

should establish a commission to examine the recent events at Kent State and Jackson State; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUIE (for himself, Mr. BRES-TER, and Mr. MATSUNAGA):

H. Con. Res. 645. A resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of a United Nations international supervisory force for the purpose of establishing a cease-fire in Indochina to aid efforts toward a political solution of current hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 17799. A bill for the relief of Otto Schueller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 17800. A bill for the relief of Mr. Jose Casian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 17801. A bill for the relief of Louisa Ann Stevenson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

391. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Cambodia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

392. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the establishment of a National Institute of Environmental Science in Alaska; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

493. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Nell Hardin et al., Fort Worth, Tex., relative to law and order; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

494. Also, petition of the City Council, Lawndale, Calif., relative to tax free local bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

495. Also, petition of the Council of the City of New Orleans, La., relative to welfare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 26, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Adlai Albert Esteb, Seventh Day Adventist Church, Takoma Park, Md., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, may Thy special blessings rest upon the Members of Congress as they face the current crises of these crucial times.

The world is literally littered with the wreckage of hate.

"O God above, we plead for love,  
For on this earth, a direful dearth  
Of love prevails and hate unveils  
Its poisoned darts and broken hearts!  
God, make us kind, and help us find  
true peace of mind.

"God grant us grace: Our human race  
Defiles the springs of faith and clings  
To fear and doubt. Make us devout,  
And, Lord, impart to ev'ry heart,  
The faith to win our war with sin  
without, within.

"God give us power, for in this hour  
Of urgent needs for greater deeds,  
Our only hope, if we're to cope  
With tasks so great, when time's so late,  
Is power benign and love divine,  
the glory Thine!"

In the precious name of Jesus. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### AUTHORITY FOR THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON JUNE 3, 1970

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, June 3, 1970, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the President of the Republic of Venezuela.

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

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, TO MONDAY, JUNE 1, 1970

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution, House Concurrent

Resolution 646, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 646

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Wednesday, May 27, 1970, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, June 1, 1970.*

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM SENATE AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday, June 1, 1970, 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### EXPENDITURE CONTROL

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the administration is currently before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives requesting an increase of the public debt ceiling to \$395 billion.

The Secretary of the Treasury has stated that an increase of the debt limit is critically needed by this administration to permit it to carry on the business of Government. During the testimony before our committee yesterday, Budget Director Robert P. Mayo stated that defense expenditures for fiscal year 1970 were \$77 billion. He further stated that it was budgeted by the administration

that defense expenditures for fiscal year 1971 would total \$71.8 billion. These budget estimates disregard the carryover of billions of dollars of appropriated funds which are available for spending at any time.

In order to assure a reasonable reduction in Defense spending compatible with the administration's announced withdrawal of 150,000 troops from Southeast Asia, I am compelled to urge that the temporary debt ceiling be held to \$389 billion, reflecting a \$5.8 billion reduction in defense spending in fiscal year 1971.

In this way, Congress can exercise its constitutional authority to bring defense spending within the framework and guidelines of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968.

Every agency of the Government should be subjected to the same kind of expenditure control—including the Department of Defense. The American taxpayer has every right to expect this kind of responsibility to be exercised by the Congress. If we can hack away at appropriations for education, for health, for veterans' services, for housing, and for pollution, we ought to make a reasonable effort to apply the same principles to defense spending.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO FILE REPORT ON EMERGENCY HOUSING BILL UNTIL MIDNIGHT SATURDAY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight Saturday night to file a report on the emergency housing bill, H.R. 17495.

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

#### AMENDING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES RELATING TO FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, and on behalf of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), I call up House Resolution

971 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 971

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 796) amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to financial disclosure. After general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 971 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of House Resolution 796 amending the rules of the House relating to financial disclosure.

The purpose of House Resolution 796 is to amend rule XLIV for the purpose of strengthening and clarifying existing provisions of the rule.

