Insurance Contribution Act has become confusing as a result of an Internal Revenue Service ruling. In an effort to clarify the situation, I am today introducing a measure which would permit these individuals to pay social security taxes as self-employed persons. So that all Members might familiarize themselves with the need for this change, Mr. Speaker, I ask that a statement on the bill be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

SUMMARY OF BILL CLARIFYING THE SOCIAL SECURITY TAX STATUS OF THE MEMBERS OF CERTAIN MISSION SOCIETIES

The Internal Revenue Code does not treat ministers and members of religious orders as regular employees for social security purposes. Instead, they are regarded as self-employed people. As a result, they pay less social security tax than the combined total that would be paid by the employer and the employee if they were treated as regular employees. In addition, ministers and members of religious orders are entitled to be exempted, on account of religious principles, from payment of tax entirely, even though they are self-employed.

The Internal Revenue Service has ruled that many Protestant missionaries are not "ministers" because those missionaries are not authorized to perform all the religious functions which ministers of their faith may perform in the United States. For example, many missionaries who are women are limited in authority by their churches, and so do not qualify as ministers. In addition, in almost all cases Protestant missionaries are not members of religious orders. On the other hand, in the Roman Catholic Church, such missionary functions are frequently performed by members of religious orders, who thereby avoid the combined social security taxes on employers and employees.

As a result of this distinction, American supporters of those Protestant missionaries must pay more support money than is needed for Catholic missionaries or for Protestant missionaries who meet the Service's definition of a minister. Furthermore, many Protestant missionaries and their churches are uncertain whether they should pay social security taxes as regular employees or as self-employed persons.

This bill would remedy the situation by placing missionary members of mission societies on a par with members of religious orders for purposes of the social security and self-employment taxes.

To prevent abuse, the bill defines a mission society as a tax-exempt organization that is sponsored or availed of by one or more churches or church denominations, and requires that more than half of the members of the society be religious missionaries in foreign countries.

LET US EXAMINE OUR OWN UNSAVORY TERMS AND PRACTICES BEFORE WE CONDEMN OTHERS OUT OF HAND

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT) is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, recent talk and editorial comments attributing "bribery" to several companies dealing with foreign purchasers of our products have attracted considerable attention.

Maybe we are discussing "basic morality" and "principles of international trade," but maybe we are engaged in an exercise in loose semantics.

We Americans, or some of us, use words, terms, practices and customs that, at least, are not clear or misunderstandable to foreign persons who often deal with us in international transactions or who must deal with us right here at home in intrastate commerce and interpersonal transactions, and at worst, are considered unsavory, unscrupulous or even unethical and unfair to them.

One definition of "bribery" suggested to me is "an act by a 'special interest group' that promises support or threatens opposition to an elected official if he or she votes for or against the demands of the 'special interest' group."

Perhaps there are other phrases, words and situations that all of us use quite casually which bear new discussion and evaluation and equal attention and space.

To bribery we could add: Commissions, fees, interest, carrying charges, tariffs, prepayment charges, discounts, points, finder's fees, contingent fees, minimum wages, service charges, tips, export fees, import fees, taxes, duties, assessments, subsidies, agent fees, campaign contributions, dues, prepayment penalties, late charges, dues checkoffs, patronage, tax credits, tax exemptions, deductions, entitlements, rebates, emoluments, payoffs, media payola, application fees, season ticket preferences, depreciation allowances, markups, deposits, travel expenses, brokerage fees, entertainment costs and expenses, advertising expenses, promotional expense, influence peddling, politics, consulting fees, barter, breakage, subordination, fringe benefits, lender's fees, legacies, exchange rates, renegotiated bids, bankruptcy, closing costs, incentive pay, bonuses, overhead charges, affirmative action, hospitality, freebies, quotas, monopolies, sick leave, cartels, prime rates, family preferences, confiscation, libel, condemnation, civil disobedience, deficit financing, liberation, defaults on political loans, slush funds, trade secrets and the disclosure of them, leaking classified information and publishing it, greasing palms, puffing, and so on and on.

This is only a partial list of a long litany of terms and practices which are not understood, and often questioned, by citizens and aliens, the naive and sophisticated, the honest and the dishonest, the international traders and the local consumers.

It is one thing to be Pollyannish and puritanical. It is something else to be cynical and condemnative. It is quite another thing to be inquisitive and understanding and to keep some reasonable perspective and to develop better practices and more precise definitions of terms we banter about.

During the McCarthy era it was quite popular to suspect and charge everyone else with being a Communist. Even Communists got attention, or diverted attention, by doing it. Today it is apparently again generally popular, and an easy means of getting attention and space, to suspect and charge everyone else of being a crook. Even crooks get attention, or divert attention, by doing it.

Exposure and open discussion can add perspective and reaffirm basic ethical and moral principles. Some of our vaunted practices are perceived as unsavory and require considerable explanation among foreign peoples, as well as among ourselves. Making judgments, finding scapegoats and discrediting others may not be as salutory as reexamining our own practices, in every activity, and redefining our principles. There may be some clear and understandable distinctons between practices that injure no one and practices which degrade the results and damage all of those involved. Before we permit ourselves too much self-adulation by finding fault with others and their ways of doing business perhaps we should review our own amazing lexicon or bewildering customs and practices.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR HOMEMAKERS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG), is recognized for 15 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing H.R. 11840, a bill which provides social security benefits for our Nation's homemakers. This legislation extends long overdue recognition to the work performed by homemakers and its economic value to our society. By establishing a separate social security account in the name of the homemaker, my bill insures that those who work inside the home as well as those who work outside the home will receive social security benefits upon retirement.

Since I introduced this concept in an earlier bill when I first came to Congress, and in the following session as H.R. 252, my office has been deluged with mail from older women throughout the country who receive no or very little social security benefits despite long years of service as a homemaker. Most of these women are divorced or widowed.

Despite the increased participation of women in the labor market, the majority of women are still homemakers. These women get no social security in their own right, but merely share in their husband's benefits provided they remain married for 20 years and their husband chooses to retire at age 65. Women divorced prior to their 20th wedding anniversary get no social security benefits. Even those spouses who meet the marriage requirement get no benefits until the wage earner claims his benefits. And even among those women who are wage earners, many do not earn a sufficiently high salary to secure greater benefits than those received as their husband's wife. Seventeen percent of retiring female workers in 1970 were receiving benefits based on their husband's earning rather than their own.

In 1974, 54 percent of the women beneficiaries were receiving social security benefits based on their own earnings records while 46 percent of the women received benefits based on the earnings of their husbands, either as wives or widows. Each of these groups will benefit by extending social security to homemakers.

Women who spend part of their career working outside the home and part as homemakers will be eligible for higher benefits upon retirement since they will be credited with an imputed wage for the years spent working inside the home rather than averaging in zero earnings during this period. The homemaker who has never worked outside the home will receive, for the first time, a benefit upon retirement based on her own entitlement. She will receive this benefit regardless of her marital status and thus is freed from the dependence on the earnings of her husband, their continued marriage and his timing of retirement. Widowed homemakers will benefit also from the option of receiving social security benefits based on their own service or receiving those based on the earnings of their deceased spouse, since the option of receiving homemaker benefits permits them to retain social security benefits despite remarriage.

There is no dispute that homemakers perform valued services for their family and society. Studies estimate the imputed value of homemaker services at 21 percent of the gross national product. Yet these workers are excluded from social security protection because their work is unpaid; the result is dependency upon the husbands' earnings. Moreover, if a homemaker becomes disabled, or separated, abandoned or divorced, neither she nor her family can collect social security benefits to compensate for the loss of her services. The failure to provide the homemaker with a social security account in her own right not only reinforces the stereotype of the dependent wife but also denigrates the important contribution of the homemaker to her family, her husband's career and to society.

The urgent need for this legislation is poignantly illustrated by a letter I received from Mrs. Laura Brock of Philadelphia, Pa. In recounting the travail that she has suffered Mrs. Brock speaks for many other women who have experienced similar difficulties. I would like to take this opportunity to share this letter with my colleagues and reprint it here followed by the text of H.R. 11840 the Social Security for Homemakers bill and an analysis of the bill:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ABZUG: I plead with you, in the name of God, and as a woman to read this letter, and if by Chance you care, then I beg of you to help the thousands of women who like me are forgotten, and cast aside to become a public burden because of an unjust law in our social security system.

I have written many letters to Congressmen, Commissioner of social security, Senator Frank Church who in turn passed my letters on to the Committee of Aging but to no avail, because no one in my government really cares.

After 38 years of marriage, my exspouse found someone younger—took off to Florida, and in 1972 obtained a divorce.

For 38 years social security was put aside for me, according to the law being married these many years, but the social security law so states, that I cannot claim social security, unless my exspouse so retires at age 65.

My exspouse has so decided that he will not claim his social security at 65, thus denying me any rights to his claim.

At age 65 my exspouse will receive a pension from a bank where he was assistant vice president, and did work for 25 years.

The amount of his pension will be near $400.00 per month. He is now in Real estate, which is not hard work and so with his pension and work in real estate he has no need for his social security which would in turn tie his hands to the amount of income he could make.

He has no need for medicare because he is covered by an insurance policy that covers all his needs in time of sickness.

Thus after 38 years I live in poverty, being a burden to my children, and being a public burden, in receiving medicaid, and food stamps.

Many, many women are left in this same position as I where the husband continues to work past 65, denying his exwife the right to social security and medicare.

Social security is given out to put children through college when they could be working and helping support the family, and thus earning wages to put themselves through college at night. I cannot deny them this right, but in the name of God what about the forgotten wife of 38 years of marriage, who cannot work, or provide for herself, who is left without a home, and must become a public, and a painful burden to her children.

I live in a house owned by my soninlaw, who has allowed me to live rent free since the divorce in 1972. I pay all the utilities from the $100.00 per month alimony there is little or nothing left.

Now my soninlaw wishes to sell the property, as he has every right, I have been a burden to him. Also, I can only ask God to bless him for the help he has given me.

Welfare sent me to apply for supplementary social security, I was turned down, because I was living rent free. I beg of you to help me and the many others to change this unjust law of social security. Help me to lift my head in dignity, and with out shame.

I was a mother, a wife, nurse, cook, house cleaner and all the rest that goes with marriage for 38 years. My reward is poverty, shame, insecurity, fear, because the social security laws so state, I cannot claim social security or receive medicare because my exspouse holds this power in his hands, denying me any right to file for social security in his name until he is ready to retire. This law is so cruel that an expouse can still control the destiny and fate, of the forgotten wife of so many years.

Please, I beg of you to change this merciless law take this power that they hold over their exspouses heads, and give me back my dignity, release me from my fears, of not knowing where I'm Going to live next in the ghetto? Wipe away the pain of being a burden to my children. In the name of God *Care*, not just for me, but for the thousands of others who too, must bend to the power of the law, put into the hands of exspouses please let me live my last few years in dignity.

Help us. God bless you.

Sincerely,

LAURA BROCK.

Analysis of Social Security for Homemakers bill:

Eligibility—Any person between 18 and 65 who conducts or supervises the affairs of a household without pay for one or more persons, one of whom is a wage earner. All persons performing household services are eligible for these benefits regardless of sex or marital status. The person for whom household services are performed may be the spouse of the homemaker or other relative including parent, grandparent, sibling, child, aunt or uncle, niece or nephew.

Imputed Wage—The amount of wages to the homemaker shall be computed as

the average wage currently being paid in the labor market for the various services performed by the homemaker according to a formula. This formula shall be established by the Secretary of HEW after public hearings and it shall include but not be limited to the following occupations: nursemaid, housekeeper, cook, dishwasher, laundress, food buyer, gardner, chauffeur, maintenance personnel, seamstress, dietitian, practical nurse, and accounting clerk.

Funding—Although a homemaker has neither salary nor employer, her work benefits our entire society. This bill incorporates this concept by permitting the homemaker benefits to be funded from general revenue. No further increase in the payroll tax would be required.

Implementation—Every homemaker would have an account in her own name which is retained regardless of separation, divorce, death or remarriage. The earning credits accumulated as a homemaker could be added to if the individual later works outside the home. This is especially important because many working women drop out of the labor force for some length of time to rear their children and then return to work. Under this plan these women would continue to accumulate social security credit as homemakers. This will result in continuous coverage and higher benefits for working women as well as independent benefits for those who remain homemakers.

This legislation is based on the premise that homemakers contribute valued services to the economy and are entitled to social security in their own right for the unpaid work they perform. It is time that their work be given dignity and their personal investment in marriage and family be given legal recognition.

TEXT OF SOCIAL SECURITY FOR HOMEMAKER BILL

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide coverage for homemakers under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program

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

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress finds that the work performed by homemakers in households contributes significantly to the economy of the Nation and, therefore, that homemakers are entitled to coverage and benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and medicare systems.

(b) The Congress further finds that homemakers should be entitled to qualify for social security benefits in their own right, and to maintain independent accounts accumulating credits toward such benefits for their work performed inside the home.

SEC. 2. (a) Title II of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"HOMEMAKER SERVICE

"SEC. 232. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, for purposes of determining entitlement to and the amount of any monthly benefit for any month after the month in which this section is enacted, or entitlement to and the amount of any lump-sum death payment in the case of a death occurring after such month, payable under this title on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of any individual, and for purposes of section 216(i)(3), such individual shall be deemed to have performed employment, and to have been paid remuneration therefor in an amount determined under subsection (c) (in addition to the wages and net earnings from self-employment, if any, actually paid to or derived by him or her), in each month during all of which he or she was a homemaker (within the meaning of subsection (b)). This subsection shall not be applicable in the case of any monthly benefit or lump-sum payment if a larger such benefit or payment, as the case may be, would be payable without its application.