This would be accomplished by requiring Members, officers, and certain employees of the House to report for public purposes disclosure of, first, the sources of honorariums of \$300 or more and, second, the identity of each creditor to whom \$10,000 or more was owed for 90 consecutive days or more in the preceding calendar year without the pledge of specific security.

The additional requirements for disclosure would be effective with the filing of reports for calendar year 1971, which would be due by April 30, 1972.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 796 amends the rules of the House relating to financial disclosure.

As the able gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) has stated, the purpose of the resolution is to amend House rule XLIV in two major respects.

First, the resolution will require Members, officers, principal assistants to Members, and professional staff members of committees to report publicly: First, the sources of all honorariums of \$300 or more, and, second, the identity of creditors to whom \$10,000 or more is owed for 90 days or longer without any specific security or collateral for the loan.

The new requirements will be effective for calendar year 1971, the report of

which is required to be filed on or before April 30, 1972.

The resolution requires that the specific honorarium amounts as well as the specific unsecured debt amounts must be reported in part B of the required report, which part is sealed and held secret unless the committee votes to open a particular report.

The fact that honorariums have been received, as well as the names of creditors holding unsecured loans must be noted in part A of the report, which is open to public inspection.

The resolution also contains a technical amendment to rule XLIV to make clear that if a person required to file has nothing to enter in part A, the filing of part B is not required.

I have no further request for time, but I reserve the balance of my time, and urge the adoption of the resolution.

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

The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 142]

Anderson, Tenn.	Ford, William D.	Patten Pettis
Ashley Baring	Gallagher	Pike
Biaggi	Gaydos	Pollock
Blester	Gilbert	Powell
Blackburn	Goldwater	Purcell
Blanton	Green, Oreg.	Railsback
Bolling	Hansen, Wash.	Randall
Broomfield	Hébert	Reid, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Helstoski	Reifel
Burton, Calif.	Hogan	Rhodes
Button	Hungate	Riegler
Carter	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Casey	Jones, Tenn.	Rodino
Celler	Kee	Rogers, Colo.
Chisholm	Kirwan	Rooney, N.Y.
Clark	Kyl	Roybal
Clawson, Del.	Landrum	Ruppe
Clay	Latta	Scherle
Cohelan	Lukens	Scheuer
Conyers	McCarthy	Schwengel
Cowger	McCloskey	Sebelius
Cramer	McClure	Sikes
Culver	McCulloch	Smith, Iowa
Daniel, Va.	McMillan	Snyder
Davis, Ga.	Macdonald, Mass.	Stokes
Dawson	MacGregor	Stratton
de la Garza	Mathias	Stubblefield
Diggs	Matsumaga	Stuckey
Donohue	May	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	Miller, Calif.	Tunney
Edwards, Ala.	Moorhead	Watson
Edwards, Calif.	Moss	Watts
Edwards, La.	Murphy, Ill.	Whitten
Evans, Colo.	Nichols	Wilson,
Evins, Tenn.	O'Neal, Ga.	Charles H. Yates
Foley	Ottinger	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 320 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Speaker, although I was present during much of the debate on the bank records and foreign transactions bill—H.R. 15073—I was unavoidably absent at the time of the roll call.

It had been my full intention to vote "aye" when my name was called, and I take this occasion to indicate my full support for this constructive legislation.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES RELATING TO FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 796, amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to financial disclosure.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Resolution 796, with Mr. YOUNG in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BETTS) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I hope not to take much of your time; the recommendations we make speak for themselves.

A little more than 2 years ago I appeared before this body, together with other members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, in support of the committee's original recommendations for a Code of Official Conduct and a system of financial disclosure. Those recommendations were adopted by a vote of 406 to 1, and have since been in force for Members, officers, and covered employees of the House.

At that time the committee, which I am honored to chair, emphasized that its product, as then presented, likely would require refinement and revision after

being put to the test of experience. The time now has arrived, in the committee's view, for the changes we now propose. It is conceivable that further experience may point to a need for other changes.

The recommendations submitted to you today in House Resolution 796 are designed to strengthen the existing financial reporting requirements as provided in House rule XLIV.