"(b) For purposes of this title, an individual shall be considered as a homemaker (and as performing homemaker service) during any month if—

"(1) throughout such month such individual, not for a wage or salary, conducts or supervises the affairs of a household which is being maintained for another person who (or for two or more other persons at least one of whom) is engaged in full-time employment or self-employment or is otherwise engaged in full-time gainful activity as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary;

"(2) the other person (or at least one of the other persons) referred to in paragraph (1) is such individual's spouse, parent, child, brother, sister, aunt, uncle, niece, nephew, grandparent, or grandchild; and

"(3) such individual (A) is not less than 18 years of age (at the beginning of such month) nor more than 65 years of age (at the close of such month), and (B) is not otherwise engaged in full-time employment or self-employment or otherwise engaged in full-time gainful activity as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"(c)(1) The amount of the remuneration which an individual is deemed to have been paid for homemaker service under subsection (a) with respect to any month, for purposes of this title, shall be an amount representing the average wages currently being paid in the labor market for services of the kind customarily performed by homemakers, as determined and published by the Secretary in the manner provided in paragraph (2) on the basis of the formula established under paragraph (3).

"(2) The Secretary, on the basis of data and statistics which shall be furnished by the Secretary of Labor and made public, and in accordance with the formula established under paragraph (3), shall determine for each quarter the amount of the remuneration which an individual will be deemed to have been paid for homemaker service under subsection (a) with respect to any month in such quarter, and shall publish the amount so determined in the Federal Register.

(3) Within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary, after holding public hearings and giving all interested persons a reasonable opportunity to present their views, shall develop and establish a formula designed to reflect appropriately, in the amount of the remuneration which an individual will be deemed to have been paid in any month for homemaker service under subsection (a), the average wages being paid in the labor market for each of the various types of services which are customarily performed by homemakers, including (but not limited to) the average wages being paid to nursemaids, housekeepers, cooks, dishwashers, laundresses, food buyers, gardeners, chauffeurs, maintenance personnel, seamstresses, dieticians, practical nurses, and accounting clerks. The formula thus developed and established shall be published in the Federal Register.

"(d) The Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe such regulations and take such other actions as may be necessary or appropriate to assure that the objectives of this section will be achieved, giving particular attention to the development and implementation of effective methods for identifying and securing information from individuals performing homemaker service, establishing and maintaining accurate records of such service in accordance with section 205(c), and facilitating proof of homemaker status.

"(e) There are authorized to be appropriated from time to time, to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, such sums as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare deems necessary for any fiscal year, on account of—

"(1) any amounts paid or to be paid during such fiscal year from such Trust Funds under titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act solely by reason of the coverage of homemakers pursuant to this section,

"(2) the additional administrative expenses resulting or expected to result therefrom, and

"(3) any loss in interest to such Trust Funds resulting from the payment of such amounts,

in order to place each of such Trust Funds in the same position at the end of such fiscal year as the position in which it would have been if the preceding provisions of this section had not been enacted."

(b) Section 210 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"HOMEMAKER SERVICE

"(p) The term 'employment' shall, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), include the performance of homemaker service within the meaning of section 232."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by section 2 shall apply with respect to service performed (and remuneration paid or deemed to be paid) in months in calendar quarters beginning more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"INSIDE THE AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION'S ANNUAL BACCHANALIA"

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned about the status and activities of military associations. An article appearing in the current issue of Rolling Stone magazine reinforces my concern.

Entitled "Inside the Air Force Association's Annual Bacchanalia," the article was written by Lucian K. Truscott IV. Mr. Truscott focuses his attention on the Air Force Association, although the issues he raises are applicable to the other service organizations.

I commend Mr. Truscott's observations to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

OPERATION GREASY PALM—INSIDE THE AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION'S ANNUAL BACCHANALIA

(By Lucian K. Truscott IV)

Lieutenant General Kenneth L. Tallman entered the lobby of the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C. on November 14th, 1975, the first day of the Air Force Association's (AFA) convention, surrounded by a blue covey of majors, lieutenant colonels and colonels. Tallman is probably the most powerful man in the Air Force, next to the chief of staff himself. He has achieved a position in the Pentagon comparable to that of

patronage chief for a big-city mayor. He controls the job market in the Air Force.

Tallman, 50, a stocky man with a crew cut and tightly lined face, stiffened his back and briefly studied a slide-show display featuring the AFA's "Airman of the Year" award winners.

"How's it going, chief?" a senior colonel asked with worshipful familiarity.

"Fine. Damn fine. How about yourself, Jimmy? How's the little woman?" Tallman glanced down at the toes of his black, spit-shined military shoes. They reflected perfectly the tiny lights in the cathedral-style ceiling. He noticed the blue covey shift its gaze downward, staring at the twinkling pinpricks of yellow on black. Tallman looked up and grinned.

On cue the colonel replied, sounding like a quick mimic of Tallman. "Fine. Damn fine, sir. Looks like we're going to get a good turnout, doesn't it, sir?"

"Sure does. Fine turnout. Damn fine. We're running buses over from the Pentagon and from Andrews and Bolling Air Force bases every morning."

Each year the AFA convention gives Air Force biggies a chance to mingle with Air Force littlies. Tallman could look forward to four more days of special attentions. He had every right to his smile of good feeling and high expectation.

Except for one technicality. There is a reasonable probability he was breaking the law.

On the surface the AFA is a kind of Rotary Club for flyboys. The AFA describes itself as a professional and educational organization comprised of active and reserve Air Force people, Pentagon civilians and civilians from the aerospace defense industries. The Association of the United States Army (AUSA) is a similar organization for the Army. The Marine Corps has two such clubs and the Navy also has one.

All five military associations maintain Washington headquarters. Each holds an annual convention, publishes expensively produced magazines and describes itself as a professional and educational organization. All are tax-exempt. (There are at least 16 lesser associations serving such military groups as the Army airborne, military surgeons, military engineers and reservists from all the services.) The military associations have a total membership of 815,293 and a combined annual budget of $10,511,033, according to a recent study by the Library of Congress.

That the major military services have their own versions of the Elk or Rotary Clubs is hardly extraordinary. What makes these organizations special is their real function—lobbying for the defense budget. At the AFA convention in 1975, members adopted policy positions criticizing the SALT talks, the Turkish Arms Embargo, the Senate's investigation of the intelligence community, the Helsinki, Conference and amnesty.

Such lobbying efforts are okay for nonmilitary people. But under Department of Defense regulations and federal law, participation by military personnel and defense department civilians might be illegal.

Membership drives for the AUSA and the AFA are often carried out by active-duty personnel at military bases around the world. This is a direct violation of the U.S. Code, Title 18, 602 and 607, that prohibits soliciting, receiving for or giving to any other officer, employee or person paid from federal funds, any contribution, subscription, or assessment for any political purpose, or for the promotion of any political object. Clearly, membership funds solicited from Army and Air Force personnel can be interpreted as support for AFA and AUSA policies against amnesty and for arms. The year AUSA president James W. Woodruff Jr., in his address to the convention (attended by 6000 AUSA members), challenged "every member in this association to join with me . . . to put our membership up over 100,000 where it belongs. We have the tools to do the job if only we will put forth the effort." If any member accepts the challenge, he will be in violation of the law.

Two years ago General Lucius D. Clay Jr., commander of the Aerospace Defense Command, sent a telex to units in his command encouraging them to join the AFA. It read as follows: "Subject: Air Force Association membership drive. Request status of Air Force Association membership drive. Request number of personnel contacted and number of new memberships be included in weekly activity reports for the month and first report in April. General L. D. Clay Jr., Commander, Aerospace Defense Command, has requested our support in the Air Force Association 1974 'Blue Suit' membership campaign to be conducted during March 1974. This is a professional orgnization for the Air Force, every officer and airman should become acquainted with its programs and objectives and be afforded the opportunity to voluntarily join this fine organization. The 1974 AFA goal is 15,000 men, active duty members. If this objective is met, the AFA membership will stand at approximately 120,000 members, equally balanced between active duty and nonactive duty personnel. Major Rutledge is the coordinator for the 1974 campaign. Select a project officer for your unit membership drive; send his name, organization and telephone number. This project merits your personal attention."

Such encouragement from a four-star general in military circles is rather plain. The Clay telex violates both the spirit and the letter of U.S. Code, Title 18, 602 and 607.

Though the Army and the Air Force are loathe to admit it, official encouragement such as General L. D. Clay's and the assignment of active duty project officers for AFA and AUSA membership campaigns go on within military commands the world over. When I was in the Army in 1970, I was simply ordered by my brigade commander to join the AUSA or expect an appropriate notation on my efficiency report. Many acquaintances told me of similar experiences. According to Senator William Proxmire, such membership drives for the AFA and the AUSA go on all the time.

Military aircraft and ground transportation have been regularly used to ferry military personnel and Defense Department civilians to and from functions sponsored by military assoociations around the United States, in violation of Department of Defense Regulation 4515.13–R. A report of the comptroller general of the United States entitled "Alleged Use of Military Aircraft for Other than Official Purposes," dated September 5th, 1975, told of frequent allegations that military planes were being used for unofficial purposes. The comptroller general found evidence which "raised serious questions as to whether some of the flights were for official government business. This is especially true of the Navy's 1974 Tailhook Reunion in Las Vegas, Nevada."

The chief of Naval Operations announced his support for the Tailhook Reunion in a July 23rd, 1974, message to subordinate commands, and stated that Naval air transportation could be used to attend the reunion. The comptroller general found that 64 Naval aircraft were used and $191,000 of taxpayer money was spent in an apparent violation of DOD Regulation 4515.13–R.

In November 1973 Proxmire's office calculated that the Pentagon spent $131,649 to support the national convention of the Reserve Officers' Association that year. (The Reserve Officers' Association is a military organization similar to the AFA and AUSA.) The money included pay and allowances and per diem for those who attended, the cost of military aircraft and ground transportation used and other miscellaneous expenses. The convention, which in no way was officially sanctioned by the Department of Defense, was held in Las Vegas, Nevada.

The office of Congressman Les Aspin found a similar apparent abuse of DOD Regulation 4515.13-R in March 1975. Air Force ground transportation and aircraft were used to ferry the secretary of the Air Force, the general counsel of the Air Force and 24 Air Force generals to the AFA charity ball held at the Beverly Wilshire Hotel in Beverly Hills, California, on October 26th, 1974.

"The list reads like a *Who's Who* of the Air Force," an Aspin staffer reported. "Practically every major commander in the Air Force was there." Yet in a letter to Aspin, Colonel James J. Shepard, chief of the Air Force's Congressional Inquiry Division of the Office of Legislative Liaison, suggested the appearance of 24 generals and two top Department of Defense civilian officials in Beverly Hills on the same date was a big coincidence. According to Colonel Shepard, they all happened to be in L.A. for the "rollout" of the prototype of the B–1 bomber, which had occurred earlier the same day. Shepard gave no estimate of taxpayer cost for the charity ball.

If Department of Defense military or civilian personnel accept goods, services or favors from defense industries they are violating military law under the DOD Standards of Conduct. A recent disclosure that Northrop Corporation, a major Air Force defense contractor (and industrial associate of the AFA), has invited top military and civilian brass to a duck shooting preserve indicates a violation of law. Former secretary of defense James Schlesinger admitted the Northrop case may be only "the tip of the iceberg." Air Force and Army officers frolicking at so-called "hospitality suites" run by defense contractors at both the AFA and AUSA conventions last year is another example. The hospitality suites also appear to violate Department of Defense directive 5500.7, which proscribes accepting corporate giveaways.

Certain civilian staff members of the military associations have been granted DOD security clearances so they can receive classified briefings on weapons procurement. This is an apparent violation of the DOD's "need to know" doctrine. According to a well-placed Pentagon source the AFA and AUSA do not qualify under any provision for a security clearance, much less any "need to know" classified information.

The classified briefings given to AFA and AUSA staffers are denied to groups like the Center for Defense Information, a discriminatory practice in favor of pro-defense spending groups over reformist defense groups—a violation of DOD directive 5500.2, which prohibits the favoring of one association or organization over another."

But General Tallman and his friends at the AFA gathering last November didn't seem too concerned about the military laws as they moved through four days of conventioneering and carnival hucksterism provided by 52 defense contractors. Two huge exhibition halls in the Sheraton Park were jammed with an arcade of super-deluxe weapon pinball machines and other games and toys. Clusters of blue-suited boys bent over devices which simulated landing a jet in zero-visibility conditions or loading ammunition into the new 30-millimeter cannon. The Martin Marietta display offered a jet cockpit mockup with two television screens simulating an attack mission at twice the speed of sound. On the first run, with the cockpit bucking as if it were buffeted by flak, fixing the weapon cross hairs on the target was almost impossible. On the second mission, using Martin Marietta's newly developed "Area-Coordinator," a computer solved the problem by fixing the weapon on target. The man who ran the display described the device as: "One pilot, one pass, one pod, one kill."

Everywhere young women in miniskirts and go-go boots escorted VIPs or adorned equipment displays. AFA waiters rushed from B–1 bomber to F–16 to Fairchild A–10 carrying huge trays of martinis and Manhattans. Strangely, no one was drinking them. Later,

in the Park Pub, a dank little basement bar, a couple of retired colonels explained the teetotalism. Word had come down from "upstairs" at the Pentagon that public drinking by Air Force personnel is now officially frowned on. "They've turned the whole damn Air Force into a bunch of closet boozers," growled one retired colonel.

On the second night of the convention, President Gerald Ford made an appearance in an upstairs ballroom, addressing the AFA convention's "Salute to Congress" reception. According to Edgar Ulsamer, senior editor of *Air Force Magazine*, the AFA publication, the president spent almost an hour mingling with "Air Force, aerospace industry and AFA leaders." Also present were more than 100 representatives and senators, including Speaker of the House Carl Albert.

The president, who is an AFA honorary life member, keynoted his address to the reception by observing that "we must be strong enough—and we *will* be strong enough—to make certain that the United States is second to none. Period. That is, in my opinion, the best way to ensure that we keep the peace, now and in the future." Ford singled out the Turkey arms embargo and the AFA's position on the need for strategic strength despite the SALT talks, for special praise. The policy resolutions had been passed the day before, proving, at least in the case of the president, that the AFA did not have to go very far, or wait very long, for its lobbyist activities to take hold.