One recommendation would require public disclosure of the sources of honoraria of \$300 or more. The actual amounts received would be entered in the sealed portion of the report which could be opened only in event of a formal investigation authorized by a majority vote of the committee.

Reporting of the sources of such honoraria would supplement point 5 of the existing Code of Official Conduct which prohibits the receipt of honoraria "for a speech, writing for publication, or other similar activities, from any person, organization or corporation in excess of the usual and customary value for such services."

Nothing in the pending resolution would change that prohibition in any way.

The other principle recommendation before you calls for the public reporting of any loan or other indebtedness of \$10,000 or more which were outstanding for 90 days or longer in the preceding calendar year without the pledge of specific collateral. Here again the actual amounts would be entered only in the sealed portion of your financial reports. The public portion would show only the identity of such creditors.

As to the "pledge of assets . . . of appropriate value" as used in the resolution, the committee recognizes that it is a customary practice for some loans to be granted on the basis of a financial statement furnished by the borrower. Such loans, however, are effectively open-book credit and provide no specific security to the lender. Otherwise, the committee feels the pledge of any specific and bona fide collateral would fulfill the requirements of the resolution.

Further as to the 90-day period involved, a natural question is whether consecutively renewable loans for periods of less than 90 days would need to be reported. Clearly such loans are in effect the same loan, so the committee feels that any loan continuously renewed or renewable between the same parties would be considered to be a single loan for the 90 consecutive day test in the rule.

The proposed additions to the financial disclosure rule were agreed upon by the committee after long and careful deliberation. The committee feels that they definitely will provide needed reinforcement of the present provisions for management of potential conflicts of interest. These proposals were supported by all Members of the House who testified before the committee or who filed statements for inclusion in the record of our hearings. Additional support for the recommendations was expressed by public witnesses and in statements filed by other interested persons and organizations.

A third proposed amendment is purely technical. Its purpose is simply to eliminate the requirement for the filing of the sealed portion, or part B, of the financial reporting form by those who have nothing to declare in part A, the public portion. By administrative action, the committee already has put this exemption into effect. In the instructions for the filings for 1969, due by April 30, we state that part B need not be filed if nothing is reported in part A.

The other recommendations in the resolution would be effective with the filings due by April 30, 1972, which means they would apply to reports for the calendar year 1971.

Our resolution may seem brief, but in the committee's opinion it is to the points we want to cover and is designed to fit precisely into the rules of the House that spell out our jurisdiction.

In arriving at the pending recommendations, the committee has examined all available views and has given careful consideration to the language of what we propose. The committee feels strongly that its recommendations are fair to all and will add needed strength to the financial reporting rule of the House.

I emphasize that the recommendations have been carefully thought out and will mesh smoothly into the apparatus of the committees' existing functions, as provided in the rules of the House.

Accordingly, I express the hope that House Resolution 796 will be adopted in the form in which it is presented.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and, indeed, I appreciate his report, to say nothing of his services on this House-created committee.

My question is merely technical, and may be in the form of a hypothetical question insofar as the financial disclosure of the amendments in House Resolution 796 is concerned:

Assuming a personal note had been given within a family for an amount over \$10,000: First, would that personal note be considered sufficient collateral; and, second, would it be reported by a Member under this amendment?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I would say so, yes. I would say that it should be reported if there is no other substance backing up or guaranteeing the payment of the note.

Mr. HALL. A second question, if the gentleman will yield further:

Assuming a family-type corporation wherein there was a note in return for real property, but only the note given in good faith and backed by the credit of the corporation to the original owner within the family corporation, would this be reportable if it was over 90 days and over \$10,000?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. The gentleman says it is backed by the credit of the corporation?