The military associations are the social meeting ground of the military/industrial complex, and it is because of the contacts made at functions like the AFA convention that so many retired military men wind up working in procurement positions in defense industries.

According to a study made by the Council on Economic Priorities, between 1968 and 1973, more than 1400 high-ranking military officers and civilian employees of the Department of Defense left the Pentagon to accept jobs with defense contractors. Three hundred and seventy-nine of these transferees had been working in apparent conflict of interest situations. The CEP study listed the following corporations among the top ten employers of former Department of Defense personnel, who, by transferring from government to private industry, were in conflict of interest: Computer Sciences, Boeing, Lockhed, Hughes Aircraft, Northrop, Rockwell International, McDonnell Douglas, LTV, Litton and RCA. All ten are industrial associates of the AFA and eight had equipment briefings at the AFA convention.

"The social function of the AFA and the other military associations is perhaps more important than the active lobbying they do," said one high-ranking Pentagon official with a background in arms procurement. "As a social unit, they are an incredible force to be reckoned with by Congress."

The question remains, of course, to what extent Congress is coping with the power of the defense lobbyists represented by the military associations and their $10 million-plus annual budget. Senator Proxmire and Congressman Aspin are engaged in an almost never-ending struggle with the Department of Defense over abuses by the military associations, in particular the AFA and the AUSA. Proxmire sent a letter to the office of Air Force Chief of Staff David C. Jones asking who attended the AFA convention (brass in particular), what duty or leave status they were on, and whether or not Air Force ground or air transportation had been used to get them to the convention. First, Proxmire received an evasive written reply from the chief of staff. He was not satisfied. So two colonels came to Proxmire's office and met with a top staff assistant, that the Pentagon had sent them to cool off the senator. Next a general stopped by Proxmire's office and asked that the inquiry be dropped.

"This whole AFA business is very, *very* sensitive," said the top Proxmire staffer. "Practically the entire Air Force top military and civilian command was at the convention. But it's the same way every time. Questioning the Pentagon on the AFA or the AUSA is like touching a nerve." Bill Broydrick, legislative assistant to Congressman Aspin, told the same story. "It's like pulling teeth," he said. "They are so uptight about the AFA and the AUSA, you wouldn't believe it. All we get from the service information people at the Pentagon is stalling and obfuscation."

Perhaps the touchiest area is the tax-exempt status of the military associations. All the military associations are tax-exempt, nonprofit organizations under special tax codes passed by Congress. Recently Senator Proxmire's office began investigating such exemptions. One Proxmire staffer has described the exemptions as a legal "bottomless pit." He said no committee of Congress appears to have oversight of the military associations, and that before Proxmire, no one had ever questioned them.

Yet it seems clear the military associations serve the defense industries; they function like an informal union for the military brass, running interference with Congress and lobbying for plenty of new hardware for their members to play with.

The association magazines, a primary lobbying tool for the AFA and the AUSA, are supported in large part by lavish ads paid by defense contractors. These magazines run regular features on the risks of detente and the need for a higher defense budget. They are sent free of charge to influential representatives and senators sympathetic to the cause, and articles from their pages sometimes appear in the *Congressional Record*. A recent 90-page edition of the AFA magazine contained 11 full-page ads from defense contractors, including Lockheed, Boeing, Singer, Motorola, Fairchild, LTV, Garrett Electronics, McDonnell Douglas and E-Systems. The September issue contained 150 pages with 41 full-page defense industry ads. The magazines are expensively printed on slick paper, professionaly written and edited.

The AFA and AUSA are especially impressive compared to nearly penniless citizen groups like SANE, the Coalition on National Priorities and Project on Budget Priorities, and the Center for Defense Information. They are sophisticated, better financed, highly organized and immune to public pressure. To the public at large, they are legitimate professional and educational military associations. Their true purpose is obscured behind a smokescreen of public relations and platitudes; they are lobbyists for the big defense industries, that part of our economy which costs taxpayers $100 billion a year.

SENATOR HUMPHREY'S OUTSTANDING LEGISLATIVE RECORD

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, an article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak in the February 9 edition of the Washington Post has caught my attention.

One paragraph of this article reports on a recent television appearance by consumer advocate Ralph Nader. This portion of the article follows:

Nader, interviewed on NBC's "Today" program Jan. 9, gave a 43-word reply when asked his opinion of Humphrey. Describing him as "a fine, ebullient person" who "exudes compassion," Nader then expressed muted criticism. He doubted whether Humphrey has "had many new ideas recently" and added: "I think he's not close enough to the need for citizen action and citizen involvement in actual reality, but he's voted very well on labor and consumer issues."

As an admirer of both Senator HUMPHREY and Ralph Nader, I felt compelled to correspond with Mr. Nader for the purpose of clarifying the record relevant to Senator HUMPHREY's recent legislative achievements. The text of my letter follows:

FEBRUARY 11, 1976.

Mr. RALPH NADER,
P.O. Box 19367,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RALPH: In reading the Washington Post of February 9, 1976, I came across the column of Rowland Evans and Robert Novak. A portion of this article dealt with a remark by you on the NBC "Today" show, which was somewhat critical of Senator Hubert Humphrey's public service achievements in recent years.

As an admirer of yours, and as a supporter of most of your worthwhile endeavors, I feel that I must inform you that I am greatly disappointed in your criticism of Senator Humphrey. We are in agreement that the Senator from Minnesota is a "fine, ebullient person," but to imply that he hasn't "had many new ideas recently" causes me to wonder where you have been recently. I find that keeping track of Senator Humphrey's legislative innovations, not to mention his physical whereabouts, is a most demanding and exhausting task.

My reaction to your comments were undoubtedly intensified by the fact that I had just read the Congressional Record of February 6, 1976, when I noticed the Evans and Novak column. In this particular issue of the Congressional Record was a statement by Senator Humphrey on the importance of forests to U.S. industry, and another statement on federal spending and the disposable incomes of American workers. Many additional pages of the Record were devoted to the beginning of debate on the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976—a bill which is primarily the personal work of Senator Humphrey. Senator Kennedy refers to this bill in the Record as "one of the most important pieces of legislation that we will consider this year."

There are several other notable Humphrey achievements which I easily recall. He has rewritten Public Law 480, the Food for Peace program, to make sure that humanitarian need is the guiding factor in the distribution of assistance.

He is the author of the WIC food assistance program providing food assistance to women, infants, and children. This program, like the Food for Peace program, demonstrates Hubert Humphrey's commitment to finding solutions to the nutrition needs of millions of people, not only in this country, but throughout the world.

Humphrey has distinguished himself as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Foreign Assistance, and has rewritten the Foreign Assistance Act mandating that American aid be channeled to the poorest of the poor.

He is the author of the Solar Energy Research Act which authorizes $1 billion over the next five years for solar energy research.

In addition, Hubert Humphrey has been a leader in the development of federal revenue sharing, rural development programs, aid for the education of handicapped children, federal campaign reform, school lunch programs, greater congressional control of the budget, and the list continues.

Not all of Senator Humphrey's proposals have been enacted into law. One such proposal is the Humphrey-Hawkins Equal Opportunity and Full Employment Act which

will commit this nation to the goal of reducing unemployment to 3% in three years.

Looking at the record, If Senator Humphrey has not been the initiator, then he has at least been a co-sponsor or supporter of nearly all major legislation to be passed by the Congress since his return to the Senate in 1971.

Ralph, you should know that this letter is not a personal endorsement of Senator Humphrey for the Presidency—he says he is not a candidate and I believe him. I do feel however that we will have to look long and hard to find an individual with the intelligence, integrity, and sheer energy that Hubert H. Humphrey possesses.

Sincerely,

GLENN M. ANDERSON, M.C.

MINUTEMAN III—AMERICA'S MOST RELIABLE STRATEGIC WEAPON

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

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, in the past few weeks since the release of the President's budget I have been voicing my concern about the proposal to cease production of our only strategic intercontinental ballistic missile, the Minuteman III. I believe that this policy is shortsighted in the extreme.

The USSR has four ICBM's presently in production; they are producing far more missiles than we are at the present time and they tend to be larger with a greater payload capacity. While the Minuteman III remains the most reliable and accurate missile ever made, the Russians accuracy is getting better and better.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the technological gap between our ICBM's and those of the Soviet Union is decreasing. Yet the administration proposes that we stop production of the Minuteman III while it concedes that production of a replacement could not begin until the mid-1980's.

The Vladivostok agreements limiting the number of MIRVed missiles on each side gives the United States a maximum of 1,320 such missiles. The Pentagon's plan is to develop our strategic arsenal up to 1,286 MIRVed missiles by 1987, with three basic components of it. One component is the Poseidon submarine-based missile. Another is the Minuteman III. The third is the Trident missile, still under development and not scheduled for deployment until 1979. Our experience in the past is that schedules like these tend to slip.

The Poseidon is scheduled to reach 496 missiles by 1978, up only slightly from its 1977 total of 464. The Minuteman III is scheduled to remain at its present level—550. And the Trident, beginning with 24 missiles in 1979, is scheduled to grow to a total of 240.

Looked at another way, Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon plans in 1977 to have only 1,014 missiles deployed, some 286 under the agreed upon limit. That amounts to almost 22 percent under the authorized level. Secretary of State Kissinger came back from Moscow recently trailed by a rumor of an additional cut in the limit of 10 percent. Even if this turns out to be the case, the Pentagon's own projections do not show the United States reaching this new, lower level until 1983. And this assumes that the Trident missile will keep on schedule, an assumption I am not inclined to make.

Our overall strategic forces are composed of these MIRVed missiles and other components, including the older, non-MIRVed Minuteman II ICBM's and nuclear weapons carried by B-52 and FB-111 bombers. It is not irrelevant to note that the Minuteman II missiles, capable as they are, were designed to 1960 standards and average nearly 15 years old.

The Minuteman III is a modern weapon still unexcelled in terms of its accuracy, its reliability or its cost-effectiveness. And, Mr. Speaker, its production line contains literally thousands of very highly skilled and trained people who, if the line should stop, would go their separate ways. I need not point out how difficult it would be, and how time-consuming, to try to put such a team back together again. Humpty Dumpty's problem was similar.

In the absence of another SALT agreement, say nothing of Senate ratification of it, does it not make more sense to keep the Minuteman III production line going at this time? The older Minuteman II's can be replaced with the III's while the development problems of the Trident are solved and while research into our strategic needs in the 1980's continues. I say it does.

The numbers I cited earlier can be a bit deceptive, Mr. Speaker, to the extent that they imply that our dependence on the Minuteman III is only equivalent to that missile's share of the total number of strategic weapons. For that is not the case. The Minuteman III has an "alert status" of 98 percent. In other words, 98 out of each 100 Minuteman III's are ready to use at any given point in time. Submarine-based missiles, because of range limitations, ship maintenance, et cetera, achieve an alert status of only 53 percent. And the bomber-based weapons are even less—40 percent for the FB-111 and 30 percent for the B-52.

The result, Mr. Speaker, is that we rely on the Minuteman III far more than may be apparent from looking only at the number of such missiles. Taking the Pentagon's proposed MIRV mix for 1978, for example, we would have 550 Minuteman III's which, with an alert status of 98 percent, would mean an average of 539 operational missiles on alert at a given point in time. We would have 496 Poseidon missiles which, with an alert status of 53 percent, means only 253 submarine-based missiles are operational at that same point in time. Thus, the Minuteman force constitutes almost 70 percent of our MIRV capacity in operational terms—the terms that count. The administration, however, would reduce this percentage by increasing our reliance on the submarine.

Given our present reliance on the Minuteman III, along with the uncertainty of success with the Trident, the time frame needed to research and develop a new ICBM, and the presently vague status of the SALT talks, I think it would be folly to shut down this proven part of our military preparedness.

INTRODUCING A BILL TO ESTABLISH A REGULATORY SYSTEM FOR DEEP OCEAN MINING

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which would establish a regulatory system for deep ocean mining. The purpose of this bill is to encourage, for the ultimate benefit of the United States, the development of the vast resources of the ocean floor.

Experts have estimated that over $3 trillion worth of minerals lies on the ocean floor at depths of over 12,000 feet. The minerals which are most important in the tomato-sized nodules scattered on the deep seabed are manganese, nickel, copper, and cobalt. In addition, there may be as many as 27 other minerals in these nodules. The quantities of these minerals which have not yet been commercially exploited are phenomenal. At the rate at which the world is currently consuming these four major minerals, 1 percent of the ocean bottom could be expected to satisfy the world's needs for about 50 years.

Until recently, the reason these ocean resources have not been developed is that the technology has not existed which could bring the nodules up from the ocean floor. Advances in technology over the last 10 years, however, have brought the exploitation of these resources within our reach. The bulk of the technology was developed in this country, with additional contributions coming recently from Japan, Great Britain, France, Germany, and Canada.

There remain, however, major obstacles to the commercial development of these ocean resources. Most important of these is the law of the sea question. As you all know, the Law of the Sea Conference is dragging on and on with no apparent end in sight. As one session follows another, the U.S. negotiators seem to be giving more and more away. The result of the last session in Geneva, a single negotiating text, can only be described as a dismal failure. The State Department yielded on several important points, including deep sea mining. It seems that the only concern of the State Department is to insure freedom of the seas and right of passage for our military. In the process of insuring this, they are giving away the rights of our deep sea mining industry.

Under the single negotiating text, the latest document to emerge from the Law of the Sea Conference, a company exploiting the minerals of the ocean floor would have to yield 75 percent to an independent seabed resource authority. That assembly would then have the authority to decide the rate of development and the price of these deep sea minerals. It would also reap the profits and determine how to distribute them. The argument for this arrangement is that the resources of the deep seabed are the common heritage of mankind and should not be exploited for the sole benefit of the countries which have developed the high level of technology necessary

for deep sea mining. This is certainly an honorable goal, but I think it is necessary to strike a more equitable balance between the developed and the underdeveloped countries. Otherwise, the independent seabed resource authority may find that no one is willing to develop the technology needed.

I will not dwell on what I think the Law of the Sea Conference should try to achieve, but will only draw a single obvious conclusion and discuss the consequences for the United States: Given the complexity of the issues involved and the apparent wide divergence of opinion, the negotiations still have a long way to go before a settlement is reached. And given the opinions stated in the current single negotiating text, the United States is a long way from reaching an agreement which would be acceptable to this Congress. I do not think that this Congress will stand by and watch the State Department bargain away U.S. interests.

The uncertainty surrounding the Law of the Sea Conference, regarding when a settlement might be reached and what form that settlement might take, has been a major obstacle to the U.S. deep sea mining industry. Large companies, like the Kennecott Copper Corp., Tenneco, Inc., and the Lockheed Missiles and Space Co., have invested millions of dollars so far in the development of technology. They have developed the means to bring the nodules up from the ocean floor, and tested these methods in pilot operations. They have also developed processing methods to extract the valuable minerals from the nodules. They are at a stage now where they are ready to begin development on a large scale. They are confident enough about the technology they have developed that they want to move on to full-scale exploitation. That step, however, will take an enormous investment of several hundreds of millions of dollars. And the American deep sea mining industry is just not prepared to make that investment under the current conditions of political uncertainty.

Neither are the banks prepared to make the kind of long-term loans that are large enough to finance these expensive operations.

So the American deep sea mining industry has slowed down until, in its estimation, the time is right to go ahead with large-scale commercial operations. In the meantime, foreign operators are taking advantage of the lull in American activities to advance their technology to the point where they are even with us.

In my opinion, Congress should not stand idly by, and watch the American technological lead erode while the Law of the Sea negotiations hobble along aimlessly. This Congress can and should take action to provide the necessary investment climate for the American ocean mining industry, so that we can maintain our technological lead and develop those ocean resources for the benefit of the American people.

After all, the benefit really would be for all Americans. The Department of the Interior has estimated that our current dependence on foreign sources of manganese, copper, nickel, and cobalt can be vastly reduced, if not totally eliminated, by 1990. Instead of importing 82 percent of our manganese needs, we could be virtually independent by 1990. And we could become totally independent in terms of nickel, copper, and cobalt, whereas we now import 82 percent of our nickel, 5 percent of our copper, and 77 percent of our cobalt. These are important minerals, and I think we should learn a lesson from our dependence on foreign oil, and try to develop resources that will be under American control.

That is why I am introducing this bill today. This bill will provide the American deep sea mining industry, and the large banks which must ultimately finance their activities, with a proper investment climate.

My bill will allow U.S. firms to go ahead immediately with mining operations under existing international law and would require the Government to protect the investment of the companies involved, both at the Law of the Sea negotiating table and through insurance coverage.

The major changes in my legislation compared to previous bills on this subject are as follows:

Regulatory authority is vested in the Secretary of Commerce instead of the Secretary of the Interior.

A provision to permit the Secretary of Commerce to request and receive comprehensive data from industry when licenses are issued has been added. We learned a lesson in the energy crisis last winter. The Government did not have adequate reliable data on resources and this change will insure no such information gap with respect to deep seabed resources.

My bill fosters and encourages the negotiation of harmonious laws, rules, and regulations with those other countries who are ready to exploit the seabed. It grants legal recognition to rights they confer on their nationals provided they recognize the rights we confer on our nationals.

This bill should have an immediate beneficial impact on our ocean mining industry. It may also help us at the upcoming Law of the Sea Conference, by showing the so-called Group of 77, the less developed countries, that we mean business in exploiting our technological lead. And even if it does not, we may be deriving benefits from the deep seabed before an international agreement is reached. In any event, it is time for the United States to act unilaterally. It is time for us to start protecting American interests, and stop giving them away. It is time to begin developing resources which are vital to this Nation and which are within our grasp.

In view of the urgency of this legislation, as chairman of the Oceanography Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee I have scheduled hearings on this and similar bills now pending beginning on February 23 and continuing through mid-March at which time I plan to report a bill to the floor for the consideration of the Congress. The Government has vacillated far too long on this issue and I ask Members to support me in this effort to give the United States the preeminence it deserves in this area.

THE LACK OF LEADERSHIP IN MODERNIZING AND COORDINATING FARM PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, high prices are a very bothersome subject. Those who are familiar with prices to consumers in the Nation's grocery stores have ample reason to complain about high prices. The shocking increases in prices to the housewives of the Nation in recent years have made it exceedingly difficult for many American families to have even the bare necessities of life. This situation is well known to the great majority of Members of Congress. What is not known, either to the consumers or to most Congressmen, is that these high costs are not reflected by high prices paid to the producer of agricultural products. Prices paid to him have risen but little during the recent years of rapid inflation. The surge in prices to the consumer has been due to increases in charges added to the farmer's products by processors, transporters, and others who handle the various areas engaged in food marketing. Their charges have multiplied while the prices paid to farmers have almost stood still.

Nevertheless, it comes as a surprise to the average consumer of food products that the farmer is not getting rich. As a matter of fact, many farmers year after year are being forced out of production because the prices paid to them remain low while the prices for the items which they must buy in order to produce have multiplied. Labor, equipment, fertilizer, feed and seed all have kept pace with price increases in other segments of the American scene. As a result, the farmer has an investment in land and equipment, per individual, that is far higher than that of virtually every manufacturing industry in the United States.

The farmer continues to buy the things required for his operations on a protected market—a market where organized labor contracts or Federal regulations insure price increases commensurate with cost increases. The farmer has no such advantage when he sells. He sells at whatever price the market will bring, after he runs the hazards of production and the vicissitudes of weather.

Government, which is so greatly concerned with other segments of America's industry and which heavily subsidizes most of them—even to the plush and prosperous magazines in the store racks—is to a large extent ignoring the plight of the farmer. There are support prices for specified farm crops, but many more are omitted than are covered and a majority of American farmers get no help from their government in the way of price supports.

Because there is a growing market for U.S. agricultural products abroad and the American farmer can produce in unprecedented amounts, the Department of Agriculture and administration officials attempt to increase the sale of U.S.

farm products abroad. Sometimes these efforts are successful; sometimes not.

An example in point is soybeans. Soybeans are now one of the principal money crops in the United States. Last year a moratorium on shipments of soybeans and grains to Iron Curtain countries was used by the United States in trade negotiations with the Russians. We were seeking Soviet petroleum products as a part of the wheat sale. As so often happens, the Russians got what they wanted. We got nothing. U.S. farmers, particularly soybean farmers, were the economic victims. It did not make sense for soybeans to be included in the moratorium because we have a surplus of soybeans. While the embargo was in effect, Brazil sold to Russia a substantial quantity of soybeans. This curtailed a part of the foreign market which we had expected to utilize. Soybeans were not included when the sale of wheat to Russia was consummated. The price of soybeans in the United States dropped throughout the fall and the average farmer sold at or below cost of production. Now, with the coming of the new year, the soybean prices are going up. This would not help the producer. He had to sell to pay his bills.

Lack of support or bungling by the Government is estimated to have cost the soybean producers of this Nation $1.25 billion on the current crop. That figures out to an average of more than $11,000 per soybean farmer in the United States.

The Government asked the farmers to plant from fence row to fence row last spring and the year before. Farmers responded because they understood that the world needed their food. Instead of an all-out program to induce sales of the food that was produced, the government has limited or actually prohibited sales of the commodities produced. These things happened after the farmer had his crops planted and they were almost ready to harvest. He had already invested his money, labor, and land. The bureaucrats in Washington ignored his plight.

American soybean farmers should have the assurance that agricultural policy of the United States be determined by administrative officials who understand the problems of agricultural production and marketing. The understanding of production problems and their solutions is sometimes more elusive than the understanding of marketing problems; but the two must go hand in hand. When agricultural marketing policy is determined by officials from the Department of Labor, Department of State or Department of Commerce, the variety of decisions do not necessarily reflect the policies necessary to insure production of food in the future or the sale of American food abroad.

Similar weaknesses are found in Federal disaster programs. This much-touted source of assistance to American farmers was of little value in northwest Florida and the South following the costly and damaging Hurricane Eloise in September. Due to the wording of the legislation, the average farmer could receive no benefit. Most of the crops produced in the area simply were not covered. These include peanuts, soybeans, and pecans. This faulty legislation should, of course, be corrected but I find little evidence either by the administration or in Congress to accomplish this purpose.

Programs designed for the help of the farmer are overloaded with regulation and redtape. Possibly the best program of all, the Farmers Home Administration, does not have adequate personnel to do the job entrusted to it for rural development by the Congress. They are underfunded and understaffed. Here is a potential for improvement in rural areas to add to the attractiveness in rural community living.

Cattle farmers have been particularly hard pressed for lack of a profitable market. Prices for cattle, for almost 3 years, have failed to meet costs of production. Very little has been accomplished through the Government to alleviate this situation.

Many farm loans, including cattle special program loans, cannot be made because local banks fail to participate. Farmers should not be denied the help of Government programs simply because the local bank does not want to do business with Government.

Crop insurance is a program that has been found highly beneficial in many areas. However, it is of very limited application and areas not now covered are denied the opportunity to participate. The fact is the Government wants to get out of the crop insurance business. In fairness, the right to participate in crop insurance programs should be extended to all farmers. Here again there is little to indicate legislative action.

The administration is attempting to save money wherever posible because of the steadily mounting costs of Government and the attendant increase in the national debt. However, there are times when it appears that the administration is overzealous in its efforts to cut expenditures. Two instances immediately come to mind.

One is the proposal by the administration that there be a rescission of $25 million in funds appropriated by Congress for the forestry incentives program. This program means immediate employment for people; it means cost-sharing assistance to landowners in replanting or improving stands of timber. Congress has made it clear that it will insist that the administration spend the funds. Obviously the time to plant trees is now while the seedlings are dormant. Nevertheless, the administration is insisting on taking the full time allowed before resuming the program—45 days. That means planting will have to be deferred until February or later and, in the event of an early spring, it could cause many participants to fail to get their trees in the ground on time. This would be a wasteful process.

A similar instance is the handling of an appropriation of $500 million for additional housing to be constructed under the auspices of the Farmers Home Administration. The administration wanted a rescission. The Congress refused. The housing is needed. It, too, will provide employment and stimulate the sick construction industry. Programs of this type benefit people and workers. The administration should welcome the opportunity to put them into operation.

Timeliness in providing farm information on farm programs is basic to a farmer's preparations. He must know what he can plant and under what regulations months before planting time because of the preparation required like financing, purchases of supplies, seed, fertilizer and lime, as well as farm equipment, which must be acquired for the year's operations. All too often it seems that the bureaucrats in Washington have lost the sense of reality which must accompany announcement of farm programs. This foot-dragging can tie up a farmer's operations until it is almost impossible for him to make the necessary preparations for planting the crops best suited to his purposes.

Credit enters into the problem. The farmer must have credit. Easy credit is not in itself an answer. However, a ceiling on interest rates to farmers may now be in order. They may even be necessary through Government guarantees.

There is much talk but little action on a long-range, comprehensive farm program. We have a rural development program which will be very promising if it is properly implemented with adequate funds and staffing. We have a crop insurance program which had a good beginning but the Government lost interest and the majority of the counties of our Nation have never received this needed coverage. We have disaster programs which touch only a few of the people who suffer natural disasters in farming. We have in agriculture the only area where the farmer must buy on a protected market, protected for everyone but him. He buys at prices that are formulated to protect everyone engaged in the production process and the farmer pays the accumulated bill when he buys equipment and all the things he must have with which to farm and produce. More and more the labor that he hires is protected through unionization or minimum wage laws which force the farmer to pay comparable wages. When he sells, he has none of the advantages. The buyers play the market. The Government may or may not be working in the farmer's best interest in its international programs. The weather may have seriously limited his crop.

When all is done, he sells his crop for what it will bring. He has no choice. He is in hock right up to his ears and everything he owns is mortgaged to make the crop. He has to turn it to keep from losing his equipment or even his property. If it does not bring enough to pay him out, that is his hard luck. A benevolent government will, in most instances, make him another loan if his local bank is big hearted enough to accept a high interest loan guarantee.

It should be obvious that this is an impossible situation. America must have a flourishing agriculture to feed our own people. Agricultural products provide one of the two commodities for which there is a sure market worldwide. The other is weapons. It is a strange contrast but the people of the world want American weapons and American food. If the

farmer is to continue to produce, I tell you there must be a floor on farm produce prices or a ceiling on the cost of what he must purchase or both. However revolutionary this may sound, such a program is required or there is a distinct possibility that the American farmer and his great productive capacity will gradually fade from the scene.

Stronger programs from Congress and more concern by the Government can wait no longer. Agriculture and farm people and rural communities are the real heart and soul of America. It is the people of the American farms and the rural communities who believe most strongly in the great traditions of our land and its ideals. They are the people who have the strength and the stamina to try to stand on their own feet. Here there is no lack of patriotism. No lack of willingness to sacrifice for America's needs, America's good and America's future. To bring this about, the farmer must learn to stand together and work together. Those who heed his voice daily grow smaller in number in the halls of government. He must demand to be heard now.

What I propose is done in one way or another for nearly every segment of the American economy. It is done for the airlines, one of the biggest and most prosperous of American industry. It is done for the railroads whose problems they do not attempt to clean up for themselves; for the big cities, whose wasteful spending practices have brought them to the verge of bankruptcy; even for the magazines and other publications which are fat from advertising. I say it is time to put a little of the farmer's own tax money back where it can insure the preservation of an essential American industry.

These are random thoughts on a very serious matter. The American farm and principally the family farm, is in jeopardy. Yet the family farm, like the family business, is one of the most important segments of the American economy. There should be a full review and a prompt one to establish what really is needed in the way of agricultural programs. The farmer is told to produce more in order to take advantage of a growing world market. Then in most instances, he is left to work out all the attendant problems of financing, encountering the risk of weather and other causes of crop failure, only to sell at what the market will bring. He is at the mercy of both the buyer of his produce and those who sell him the supplies he must have. It is time to realize that there must be a floor on the farm produce prices or a ceiling on the cost of what he must purchase, or both. However revolutionary it may sound, there is a distinct possibility that without a stronger program and more concern by the Government and the Congress, the American farmer as we now know him, will largely cease to exist. The big corporation farms possibly can remain, but they are not the heart and soul of the agriculture of America. It is the people of the American farms and in the rural communities who in generations past have done most to maintain the traditions of Americanism, the strength of patriotism, the willingness to sacrifice for our country's good.