Mr. HALL. That is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I would say that any note owned by a Member is an asset and therefore not reportable as a debt; also any note owned by a Member if

there is no collateral pledged to support the note, would be reported also under this amendment as a debt.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that is exactly what I am trying to determine, not that I am interested in either instance, but in just reading the report I suppose what we are trying to develop in the legislative record here, is what is adequate collateral? Is it a personal note within a family on the one hand, or is it something tangible and in escrow? Apparently the gentleman from Illinois says in the one instance it is not adequate collateral, and in the other instance that because of the good faith and credit of the corporation whether or not it is an asset and hence reportable or not—because it probably could be reclaimed by the original donor for which the note was given—am I to presume that that is adequate collateral?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. A note made by a Member would have to be specifically secured by definite and bona fide collateral; where the creditor would be in a position to foreclose on such a note.

Mr. Chairman, I would yield at this time to one of our legal minds on the committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ABBITT).

Mr. HALL. I certainly am not a legally trained mind either, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding. What I really want to know is: What is adequate collateral? Must it be something that is placed in escrow, such as bonds, or what?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ABBITT) to answer that.

Mr. ABBITT. As I understand the chairman's answer, it is entirely correct, as to the question you have put.

Of course, if a corporation made the note, it would not be incumbent upon the Member to report the note that the corporation owed. That is what I understood your question was—assuming that the corporation gave a note, the corporation would be the debtor and, of course, it would not be incumbent upon the Member just because he had stock in the corporation, to report that note.

If you have enough stock in a corporation and the statutory amount of the income was sufficient, then it would have to be reported in the income section of the report.

Mr. HALL. I understand that.

Mr. ABBITT. But you would not have to report on a note that a corporation owed, that is my understanding of it.

What the chairman is trying to say is: A note made by a Member has to be reported unless it has a sufficient collateral behind the note, like putting up a mortgage or collateral security, meeting the other tests in the rule.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

I wonder if he would care to define for us "adequate collateral," and further answering my question as to whether it must be in some tangible form that is placed in escrow, in order for it to be adequate collateral?

Mr. ABBITT. With reference to specific security to the lenders, we are concerned with the kind of obligation that could be interpreted under the law as other than a bona fide credit transaction.

In other words, where there is a transaction, a bona fide transaction, with a banker, or some similar situation that is arms length, and in that transaction security is given, such as stock or a lien on an automobile or something like that, it is not contemplated that that would come within the rule and it would not have to be reported.

In other words, what we are trying to get at is the arms length transaction, as I understand it.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield for one final question, insofar as we have gotten into this thus far, am I to understand then that if a bona fide bank would lend, say in excess of \$50,000, on a personal signature, regardless of whether or not the bank examiners and the State banking laws require adequate collateral, that this would then have to be reported if he held it over 90 days in any one year?

I think this area and definition is fuzzy, this question of the definition of collateral under this amendment, and I am simply trying to make a legislative record here so we will know how to implement this rule.

Mr. ABBITT. My understanding is that the security has to be something that the creditor can foreclose on, in other words, a specific and bona fide collateral and the pledge of specific and bona fide collateral would fulfill the requirements of the resolution.

But it should be noted that loans granted on the basis of a financial statement furnished by the borrower are in effect open-book credit and provide no specific security to the lender, therefore these loans would not fall within the definition of security demanded by the resolution.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. Suppose I have \$25,000 put in my account on a cattle feed loan and do not actually put the account up as collateral—but do it year after year and after the cattle are fed repay the note that I have with the bank. You would have to report that note under this resolution; is that not correct?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. I would say so—yes.

Mr. MIZE. I thank the gentleman.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to pay my sincere respects to our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, for the able manner in which he has presided over the sessions of this committee from its inception. I associate myself with his remarks.

And I want to compliment the committee membership generally for the interest they have shown and the contributions they have made to the extensive discussions we held on this matter.

Beyond that, may I express my appreciation to the Members of this body who have cooperated in the filing of reports required under rule XLIV.

As one who was privileged to take part in the effort which led to the drafting of the present Code of Official Conduct and the establishment of the standing committee, I can assure you that this is a most difficult area in which to legislate effectively.

We of the committee realize that the amendments we are proposing here today with respect to financial disclosure may yet not yield a perfect rule.

The committee has entertained many suggestions for more inclusive financial disclosure requirements, and has carefully considered them.

But it is one thing, for instance, to call for "full financial disclosure," and quite another to nail down just what that term means.

Not even a Federal tax return constitutes "full financial disclosure," and would not be as relevant to the fundamental purposes of the rule as the report now required under rule XLIV.

As for the dollar amounts on honorariums and debts as proposed in these amendments, we also realize that there may well be a wide difference of opinion as to whether they are too high or too low.

Arguments on that score—pro and con—could go on ad infinitum.

But I submit that this resolution was reported out of committee, after the most careful consideration, with unanimous approval.

It is also noteworthy, I think, that members who testified before the committee, or submitted statements, all endorsed House Resolution 796, although some, admittedly, called for more extensive disclosure than the committee could justify as realistically needed to control potential conflict of interest.

The whole area of financial disclosure will, of course, be a matter of continuing interest by the committee and should the need for further perfection of rule XLIV become evident, appropriate amendments will be forthcoming, I'm sure.

Meanwhile, I hope the House will accept House Resolution 796 as reported by the committee.

I believe the amendments are reasonable and justified, and their incorporation in House rule XLIV will be a positive step, and work no hardship on anyone.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to express my support of the recommendations of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, of which I am privileged to be a member, and to add the hope that the House will accept the recommendations without change.

I shall deal briefly with only one aspect of the pending resolution—the 90-day provision in the recommendation relating to unsecured indebtedness.

Why did we apply the reporting requirement only to such indebtedness that existed for 90 consecutive days or longer in the year covered?

The answer is simple.

Some Members—and perhaps some employees of the House—own noncon-

flicting business interests that are subject to seasonal borrowing demands. Many such businesses obtain short-term or seasonal loans on the basis of established lines of credit or their financial statements. Since such loans offer no specific security to the lender, they are actually unsecured loans within the meaning of this resolution.

But they usually are needed for periods of 90 days or less, and hence the committee sees no purpose in requiring that such loans be reported.

Our proposal is concerned with the kind of obligations that could be interpreted to arise from other than bona fide credit transactions and thus arouse suspicion in the conflict-of-interest area.

The reporting requirement thus would place before the public sufficient information for making any necessary judgments relative to conflict of interest without undue invasion of privacy or disclosure of facts potentially useful to a competitor.

I urge my colleagues in the House to accept our recommendations as written.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD).

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in urging this body to accept the committee's recommendations. They are the product of a long and careful study.

Some of you may wonder why, in dealing with honorariums, we chose the \$300 figure. Or why we do not provide for public disclosure of the actual amounts received.

We settled on the \$300 figure: First, because it seemed a reasonable minimum; and, second, because it goes along with what the Senate requires.

The question may arise whether the \$300 figure applies only to a single payment of that amount or more. The language of the resolution covers that point when it says "honorariums from a single source aggregating \$300 or more." In other words, if a Member received one fee of \$200 and another of \$100 from the same source, he would be subject to the reporting requirement.

Another probable question concerns fees received through a booking agency. To be fully responsive to the reporting requirement, a Member or employee should list the sponsoring group as the source, not the agency which arranged the engagement. The committee feels that this should impose no difficulty. To list an agency as the source, even though the actual payment came from the agency, would be evading the intent of the requirement.

Some may feel that the actual amounts should be included in the public part of the reports. The committee's answer to that is that the source is the important thing, that is what the public would be mostly concerned with. It also keeps this provision consistent with other parts of the rule.

As I am sure you know, there already exists a prohibition in the rules of the House against the acceptance of any honorarium "in excess of the usual and

customary value of such services." This is contained in point 5 of the Code of Official Conduct, as adopted April 3, 1968. This remains intact.

Although the committee requested an open rule and the matter properly is before you under such conditions, I urge my colleagues to see this amendment as part of the whole interlocking system with which the committee is concerned and support it as presented.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, along the lines of the remarks made by the gentleman and the part of the resolution to which the gentleman refers, would it be considered reportable if a Member of the House were invited to speak, say, on the west coast, where the cost of the airplane transportation would exceed \$300? If the speaker is to receive not \$1 but is to receive airplane transportation to the west coast or Hawaii or Alaska, all of which would exceed the amount specified, if he is not receiving a single dollar other than the ticket, and in effect the expense of the transportation package were to be paid, would such an episode be reportable under the resolution presented?