NUCLEAR MORATORIUM, GE RESIGNATIONS INDICATE URGENCY

(Mr. OTTINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce into the RECORD at this time the texts of the letters of resignation that were submitted by the three General Electric nuclear power engineers last week.

The points of concern that they raise have convinced me that we need to stop and reevaluate our entire nuclear power program now before we commit ourselves to too heavy a reliance on this controversial technology for our energy needs.

Accordingly, I am introducing a slightly modified version of the bill introduced last year by my colleagues, Congressman HAMILTON FISH and Congressman EDWARD PATTISON, calling for a moratorium on the licensing of the construction of any new nuclear power reactors and a complete and thorough study of the safety hazards posed by these plants.

The material referred to follows:

Dale G. Bridenbaugh, Manager, Performance Evaluation & Improvement. Manager, Mark I Containment, Nuclear Energy Division General Electric Company.

Responsible for establishment and management of systems to provide for the monitoring and measurement of Boiling Water Reactor (BWR) equipment and system performance and for the development of performance improvement modifications.

For the past 10 months on special assignment as Manager of Mark I Containment, A special project formed to evaluate the safety and adequacy of the primary containment of 25 nuclear power plants in the United States.

Mr. Bridenbaugh has been involved with nuclear power plants since 1958 when he was assigned as Field Engineer on the installation and startup of the first large-scale commercial nuclear power plant—Commonwealth Edison's Dresden I near Chicago, Illinois.

Employed by General Electric Company: 1953–1976.

Degree: BSME, South Dakota School of Mines & Technology.

FEBRUARY 2, 1976.

Mr. N. L. FELMUS,
Manager, BWR Services, General Electric Co., San Jose, Calif.

DEAR NEIL: This letter is to advise you that I am resigning from the General Electric Company effective immediately.

My reason for leaving is that I have become deeply concerned about the impact—environmentally, politically, socially, and genetically—that nuclear power has made and potentially can make to life on earth. As we have discussed in the past, there is an inherent close intertie between commercial power and weapons technologies and capabilities. I am strongly opposed to the deployment of such capabilities and I fear the implications of a plutonium economy. The risk involved in such a system is far too great for the short term benefit. I see no way for us to develop the ability to maintain the perfect human and technical control needed for the long periods of time necessarily involved with the highly toxic materials we are producing. This problem is not something I wish to pass on to my children and to succeeding generations to control. Contributing to the advancment of such proliferation now seem immoral and is no longer an acceptable occupation for me.

Furthermore, in my recent assignment as the Project Manager of the Mark I Containment assessment, I have become increasingly alarmed at the shallowness of understanding that has formed the basis for many of the current designs. It is probable that many more problems will emerge with severe consequences, impacting either the safety or the economic viability of the nuclear power program.

It is hard for the mind to comprehend the immensity of the power contained in the relaively small reactor or core and the risk associated with its control. In the past we have been able to learn from our technological mistakes. With nuclear power we cannot afford that luxury!

Much has been entrusted to the corporate and regulatory decision makers and the tremendous cost, schedule, and political pressures these humans experience have made unbiased decisions, with true evaluation of the consequences, very difficult to achieve. This is not meant as an indictment of any specific individuals; it is just a statement of the human imperfection which leads, ultimately, to the imperfection of the complex technological system. Nuclear power has become a "technological monster" and it is not clear who, if anyone, is in control.

In summary, I am no longer convinced of the technical safety of nuclear power and I fear the high risk of political and human factors that will ultimately lead to the misuse of its byproducts. This makes it impossible for me to work in an objective manner in my current position and I, therefore, have decided that my only choice is to get out of the nuclear business. This seems the only course of action for me to take if I am to be fair to my associates, the Company, to you, and to myself.

I also must tell you that I have become so convinced that nuclear power is not right for this country or for this world, that I have decided to volunteer my time for the next several months to work in support of the California Nuclear Safeguards Initiative. Following this, I will be looking for a job either in a non-nuclear area or, if possible, where I can use my experience to help safeguard the substantial nuclear legacy that has already been created.

I am sorry that I have been unable until now to fully confide in you the concerns I have had. This has not been an easy decision for me to make, but I finally came to the conclusion that it is something I must do. Perhaps my action will cause other people to consider the vast implications of the nuclear power program before it is too late.

I have come to believe very deeply that we cannot afford nuclear power and I intend to do whatever I can to get the message to the public where the decision on its continuation must ultimately be made.

Sincerely,

DALE G. BRIDENBAUGH,
Manager, Performance Evaluation and Improvement; Manager, Mark I Containment Program.

Gregory C. Minor, Manager, Advanced Control & Instrumentation, Nuclear Energy Division, General Electric Division.

Mr. Minor has 16 years experience in the energy systems business, designing, building and managing control and instrumentation systems.

Mr. Minor began his career with General Electric in 1960 when he was assigned to a position at Hanford, Washington. In 1963 he served as an Electronic Design & Development Engineer in the Nuclear Power Generation Control Department in San Jose. There he was responsible for design of

major instrumentation channels and control systems.

He has served as Manager of Reactor Control Systems Engineering where he was responsible for the design of protection, containment, and related control systems.

Since 1971 he has been Manager of Advanced Control & Instrumentation, responsible for the design of safety systems, control systems, and control room configuration.

Employed by General Electric Company: 1960–1976.

Degrees: BSME, University of California, MSEE, Stanford University.

FEBRUARY 2, 1976.

Mr. HARRY H. HENDON,
Manager, C & I Engineering,
General Electric Co.,
San Jose, Calif.

DEAR HARRY: This is to inform you that I am resigning from the General Electric Company effective today.

My reason for leaving is a deep conviction that nuclear reactors and nuclear weapons now present a serious danger to the future of all life on this planet.

I am convinced that the reactors, the nuclear fuel cycle, and waste storage systems are not safe. We cannot prevent major accidents or acts of sabotage. I fear that continued nuclear proliferation will quickly consume the limited uranium supply and force us into a plutonium-based fuel economy with even greater dangers of genetic damage and terrorist or weapons activity.

From my earliest days at Hanford, I have been deeply concerned about the dangers of radioactivity. I can still remember my wife's shock at having a container for urine sampling placed on our front doorstep for the use of our family. I wonder now if that police-state atmosphere at Hanford wasn't an omen for all people for the future.

I cannot be a part of an industry that promotes a policy that would lead our generation to consume 30 years of nuclear power for our own selfish purposes and leave behind radioactive wastes that will be a health hazard for thousands of generations to come.

In recent months I have become increasingly dismayed at the industry's opposition to the Nuclear Safeguards Initiative. I have seen the attempts to confuse and whitewash the issues by claiming that there are no unsolvable problems and appealing to individual's fears for their jobs. The public must be told that there are many problems. I am confident that an informed public—given the truth—will decide against continued nuclear proliferation.

I am also sure that there are others in the industry who share my concerns and I hope my decision will cause them to stop and consider the enormous implications and dangers of the nuclear legacy we are creating.

Sincerely,

GREGORY C. MINOR,
Manager, Advanced Control & Instrumentation.

Richard B. Hubbard, Manager, Quality Assurance, Nuclear Energy Control & Instrumentation Department, General Electric Company.

As Manager of the Quality Assurance Section, Nuclear Energy Control and Instrumentation Department, Mr. Hubbard is responsible for developing and implementing quality plans, programs, methods, and equipment which assure that products produced by the Department meet all quality requirements as defined in NRC 10CFR50. He is involved in the manufacture of radiation sensors, reactor vessel internals, fuel handling and servicing tools, nuclear plant control and protection instrumentation systems, and control room panels.

With GE, he has held a variety of technical and supervisory positions in the application, manufacture and marketing of instrumentation and control systems for nuclear power plants.

Mr. Hubbard is an active member of the IEEE standards subcommittee on quality assurance and has published several papers on incore neutron detector systems and quality assurance programs.

Employed by General Electric Company: 1960–1976.

Degrees: BSEE, University of Arizona, MBA, University of Santa Clara.

FEBRUARY 2, 1976.

Mr. ABDON RUBIO,
General Manager, Nuclear Energy Control & Instrumentation Department, General Electric Co., Nuclear Energy System Division, San Jose, Calif.

DEAR DON: During the past year and a half I've experienced a series of events which have forced me to question the continued operation and proliferation of nuclear power plants. I see that we have become an industry of narrow specialists with little comprehension of the total impact of our individual actions. I feel it is imperative that the people of California know the truth about nuclear power and know that there are people within the industry who have serious doubts and reservations about continuing our present course.

Consequently, I have decided effective today, February 2nd, to terminate my employment with General Electric and to devote myself full time to the task of educating my fellow Californians on the moral and technical issues encompassed by the Nuclear Safeguards Initiative.

When I joined the nuclear division in 1964 I was very excited about the promise of the new technology—the promise of a virtually limitless source of safe, clean and economic energy for this and future generations. Like many of my colleagues, I consciously chose to bypass the technical and financial glamour of the defense/aerospace industries, and instead to pioneer in the infant nuclear industry. There was a common sense of excitement in the industry that approached a missionary zeal in those early years. Now, twelve years later, the vision has faded and the promises are still unfulfilled.

I have seen too many instances where engineers did not consider all the relevant parameters, where craftsmen did not follow the prescribed manufacturing and construction methods, where the plant operator acted in error when called upon for a split-second decision, and where plant maintenance decisions were based on continued power production—not plant safety. I know that very few people are aware that one of the plant wastes, plutonium, must be safeguarded from the biosphere for nearly 500,000 years; that there are presently no long-term radioactive waste storage facilities; that the genetic effects of the wastes challenge our continuing existence; and that the disposal safeguard record of the existing government weapons and submarine fuel facilities is replete with failures.

In addition to the ecological significance of the radioactive legacy, the global political impacts of a plutonium energy economy must be faced. India's construction of an atom bomb from nuclear fuel clearly demonstrates that nuclear power plants and nuclear weapons are inseparable. If the forecasted nuclear power plants are constructed in the U.S. and if the rush to export the nuclear technology to the emerging nations continues unabated, then plutonium will be readily available for weapons diversion, hijacking, sabotage, and ransom. The power of the atom will be available to any tyrant or dissident group. We Californians cannot ignore our global interdependence.

I have struggled hard in arriving at today's decision. I considered continuing in my position, hoping that technology could somehow overcome all the obstacles. After my experience, I am now convinced that businesses and individuals can no longer take the risk of contaminating our environment, upsetting the ecological balance, or take any other steps which could irreversibly affect future generations. The limited comprehension of the present technology, coupled with the technological requirement for 100% human perfection, is a situation I can no longer rationalize as responsible or acceptable.

I came to San Jose with the vision and hope that I could benefit mankind through my contributions in harnessing the atom. Now I sense an even greater purpose—the sharing of the knowledge gained in this pursuit to help awaken the people to the dangers and to the imperative to act now in order to preserve our planet. The issue we face is not the survival of an industry, rather it is the survival of mankind.

Sincerely,

RICHARD B. HUBBARD,
Manager, Quality Assurance.

REFORMING THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

(Mr. OTTINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the opportunity to submit testimony to the House Committee on Agriculture regarding the numerous proposals for reform of the food stamp program that have been introduced during the 94th Congress, opposing the administration position which would wreak cruel hardships, particularly on the elderly who can least afford the figured cuts, and suggesting reforms that I think would make the program more effective and equitable in assuring nutritious diets to those who otherwise could not afford them.

I am inserting this testimony in the RECORD to share my views with my colleagues.

REFORMING THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

(Testimony of Hon. RICHARD L. OTTINGER)

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to submit testimony in conjunction with hearings being held on the question of reforming the food stamp program.

The food stamp program is one of the most worthwhile and beneficial programs ever begun by the Federal Government. At the same time, it is obvious that changes in it must be made if it is to continue to operate effectively in providing good nutrition for low income people. It is unfortunate that we have come to the conference table so divided over the basic philosophy of this program and in such a spirit of controversy. Surely nothing will be accomplished by such unfair remarks as those of Treasury Secretary Simon, who calls the food stamp program "a well-known haven for chiselers and rip-off artists." The Administration's own figures indicate that the fraud rate is only about .08 percent. Any fraud is too much, but this is certainly not a cause for gutting the program as the Administration would do.

Food stamps began in 1962 as a small, experimental program involving a handful of counties and costing about $14 million. The program has grown enormously in outreach and expense for two reasons: first, because an unprecedented rate of inflation and dramatically high unemployment forced more people into the program; secondly, because the Congress decided that its expansion was consistent with our national commitment to providing every American with access to

good nutrition. If this growth seems phenomenal, we should keep in mind that many State and local governments believe that they are still reaching only a portion of those who qualify for aid and are making efforts to spread the word among the poor and unemployed that they may be missing out on a program which can offer families an adequate diet they might not otherwise be able to afford. Simple economics tells us that as long as adverse financial conditions in the U.S. persist we cannot hope to lower spending for the food stamp program and that, in fact, expenditures may increase still further.

Our sense of compassion and common sense tell us that we cannot allow the victims of hard times to go hungry and that sound nutrition for everyone is in the national interest.

In a staff paper released last month by the General Accounting Office four major issues were identified as being at the center of the food stamp debate. I would like to outline these and give my personal responses to the questions posed as follows:

1. Target population: Who should get food stamps, and how should the benefits be determined? Every family that can legitimately claim the inability to provide a sound diet for its members should be eligible for food stamps. This should include those whose adverse circumstances are likely to be only temporary, such as those unemployed due to the recession, but it should not include groups such as students who are living away from home but have parents with the means to support them. Eligibility standards should take into consideration the rate of inflation, and there should be allowances for the possibility of appreciable rises in that rate.