Mr. STAFFORD. It would be the intent of the committee that if an honorarium is received, if that also must cover transportation to and from the point at which the honorarium is received, that the recipient is entitled to deduct the actual cost of his expenses before determining how much honorarium is received.

Then only should the honorarium in excess of expenses by \$300 have to be reported by source.

Mr. DELLENBACK. In the situation which I hypothesized, where there was in effect no net return to the speaker, and in fact he did not get any money and did not buy any ticket himself, but the sponsoring organization purchased and supplied the ticket, it would be unnecessary to make a report on that particular episode at all?

Mr. STAFFORD. In the opinion of this member of the committee, that is correct.

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

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

Mr. BETTS. As an example we might point out, anything over and above expenses which the Member receives in excess of \$300 would have to be reported. Is that another way of saying the same thing?

Mr. STAFFORD. That would be this Member's opinion.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield further to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. In view of the statement just made by the gentleman from Ohio, instead of the situation being as I first propounded it to the gentleman in the well, if one were expected to make a trip, again to the west coast, and it were to be understood that the person making the speech would pay his own expenses,

if a check then were to be given to the speaker in, let us say, the amount of \$350, with the understanding that all or practically all of that would be used to pay for the transportation, would it then be necessary, since \$350 actually was to be paid to the speaker, to report that?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not in the opinion of this Member, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution cosponsored by all the members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, on which I am honored to serve.

In case there are any questions about the \$10,000 figure contained in the committee's recommendation dealing with the reporting of unsecured debts, let me say that we settled on that figure after long and careful consideration of what minimum figure should be established.

The committee's thinking was that the \$10,000 figure was adequate to meet the objectives of financial disclosure in relation to potential conflicts of interest while exempting routine borrowings so familiar to many of us.

A special committee of the bar association of the city of New York, in response to an invitation to testify at the hearings, came out with a recommendation for disclosure of such indebtedness in excess of \$5,000, but the committee remained convinced that its \$10,000 figure was totally realistic and adequate to meet the problem.

Our proposal is aimed primarily at long-term, unsecured loans—the type of loan that could give rise to genuine public concern.

It covers unsecured indebtedness to individuals, businesses, or any type of lender when it reaches the \$10,000 figure either in single or multiple instruments if that total is exceeded for more than 90 days.

Should such indebtedness ever be written off by the creditor even though previously reported, such might well fall into the category of gifts and thereby become subject to point 4 of the existing Code of Official Conduct. This provision of the code prohibits acceptance of gifts "of substantial value from any person, organization or corporation having a direct interest in legislation before the Congress." Even if there were no such legislation pending, such a gift could raise the suspicion that an attempt is being made to improperly influence a Member or employee.

The committee feels that its proposed \$10,000 figure is appropriate and hopes that this and the other provisions of House Resolution 796 will be written into the rules of the House without change.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, we all know that the Congress has taken many licks over the years. Of the three branches of our Government, it has been the favorite whipping boy, no matter whether the criticism is real or fancied.

This probably is as it should be—because the Congress, and in particular a Member of the House of Representatives, is the closest link the citizen has with all our vast Federal structure.

Will Rogers, Oklahoma's beloved cowboy humorist, used to throw many barbs at Congress. He once said—and I quote:

Now if Congress won't defend themselves, I will enter protest. I knock 'em but I like 'em, and I understand 'em.

After a time, the Congress saw the wisdom of arming itself with safeguards against questionable acts by individual Members for which Congress as a whole would have to pay the price. I refer to the Codes of Conduct adopted by both the Senate and the House, together with the annual financial disclosure reports now required of Members and certain employees of both Houses. These safeguards were adopted just a little more than 2 years ago.