2. Administration: Is the food stamp program effectively administered? If not, what areas need change and what changes should be considered? At the present time it appears that there is a lot of unnecessary red tape at all three levels of government—Federal, State and local—which frequently results in benefits being delayed or computed incorrectly. This not only causes problems for food stamp recipients, it also costs the government a great deal to correct these errors. Probably there should be more flexibility in administering the program at the local level, to allow for any unique problems that may exist there. I also question the practicality of the work registration requirement for certain groups. Experience has shown that this is costly to administer and largely ineffective. I believe that the overwhelming majority of able-bodied, employable Americans prefer to work if jobs are available and that those who fall outside of that category are too few to warrant the enormous administrative burden of a work registration program.

3. The food stamp program as a nutrition program: Should food stamps serve as a nutrition program? If so, are current levels adequate and are benefits equitably determined? The early objective of using this program to supplement farm income by increasing food demand has largely disappeared. There is widespread agreement that the second original objective of insuring that food stamp recipients enjoy a nutritionally adequate food intake is not reached by the present program. A great deal of this problem can be attributed to the participants' lack of knowledge about proper nutrition—a situation, by the way, that is not uncommon among the U.S. population as a whole. The remainder of the problem is due largely to the fact that Agriculture Department standards do not make any allowances for differences in dietary requirements or regional cost-of-living. Often the elderly and poor are forced to buy their food in the inner city neighborhoods where so many of them live and pay much higher food prices than those in other locations.

4. Food stamps and other income security programs: How is the food stamp program affected by other program benefits? What should the balance be between different program applications? The food stamp program is the only income security program that is universal in that the eligibility requirements are based on income and assets only. Most participants realize an increase in discretionary income because a portion of total income otherwise have to be spent for food is left free. There is no question but that there is much duplication among Federal income security programs and that many people receive more than their fair share while others continue to suffer needlessly. One proposal for eliminating such duplication is that of a single cash out plan. While studies have shown that the typical food stamp recipient would rather receive a cash benefit, great caution should be exercised in pursuing such a course. The implications for sound nutrition and the small role that food stamps may continue to play in farm income must be carefully evaluated before we attempt to substitute cash benefits for in kind programs. Food stamp cash out for recipients of Supplementary Security Income has been tried in New York, among other states, and the reaction I have heard has been overwhelmingly negative. In fact, there have been proposals in the 94th Congress to make these SSI recipients eligible for food stamps and end the cash out, a move which I strongly support.

Mr. Chairman, more than 100 bills have been introduced in the House calling for various types of reform of the food stamp program. I frankly do not know that I have seen a single one that I accept in its entirety. Many of these proposals suggest eliminating the present purchase requirement and giving the stamps to eligible families at no cost. I believe that this is one of the most reasonable ideas and one that should be adopted. Other bills call for eliminating automatic food stamp eligibility for those on welfare. I have serious reservations about this particular proposal, since it could have very serious implications for some families, particularly those with young children, who benefit so much from this type of assistance. There is also a proposal to not take Social Security cost-of-living increases into consideration when determining eligibility of beneficiaries—an idea that I fully support. In so many cases senior citizens are losing out on Federal programs because meager increases in their income place them just above the eligibility level. Often the elderly end up actually suffering adverse effects from these cost-of-living increases.

Well over eighteen million Americans now receive food stamps. At the end of 1974 the Agriculture Department estimated that close to thirty million people are eligible in a given month and that more than forty million may be eligible during at least one month of the year. Surely when we consider reforms in a program that affects so many Americans, we must approach the task with concern over the problems that have necessitated the program in the first place and with intentions of resolving these along with the shortcomings of the program itself. I for one pledge to you my cooperation in making the food stamp program one that operates efficiently and effectively to insure that every American, regardless of financial circumstances, can enjoy a nutritionally adequate diet.

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

(Mr. OTTINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the opportunity to submit testimony to the Ways and Means Committee's Subcommittee on Social Security regarding the administration's outrageous proposals for making social security benefits more expensive for the elderly, already pressed to the wall by inflation, and imposing inequitable new social security taxes on already overburdened low- and middle-income workers. These social security proposals are of vital importance to our more than 20 million senior citizens and to all American workers who pay into the system with the expectation of one day drawing benefits. I would like to take this opportunity to share my views with my colleagues:

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

(Testimony of Hon. Richard L. Ottinger)

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express to you my gratitude for the opportunity to submit these remarks in conjunction with your hearings on the President's proposals for reforming the Social Security program, with particularl emphasis on the trust fund.

At the start, let me convey to you my very strong opposition to the proposal to raise Social Security taxes by .3 percent each for employer and employee. In the first place this idea creates an unfair burden for the lower income wage earner. The Social Security tax is a most regressive type of tax to begin with. To increase it at a time when all Americans are having difficulty coping with an unprecedented rate of inflation is impractical, at best. Surely it is worth noting that many people are now paying more in Social Security tax each year than they pay in income tax.

The step that would more equitably resolve the short-term funding needs for Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance is an increase in the taxable wage base beyond the automatic raises included in present law. As you know, I am a co-sponsor of your bill, H.R. 2420, which calls for actually lowering the Social Security tax, raising the taxable wage base to $25,000 per year and infusing one-third of the trust fund requirements from general revenues. Indeed, the founders of the Social Security program envisioned the day when general revenue financing would be required, and I believe that day has ararrived.

The President has further proposed that the cost-of-living index for Social Security benefits be terminated, though he supports full cost-of-living increases for Social Security and Supplemental Security Income beneficiaries of 6.7 percent payable in July, 1976 and 5.9 percent payable in July, 1977. Certainly the present method of tying these increases to the rate of inflation as reflected by the Consumer Price Index for the first quarter of the year is the only method that allows beneficiaries to keep pace with a rising cost-of-living. I therefore urge that you retain the present formula and reject the President's proposal.

Suggestions relating to staffing and administrative problems of the Social Security Administration made by the President are, I feel, sound. I understand that Federal employee groups support converting the 2-year temporary positions at SSA to permanent staff slots. This move would provide secure employment for the staff affected and would also reduce overtime payments that are so costly. The development of a master plan to improve and modernize SSA's automated systems and processing procedures is commendable. Hopefully, this will result in a reduction of errors in the system—a situation which causes great anxiety for beneficiaries and costs the Federal Government a great deal of time and money to correct.

With regard to the outside earnings test,

you know that I favor abolishment of this requirement entirely and have co-sponsored legislation to eliminate it. I think it is a particularly offensive part of the law in view of the fact that it applies only to income earned as wages and not to income from investments. It therefore penalizes the lower income recipient doubly—first of all because he is severely limited in what he can earn, though he needs the extra income, and secondly because he is unlikely to be able to afford investments, the income from which is not counted.

As my final reaction to the President's proposals, I would like to state that I think it is outrageous to suggest phasing out dependents' benefits for students aged 18 to 22 under the guise of providing the necessary assistance through Federal student financial aid. There is already great inequity in this country regarding the availability of higher education, which is not provided as a right to all those who have the ability to take advantage of it, but which must be purchased by those who can find the means. To deny qualified young people the small benefits they can now receive as the survivors of insured workers in order that they may further their education is unconscionable. The proposal compounds the inequities of our present education system, and I hope you will reject it outright.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to your attention a bill I have introduced proposing the elimination of the 20–40 requirement for disability benefits. This bill, H.R. 4314, has a total of 44 co-sponsors in the House. I recognize that the disability trust fund is also experiencing adverse conditions and that revenues to it are going to have to improve. My proposal, however, is based on the belief that it is unfair to deny disability benefits to fully insured workers just because a portion of the coverage was not earned during a specific period of time. It appears that women, who frequently leave the work force for extended periods in order to care for the needs of their families, suffer unduly under this restriction. But basically, it is just not right to refuse benefits to a covered individual who has paid his part but gets nothing in return due to arbitrary provisions of law.

Social Security is one of the most worthwhile programs operated by the Federal Government. I look forward to cooperating with you in developing sound corrective legislation that includes the human element and appreciate this opportunity to share my views.

NOTRE DAME'S FATHER HESBURGH

(Mr. BRADEMAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, I take pride in the fact that I have the privilege to represent in Congress the district where the University of Notre Dame is located and I have, therefore, the further privilege of having as one of my constituents the distinguished president of Notre Dame, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C.

Father Hesburgh is not only an internationally recognized leader in the field of higher education, he is also a person who is respected for his leadership in a remarkable number of areas, ranging from civil rights to world development and the relationship between religion and public affairs generally.

I believe that Members of Congress will, therefore, read with interest the following article entitled "Notre Dame's Father Hesburgh," by Gary MacEoin, published in the February 1976 issue of Change magazine.

The article follows:

NOTRE DAME'S FATHER HESBURGH

(By Gary MacEoin)

Thanks to plane-stacking weather in Chicago, it was midnight when I reached Notre Dame to talk to the college president recently singled out as one of America's few authentic leaders in a *Change* poll of 4,000 college and university presidents and other opinion makers. We passed the administration building on the way to my modest room in Corby Hall, a room similar to the one in the same building in which Father Theodore M. Hesburgh sleeps, when he does sleep.

"He's there as usual," said my guide, pointing to the lighted window of the Hesburgh office on the third floor, "and if you check three hours from now, he'll probably still be there." I didn't check, but the following night again I saw the light burning after midnight. He arrives about noon, leaves when the day's issues have been resolved. These typically involve the hopes and anxieties of an institution that he has transformed in 24 years as president from a good denominational college with a seminarylike outlook and life style into an outstanding university free of juridical links to any church authority, an institution that for the first time has given Catholic higher education respectability. But they fan out to include as well as the business of a dozen major national and international bodies, public and private, of which he is a director; and to each he offers a continuous flow of ideas and the same meticulous management he brings to Notre Dame.

Everything is neat in the unpretentious Hesburgh office, as is the man himself. He relaxes to Muzak-type tones from the stereo combination in the corner, his one self-indulgence. He dresses impeccably in Roman collar and solid black clerical-cut suit that matches his sleeked hair. His personal staff consists of a single secretary, Helen Hosinski, a woman is imperturbable as her boss. As she decribes the office procedures, Hesburgh reads everything addressed to him—other than the purely routine that she has prewinnowed—and disposes of it the same day, dictating a substantive answer or transferring the matter to the appropriate decision maker, with an acknowledgment to the writer. Once, she recalls, 250 issues awaited the president on his return from an extended trip. It just took three nights to wipe out that backlog.

Hesburgh's amazing achievements far transcend hard work and order, however. At a time when even the best university presidents have preferred low visibility and ambiguous reactions in their efforts to survive the polarization and tensions that split the traditionally peaceful campuses of America, he has taken another course. His role came into focus as I talked to faculty, administrators, and students on the 1,200-acre campus where yellow-brick American Gothic structures (dominated by the pseudo-Byzantine golden dome on the administration building) rub uncomfortable shoulders with 20 modern constructions, including a Radiation Research Building, a Computing Center, the Galvin Life Science Center, and—in deference to the source of Notre Dame's national notoriety—a monster Athletic and Convocation Center nicknamed the sweatshirt paradise or, because of its twin domes (not gilt), the world's biggest bra.

MAN OF CREDIBILITY

I was deeply impressed by the conviction among all I spoke to that Hesburgh is totally sincere, straightforward, and impartial. Even on certain issues he had declared non-negotiable, he has acceded to others' views. Undergraduates now participate in making policy. Girls may visit men's dormitories. A campus daily runs advertisements for gay students of Notre Dame. His most voluble critics do not charge or suspect Hesburgh of trimming his political sails. He is probably the one American public figure whose credibility has increased through a quarter century of exposure.

Hesburgh's religious zeal, which once might have bred suspicion, appeals to an age steeped in transcendental meditation, oriental mysticism, and other versions of religious experience. Hesburgh identifies himself primarily as a priest in the Holy Cross order. This religious order, founded in France shortly after the French Revolution to promote education within the defense and pious molds of Ultramontanism, imbued its members with a spirit of military discipline to undertake unquestioningly whatever tasks superiors assigned. Hesburgh is part of that tradition, and it is part of him. He says Mass every day, even in Moscow or on the Andean altiplano, and he reads the psalms and other prayers known as the divine office, a tradition to which many priests no longer feel obligated. In the words of a long-time colleague, "His concept of his role as a priest is the source of the energy in his life; it translates into a concern for others that ranges from the individual student at Notre Dame to global problems."

Another Holy Cross tradition highly developed in Hesburgh is the ability to interpret creatively and innovatively the assignment undertaken in obedience. Not since Father Sorin secured a state charter in 1844 to convert his Indian mission school in the wilderness of northern Indiana into a university—a university without campus, faculty, student body, or endowment—has any Notre Dame president effected such radical transformations. Faculty and administrators tend to isolate as his supreme contribution the upgrading of a good college to a major university, a task initiated by his two immediate predecessors. But in my view, his most original—and most controversial—action has been to redefine the Catholic university. On his ability to make the new formula work and have it accepted as orthodox may depend the survival of the Catholic—and the denominational—university here and around the world.

REDEFINING THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

When universities developed under church auspices in medieval Europe, their autonomy in the pursuit of truth was challenged by churchmen who saw themselves as guardians protecting their flocks from error. For a time, the major universities achieved de facto autonomy. Thomas Aquinas at the University of Paris simply ignored Rome's prohibition to teach the suspect doctrines of Aristotle. But from the Protestant Reformation to the second Vatican Council (1962–65), the Catholic university was strictly regulated by juridic ties to the Holy See or to the local bishop, or by belonging to a religious order controlled by Rome, a situation which provoked Bernard Shaw's oft-quoted quip that "a Catholic university is a contradiction in terms."

The church's changed self-understanding at Vatican II included a stress on individual responsbility and the corresponding obligation to know fully in order to judge intelligently. Catholic universities quickly saw the implications. Faculty members chafed at restrictions on what they could teach. Catholic parents questioned the value of institutions that offered their children answers when they should be asking questions. The crisis, intensified by rising costs and other factors, was met variously. Some—like Webster College, Missouri—reorganized as professedly secular institutions. Others declined to change, and several

of these have since shut their doors (Mary Manse and St. John Colleges in Ohio, for example), while others are troubled by declining enrollments or lowered academic standards, and by economic pressures.

Hesburgh was one who envisaged a creative solution. As president of the International Federation of Catholic Universities, he assembled Catholic educators from several countries at Land O'Lakes, Wisconsin, in 1967. Although he projects the image of a solid rather than a brilliant intellect and devotes little time to abstract philosophizing in his daily work, he was the catalyst and main strategist at Land O'Lakes, emerging with a statement he hoped would be adopted as basic policy for some 600 Catholic institutions around the world at the federation's congress scheduled for Kinshasa, Congo, the following year. He did this knowing it would bring anguished cries from Vatican officials and run-of-the-mill Notre Dame alumni.

MODERN SENSE OF UNIVERSITY

The Catholic university, this statement insists, must be a university in the full modern sense of the word. It must have a strong commitment to and concern for academic excellence. "To perform its teaching and research functions effectively, the Catholic university must have a true autonomy and academic freedom in the face of authority of whatever kind, lay or clerical, external to the academic community itself." But to be Catholic, a university requires distinctive characteristics. It must be "a community of learners or a community of scholars in which Catholicism is perceptibly present and effectively operative."

Such operative presence requires, first of all, scholars in all branches of theology to explore the depths of the Christian tradition and the total religious heritage of the world, elaborate a Christian anthropology, and serve the ecumenical goals of collaboration and unity. Within the university, theology must confront all the rest of modern culture, enriching the other disciplines, bringing its own insights to bear on the problems of culture, and stimulating the development of the disciplines themselves. But this must be done with all respect for the internal autonomy of the other disciplines. "There must be no theological or philosophical imperialism; all scientific and disciplinary methods, and methodologies, must be given due honor and respect." No professional discipline per se is barred, but all of them should reflect the spirit of the liberal disciplines, of scientific and philosophic inquiry, and of humanistic and cultural understanding. The fine arts deserve a status seldom accorded them in Catholic colleges in the past.

Some months earlier Hesburgh had already taken the first major step to implement these principles. With some misgivings and much internal dissent, the Congregation of Holy Cross had been persuaded by him to turn Notre Dame over to a predominantly lay board of trustees. "I believe this was the largest gift ever made by a religious community to a lay group," Hesburgh notes with understandable pride. "We had built it up to a holding valued at several hundred million dollars, and we transferred it with no strings attached, as an act of faith following the urging of Vatican Council II that lay people should be given responsibility commensurate with their talent. Even the president is named by the board and serves at its will." Traditionally, the Notre Dame president served only six years, and it is Hesburgh's practice to submit his resignation once a year.

NOTRE DAME UNDER LAY TRUSTEES

How long an institution can maintain a distinctively Catholic character without juridic links to a highly hierarchical and centrally controlled church is a moot question that Hesburgh dismisses more lightly than some at Notre Dame. He offers three reasons for his belief that Notre Name will not repeat the experience of such formerly denominational institutions as Yale and Harvard. The new board of trustees has the same commitment to its Catholic character as the old, he says. It insisted on a bylaw providing that the president will always be a Holy Cross priest. In addition, the Holy Cross community will continue its traditional administrative and teaching contributions. Finally, the faculty will remain predominantly Catholic (at the latest count 64 percent), while attracting—as in the past—a small percentage of Jewish and Protestant professors who regard faith as important and see the transcendental as an integral component in the search for truth. Some fear that the insistence on a predominantly Catholic faculty will affect academic quality adversely, but so far this has not happened.

Hesburgh further argues that only a juridically independent Catholic university can perform one of its main functions, to be "the critical reflective intelligence of the church," a function hitherto notoriously neglected by Catholic universities in the United States. Incidentally, he applies the same principle to other opinion-making institutions—especially the press—which traditionally have been directly controlled by the bishop or a religious order. Asked how Notre Dame is now performing this function, he points immediately to its symposia on abortion—"for which I've been terribly criticized and get the nastiest possible mail." The Catholic university, he says, enables the church to be part of the world and join with others in search of rational solutions for divisive problems. Population is another area in which Notre Dame has searched and still searches for consensus. It has held many colloquia on the role of the Catholic university itself, and several bishops joined in the most recent discussion in January.

Criticism of conferences on abortion and other sensitive issues comes not only from outside, but from a small, highly vocal group within the university led by Charles E. Rice, a law professor. A Catholic university, he insists, cannot suspend judgment on decided Catholic issues, such as abortion and contraception. Hesburgh believes, on the contrary, that the hard line taken by American bishops on abortion is politically futile and theologically questionable. "It simply isn't true," he says, "that abortion is never justified or that it is always justifiable. There probably are circumstances in which a country as pluralistic as ours should allow some conscience decision on the matter."

INDEPENDENT CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY

Hesburgh's concept of a juridically independent Catholic university has not been officially accepted in Rome, nor is it likely to be soon. In spite of approval by representatives of the principal Catholic institutions of higher learning around the world at a meeting in Rome in 1969, it was rejected by Rome's Congregation for Catholic Education. And again in August 1975, Pope Paul reaffirmed the need for direct control in a talk to some 70 heads of Jesuit universities. Rome's displeasure over innovations from the United States is not new. For more than 50 years it called the American view on religious freedom "offensive to pious ears" if not "heretical," then adopted it as the official church position at Vatican II. On university freedom, Rome will keep barking but is unlikely to bite.

Meanwhile, Hesburgh is achieving the practical objectives formulated at Land O'Lakes. Renewing Notre Dames's full accreditation at all degree levels for a further decade, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools commented in 1974 on "a clear and strong sense of purpose, outstanding leadership, academic and financial strength, high morale, and a sense of community." Administrative leadership was rated "outstanding." Such criticisms as a need for more sharing of information and a sense of faculty frustration at its marginal role in decision making must be placed in the perspective of transition from a clerical autocratic regime. In fact, the faculty now has an absolute majority and students are also represented on the academic council, the highest legislative body. The administration maintains control simply by greater cohesion and better homework. Besides, old habits die hard, and even Hesburgh occasionally slips back into the molds in which he was formed. A recurrent criticism I encountered on campus, even from ardent admirers, was his tendency to hasty personal resolution of issues on which prudence would have dictated wide consultation and a search for an agreed stand.

Notre Dame has made progress in efforts to be not only our best Catholic university, but one of the country's best universities. Of the 656 teaching-and-research faculty members, 79 percent hold doctorates or the equivalent. The faculty-student ratio is 1 to 13. While applications for admission come almost exclusively from Catholic students (94 percent Catholic enrollment), the demand grows steadily, permitting high selectivity. Children of alumni get preference, "all things being equal," including academic qualifications. Average scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test for freshmen are: verbal, 560; mathematics, 630.

Students enrollment reflects Hesburgh's advocacy of civil and human rights. The Graduate School has enrolled women since its start in 1918, and for years students of nearby St. Mary's could take undergraduate exchange courses. Hesburgh first used all his impressive powers of persuasion to merge St. Mary's and Notre Dame. After that effort failed, he opened all undergraduate colleges to women. The first women will graduate in May 1976, and by fall 1976, Notre Dames will have 1,500 women, plus 500 exchange students from St. Mary's. The Hesburgh projection of a 3:5 women to men ratio will involve further tightening of standards for men.

Admission problems for the sons of the prosperous conservative midwesterners who for a century have looked to Notre Dame for a modicum of culture and outstanding football are further aggravated by Hesburgh's aggressive search for ethnic minority students. Only 12 were admitted in 1966-67, but by 1975 the number climbed to 105. They constitute 6 percent of freshmen, "a modest figure," says an admissions office official, "but an increase which goes against the trend of the past three years on college campuses across the country." A parallel program of active faculty recruitment has raised the number of women from 48 to 67 in three years while minority faculty grew from 51 to 58 over the same period. The university's affirmative action statement was approved by the HEW office of civil rights in September 1975.

SIZE OF NOTRE DAME

Hesburgh supports a decision taken in 1973 by a Committee on University Priorities to limit undergraduate enrollment to 6,600. While approving recent vigorous expansion that added broad new areas of teaching and research and invested $96 million in construction and equipment, the committee recommended a halt. In spite of a book-value growth of endowment during Hesburgh's term in office from $4.7 million to $72.6 million (by 1975, $86 million), federal and other sources of income were declining and costs rising inexorably. Though often described by outside admirers as a "Catholic Harvard," Notre Dame could not compete in all areas with a university whose endowment is $1.32 billion and growing.

What Hesburgh sees as realistic is an enrollment comparable to Princeton's, big

enough to provide the variety of a university, small enough to be a community. As part of the community focus, he would retain the traditional 75 percent of residential students, whose annual room-and-board cost on campus now averages $1,300. Tuition is $2,982 for undergraduates and $2,800 for graduates, and more than half the undergraduates get some financial aid. The accreditation report described charges to students as "a comparative bargain" in relation to other private institutions, many of lesser academic stature. Hesburgh wants to keep it that way, so that "intellect and character, not money" will continue to open the doors.

Some faculty are dissatisfied that salaries run about $500 less than those at private colleges such as Duke, Emory, and Vanderbilt, and $1,500 below the big state colleges. Average salary for all ranks this year came to over $18,000, plus fringe benefits and summer pay, but the 70 Holy Cross staff members voluntarily return what they do not need for living expenses. Their contribution to the coffers this year was $621,040. A further Holy Cross contribution, of course, is the willingness of Hesburgh and his two top aides to work 12-hour days and 7-day weeks.

Whatever the salary grievances, however, faculty members revealed a high morale and sense of commitment, and an immense respect, admiration, and affection for the president along with a sense that intangible benefits compensate for salary differentials. They emphasized that there are absolutely no restrictions on academic freedom. Even in philosophy (six credits obligatory for all students), few professors teach Thomism any more and several professors are not Catholics. The introductory survey text is that used at Harvard, and choices for specialization are virtually unlimited. Sartre is popular. In theology (also six obligatory credits), the approach is similarly open. A student may even concentrate on shamanism.

CONCERN FOR VALUES

This open approach to philosophy and theology does not represent for Hesburgh any downgrading of their importance. On the contrary, he insists, they constitute the core of a liberal education because they treat explicitly of values; and if one thing is clearer than another about Hesburgh's understanding of his role as university president, his philosophy of education, it is the primacy of values. The American university, he laments, has abdicated all concern for values. "We have become so obsessed with objectivity that we have neutralized any standing for anything. The result is that we turn out highly competent but morally neutral people, the kind of people who have the sophisticated techniques required to create a Watergate, while never asking themselves the fundamental question if it is right or wrong to behave thus."

Excellence, he points out, must be at the heart of the university effort, quoting with approval the dictum of John Gardner that "unless our philosophers and plumbers are committed to excellence, neither our pipes nor our arguments will hold water." But in the pursuit of excellence in the parts, we have lost unity of the curriculum as a whole. "We have managed to become so fragmented and so overspecialized as to be completely dissipated. We don't have the great questions elucidated in the youngsters' minds today, about love and hate, peace and war, violence and nonviolence, questions of humanity and inhumanity, beauty and ugliness, the kind of great sweeping global, cosmic questions that used to always be a part of a humanistic education, that involved an approach to history and literature, art, music, mathematics, science, philosophy, and theology, that is to say, a total unified mix."

To call an education "liberal" that neglects these purposes is for him a contradiction in terms. The word's root meaning indicates that its objective is to liberate, to free a person to think clearly and logically, to communicate clearly and gracefully, to choose, to determine that one thing is better than another, and finally, "to add value consciously to relationships that might otherwise be banal or superficial or meaningless: relations to God, to other people, to a wife or husband or children, to associates, the community, the country, the world."

He points out, however, that the American experience shows that it is possible to study all branches of knowledge without becoming imbued with and seized by their great humanizing and liberating values. Several years ago, he formulated the proposition that "the key and central factor in liberal education is the teacher-educator, his perception of his role, how he teaches, but particularly, how he lives and exemplifies the values inherent in what he teaches." He has now come up with what he hopes will prove catalyst and synthesizer, a seminar in values that is being conducted experimentally with some volunteer seniors this year.

Hesburgh's projection is to make this seminar a requirement for graduation, and to enlist the entire faculty to take turns leading it. Nobody at Notre Dame challenges the ideal, but some faculty members have reservations, either about the possibility of teaching values, or about their right to attempt to pontificate outside the area of their professional competence. Hesburgh is unconvinced by such arguments "How can anyone be a university professor if he does not have values and if he is not able to express and defend them? I'm not asking professors to give answers but to raise questions. I don't want any student to graduate from Notre Dame without being confronted with the reality of world hunger, the reality of global injustice, the need for him to make moral decisions as public servant, politican, engineer, lawyers, doctor, teacher, or priest." At the same time, he avoids direct confrontation. "All we're doing at this time is experimenting. I know we'll find a way on which we can all agree."

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL PRESTIGE

Many faculty members rate high among Notre Dame's intangible benefits. Hesburgh's national and international prestige and influence, and the resulting impact on the university. Several recalled for me with approval the comment of George Shuster, who came to semiretirement at Notre Dame when he left the presidency of Hunter College, New York, that "the president who never leaves compus has no place on campus." Among the benefits of outside exposure is a perspective that allows one to see how petty some campus issues are.

Hesburgh's convictions were not changed by exposure to national and world problems as head of the International Federation of Catholic Universities, as a director of the Institute of International Education, as Vatican representative for 14 years to the International Atomic Energy Agency, as Vatican delegate to the UN General Assembly, as member and later chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and as member of a dozen other prestigious private and public bodies. But his sense of urgency was enormously intensified. And he quickly realized that he could contribute not only through his own knowledge and education, but by motivating faculty and students to relate their academic work to the needs of the nation and the world.

One concrete result is a strong social awareness among today's students at Notre Dame, an awareness never acute in Catholic schools and colleges. Seminars and campaigns led students to create a World Hunger Coalition in response to famine in the Sahel and Bangladesh, organizing collective fasts and donating the proceeds. More than a thousand students are active in neighboring South Bend, tutoring underprivileged children, working in minority industries, caring for the elderly in their homes and crippled children in a hospital that depends on their services to survive. At a higher level, Hesburgh's energies have gone into raising funds for international studies, urban studies, continuing education, and civil rights, as well as for the $6-million Ecumenical Institute outside Jerusalem, which operates under Notre Dame auspices.

As he tells it, all this whirlwind activity just happened. One Sunday afternoon in 1954, Sherman Adams called to say President Eisenhower wanted him on the National Science Board. "I am a theologian," he protested (he had earlier headed Notre Dame's theology department). "Exactly," replied Adams. "The President has 23 scientists and he thinks we should have a specialist in the morality and ethics of the board's programs, particularly in the developing field of the peaceful uses of the atom." When the International Atomic Energy Agency was launched, Washington sought a Vatican presence; told by Rome it had no expert, Washington retorted that indeed it had one at Notre Dame. And so it went, from one area to another. When the scientists, diplomats, or businessmen got used to the Roman collar, they were impressed by Hesburgh's ability to learn quickly, to formulate issues clearly, and to be forthright without being offensive. They discovered that this softspoken man could divert Russians and Americans from their prejudices and help them to identify their common interests. He could persuade businessmen that it was not only right but profitable to upgrade minorities. And when all failed, he still spoke his mind, as when he denounced President Nixon for politicking with minority rights and in revenge was dropped as chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

One criticism voiced to me was that Hesburgh's cordial association with many activities of American business, sometimes disguised as philanthropy but sometimes open (Chase Manhattan Bank), tends to legitimate activities of the multinationals that are under growing attack at home and worldwide. His response to such questioning is revealing.

FOREIGN POLICY

He supports the concept of foreign aid to help rebuild poor countries suffering the effects of centuries of exploitation, just as he believes in special programs for domestic minorities hitherto denied their fair share. But he regards our contribution as far too small and deplores its frequent misuses for political purposes or to benefit multinational entrepreneurs rather than the recipient economy. He also deplores our narrow concentration on development as an economic problem. For him, true world development must give equal emphasis to human, social, cultural, and educational factors. He asserts that if it were not for the Pentagon's empire-building complex, we could have persuaded the Russians long ago to cooperate in deescalating the world armaments race, thereby releasing vast sums for domestic and foreign development. The Pentagon's resistance to gradually restoring to Panama the control and operation of the canal he describes as "paranoiac."

All these stands fully legitimate his honorary membership in the liberal Eastern establishment. But his approach to implementing such changes reveals a middle-of-the-road midwesterner in tune with the Notre Dame of yesterday and today. Sweet reason is his weapon to improve attitudes and understanding as a prelude to improving structures, and that is what he sees himself as doing through his dialog with key decision makers in government and business.

So sure is Hesburgh of the correctness of his own approach that he is impatient with the growing volume of opinion, in the

Christian churches as elsewhere, that regards the institutions of capitalism as incapable of self-reform. He ranges himself with Barbara Ward against such thinking. "I'm against violence," he says. "It usually ends up making things worse. I'm against violent revolution. I'm for reform within the structure, not that the structure is pretty good the way it is—it's pretty damn bad. I strongly disagree with those Christians who think our institutions are irreformable. In the 1960s we changed a lot of institutions, including the overriding apartheid. There was a quantum jump forward with the 1964, 1965, and 1968 laws on voting, accommodations, education, housing, and employment, much of which I think is institutionalized so that we can never go back to the apartheid situation again. And what the American constitutional system effected in that area, it can effect in others."

Neither is Hesburgh defensive about his Chase Manhattan board membership. When asked to join as "a public interest member," he studied the materials, got some sense of the enormous influence involved, and decided to give it a try. "So far, I'm continuing to work on it; still learning, too. Our many New York branches have 36 percent minority employment, high for a bank, and we are involved in about a dozen international development funds overseas. They are generally unprofitable, but enormously helpful in developing local business projects in countries that need them and want them, but need both technical and financial assistance to start—even to know where to start."

Even if one has reservations at times about the profundity and accuracy of the analysis, the sincerity and the level of achievement are impressive. Here is a man who illustrates the continuing value of commitment, openness, civility, readiness to serve, and profoundly humane integrity.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia (at the request of Mr. SATTERFIELD), for February 9, 10, and 11, 1976, on account of illness.

Mr. BAUMAN (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRASSLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CONABLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. TALCOTT, for 8 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ABZUG, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANDERSON of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAFALCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MURPHY of New York, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. SIKES, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BRADEMAS, and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $858.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRASSLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WINN.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan in two instances.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. SYMMS in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. MICHEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. NEDZI.

Mr. MIKVA.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Ms. ABZUG.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. MURTHA in two instances.

Mr. FRASER in two instances.

Mr. MEZVINSKY.

Mrs. MEYNER.

Mr. BRODHEAD.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. MCDONALD of Georgia in four instances.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. RICHMOND.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. SIMON.

Mr. ROGERS in five instances.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. TRAXLER in three instances.

Mr. FLOOD.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, 94th Congress, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday, February 16, 1976.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, the House adjourned until Monday, February 16, 1976, 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:

2515. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, for 1½ years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2516. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority for fiscal year 1976 as of February 1, 1976, pursuant to section 1014(e) of Public Law 93–344 (H. Doc. 94–365); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2517. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2518. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report of the Department's intention to establish a new system of personal records resulting from the collection of demographic and housing information from native Alaskans, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2519. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior; transmitting the annual report of the anthracite mine water control and mine sealing and filling program for calendar year 1975, pursuant to 76 stat. 935 (30 U.S.C. 575); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2520. A letter from the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the second annual report on activities under the Emergency Medical Services Systems Act, pursuant to section 1210 of the act (Public Law 93–154); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2521. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend certain provisions of the Clean Air Act for 2 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2522. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend provisions of the Noise Control Act of 1972, for 2 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2523. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend provisions of title XIV of the Public Health Service Act for 1¼ years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2524. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, for 2 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2525. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of a publication entitled "Typical Electric Bills, 1975"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2526. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended [8 U.S.C. 1154(d)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2527. 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.

2528. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act for 2 years; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2529. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the second annual report on highway safety improvement programs, covering fiscal year 1975, pursuant to section 203(e) of the Highway Safety Act of 1973 and sections 151(g), 152(e), 153(e), and 405(h) of title 23, United States Code (H. Doc. No. 94-366); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2530. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for 2 years; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2531. A letter from the Federal Cochairman, Pacific Northwest Regional Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Commission for fiscal year 1975, pursuant to section 510 of the Public Works and Economics Development Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2532. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July-October 1975, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Small Business.

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:

Mrs. SCHROEDER: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 7824. A bill to amend secion 142 of title 13, United States Code, entitled "Census"; with amendment (Rept. No. 94-821). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. Senate Joint Resolution 154. Joint resolution to extend the time period during which the President is authorized to call a White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals, and to extend the time period during which appropriated funds may be expended (Rept. No. 94-822). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. SULLIVAN: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 10229. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973; with amendment (Rept. No. 94-823). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 1313. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the city of Rolla, Mo., for airport purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 94-824). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2575. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the city of Algona, Iowa, for airport purposes with amendment (Rept. No. 94-825). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 2740. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the city of Elkhart, Kans., for airport purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 94-826). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 3440. A bill to clarify authorization for the approval by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency of the exchange of a portion of real property conveyed to the city of Grand Junction, Colo., for airport purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 94-827). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 7017. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to tariff changes; with amendment (Rept. No. 94-828). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 8228. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to emergency locator transmitters, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 94-829). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 8508. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the city of Camden, Ark., for airport purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 94-830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Alabama: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 9617. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to release restrictions on the use of certain property conveyed to the city of Alva, Okla., for airport purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 94-831). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 801. Joint Resolution making supplemental railroad appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, the period ending September 30, 1976, the fiscal year ending September 30, 1978, and the fiscal year ending September 30, 1979, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 94-832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan (for himself and Mr. STEPHENS):

H.R. 11860. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to provide supplementary community development block grant assistance to communities with high unemployment due to adverse national economic conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Ms. JORDAN, Mr. BEDELL Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HOWE, Mr. MANN, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RISENHOOVER, Ms. SPELLMAN, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 11861. A bill to reorganize the executive branch of the Federal Government to eliminate excessive, duplicative, inflationary, and anticompetitive regulation; jointly to the Committees on Government Operations, and Rules.

By Mr. BEDELL (for himself, Mr. WHALEN, Ms. ABZUG, Mr. BALDUS, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORNELL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. KREBS, Mr. OTTINGER, Ms. MEYNER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PATTISON of New York, and Ms. SPELLMAN):

H.R. 11862. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to increase to $28,500 over a 3-year period (subject to further increases based on rises in reported wage levels) the ceiling on the amount of earnings which may be counted for social security benefit and tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 11863. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that political contributions may not be used to pay the cost of preparing or printing franked mail, to prohibit the loaning of the frank in connection with any mass mailing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRODHEAD:

H.R. 11864. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act so as to make the supplemental security income benefits program more effective, and benefits under such program more realistically available, for mentally retarded persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 11865. A bill to authorize instruction, research, and demonstration directly and primarily related to the maintenance, protection, and improvement of the environment; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, and Science and Technology.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 11866. A bill to require a health warning in the labeling and advertising of certain alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 11867. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude certain mission societies and their missionary members from social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA (for himself and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 11868. A bill to amend section 602 of the Agricultural Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11869. A bill to amend section 5924 (4)(B) of title V of United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DRINAN:

H.R. 11870. A bill to amend part V of title 18 of the United States Code to provide transectional immunity in certain cases in which the privilege against self-incrimination is asserted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FENWICK:

H.R. 11871. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide a priority for certain debts to consumers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENZEL (for himself, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. VANDER VEEN, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr.

DUNCAN of Oregon, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SIMON, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 11872. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974 to establish an independent establishment of the executive branch of the Government of the United States, a commission to be known as the Federal Election Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRENZEL (for himself, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. BALDUS, Mr. QUIE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. DU PONT, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. MINETA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FISHER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. ROBINSON):

H.R. 11873. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974 to establish an independent establishment of the executive branch of the Government of the United States, a commission to be known as the Federal Election Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRENZEL (for himself, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 11874. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974 to establish an independent establishment of the executive branch of the Government of the United States, a commission to be known as the Federal Election Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GUDE (for himself, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Mr. YOUNG of Georgia, and Mr. SEIBERLING):

H.R. 11875. A bill to establish the Potomac National River in the States of Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia, and in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California (for himself, Mr. LUJAN, Mrs. PETTIS, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, and Mr. WEAVER):

H.R. 11876. A bill to amend the Water Resources Planning Act (79 Stat. 244) as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 11877. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for the National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works to be coextensive with the life of such Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN (for himself, Mr. BAFALIS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JENRETTE, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 11878. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide the death penalty for certain destructive acts to airports, airplanes, and related things and places; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11879. A bill to promote the conservation and orderly development of hard mineral resources of the deep seabed, pending adoption of an international regime relating thereto; jointly to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 11880. A bill to terminate the granting of construction licenses of new nuclear fission powerplants in the United States pending action by the Congress following a comprehensive study of the nuclear fuel cycle, with particular reference to its safety and environmental hazards, to be conducted by the Office of Technology Assessment, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. RUPPE (for himself, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BALDUS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CORNELL, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCCLORY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. OBEY, Mrs. PETTIS, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SISK, and Mr. TRAXLER):

H.R. 11881. A bill to authorize the construction and operation of a natural gas pipeline from the North Slope of Alaska across Canada to domestic markets, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. RUPPE (for himself, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. ESCH, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 11882. A bill to authorize the construction and operation of a natural gas pipeline from the North Slope of Alaska across Canada to domestic markets, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. RUSSO:

H.R. 11883. A bill to provide compensation for the victims of crime, assistance to witnesses in criminal cases, and an increase in witness fees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11884. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, and to amend the Act of October 15, 1966, to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIMON (for himself, Mr. MCKAY, Mr. BEDELL, and Mr. HANSEN):

H.R. 11885. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to require that population census records be transferred to the National Archives within 50 years after a census, and that such records be made available after 75 years to persons conducting research for genealogical or other proper purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 11886. A bill to provide for the commemoration of the opening of the Cherokee Strip to homesteading, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. SEBELIUS):

H.R. 11887. A bill to amend the act approved August 18, 1970, providing for improvement in the administration of the National Park System by the Secretary of the Interior and clarifying authorities applicable to the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 11888. A bill to amend section 303 of the Communications Act of 1934 to require that radios be capable of receiving both amplitude modulated (AM) and frequency modulated (FM) broadcasts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 11889. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow taxpayers electing the standard deduction to take a separate deduction for charitable contributions and to allow low- and middle-income taxpayers a deduction of up to 200 percent of such contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 807. Joint resolution to establish a Bicentennial Commission on Presidential Nominations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROBINSON (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. ROE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FISH, Mr. CONTE, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. STAGGERS, Mrs. SPELLMAN, and Mr. BROYHILL):

H.J. Res. 808. Joint resolution to designate the apple as the official Bicentennial fruit; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SYMMS (for himself, Mr. MCCORMACK, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. DENT, Mr. HAYES of Indiana, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. EMERY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HICKS, and Mr. JOHNSON of California).

H.J. Res. 809. Joint resolution to designate the apple as the official Bicentennial fruit; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Ms. HOLTZMAN introduced a bill (H.R. 11890) for the relief of Bernard Julian Phillips, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

390. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city council, Pico Rivera, Calif., relative to the impoundment of housing rehabilitation loan funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

391. Also, petition of the city council, Wheaton, Ill., relative to the Municipal Capital Market Improvement Act; to the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing.

392. Also, petition of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Washington, D.C., relative to marine fisheries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

393. Also, petition of the Board of Kern Park Christian Church, Portland, Oreg., relative to the Bicentennial observance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.