With the benefit of this experience the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct on which I have the honor of serving, now feels the need for reinforcement in two areas of the financial disclosure report in its continuing concern for real or seeming conflict of interest.

Our committee is of the unanimous opinion that this addition will provide both an active and a passive weapon against potential conflicts of interest which might arise from excessive honorariums of transparent debt arrangements.

The resolution before you, as I am sure you know by now, would require the annual reporting, for public purposes, of, first, sources of honorarium of \$300 or more and, second, the identity of creditors to whom \$10,000 or more was owed for 90 days or longer without the pledge of specific security.

Our committee, as I said before, is unanimous in its support of these proposals. My own feeling is that it is not only in the public interest, but in our own congressional self-interest that we approve this resolution and I urge my colleagues to vote aye on the measure as presented.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ABBITT).

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to add my voice in support of House Resolution 796, which has the endorsement of all members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, on which I am honored to serve.

Most of you will recall that when our committee brought its original recommendations before you a little more than 2 years ago, the financial disclosure proposal was received with mixed opinions. Some thought it too strong, others felt it too weak.

Our feeling was that its provisions represented a reasonable beginning in a sensitive area. We also felt that they fitted well into the whole fabric of our recommendations. The House went along with our thinking, accepting our package—including the Code of Official Conduct and the related financial reporting rule—by a vote of 406 to 1.

The time now has come, our committee

feels, to tighten the financial disclosure requirements—as proposed in the pending resolution. We believe that it will provide additional safeguards against the creation, wittingly or unwittingly, of potential conflict-of-interest situations.

You know, and I know, that the overwhelming majority of Members and employees of the House are honest and ethical, and that it is a rare occurrence when one of them becomes involved, or arouses the suspicion of being involved, in an evident conflict of interest. You know, too, that when that does happen, an unfavorable reflection is cast upon all of us.

The proposal we put before you today for reinforcement of the present financial disclosure rule, it seems to me, not only would protect and restrain Members and employees from involvement in improper acts, but would deter outside interests—to some extent, at least—from creating any kind of temptation for favored treatment.

In short, I believe the pending resolution would beef up the present financial reporting rule in areas in which it should be stronger, and I join my colleagues on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in urging you to accept the amendments in the form in which they are presented.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I should like to ask the gentleman in the well or the chairman of the committee a question about honorariums which go to charitable uses.

When a Member speaks and receives an honorarium for his speech and then immediately makes that honorarium available to a charitable institution, or donates it to some kind of nonprofit organization, is that honorarium reportable?

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois in order to respond to the question propounded by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. If the Member did receive it himself and then donates it back, it would be reportable.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield further, in other words, if he receives for himself the income tax benefit from it as a charitable donation, that would be the case.

Now, if I may ask the second part of the question, assume that a Member speaks before an organization and the organization makes the donation in his name and he does not receive the income tax benefit and the donation was made by the organization before which he spoke to some charitable organization which the Member had designated—

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Then, it would not be reportable if the Member did not receive it in his own name.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In other words, he has to have beneficial control of the

honorarium for his own benefit and for his own income tax record.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that in the case to which the gentleman referred where the contributions are made to charitable organizations, normally those arrangements are made in advance and the fact that an honorarium is contributed to an organization is not reportable.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in urging you to write the provisions of House Resolution 796 into the rules of the House.

The prevention of conflicts of interest has been a problem of responsible governments throughout recorded history. In our own country the very first Congress acted to prohibit the first Secretary of the Treasury from investing in Government securities. It was recognized that an officer of the Government ought not to turn to his own profit any advantage of inside information known to him because of the office he holds. Nor should an officer of the Government be qualified to contract with the Government for any of its supplies, because he might be unfairly advantaged over his competitors.

This time-honored standard against conflicts of interest—that an official ought not to profit from any advantages of inside information known to him because of his office, is as valid a test in the legislative and judicial branches of Government as in the executive and administrative.

But how shall adherence to such a standard be enforced? Until recently it was believed that evil would surface, and corruption would be found out because those victimized or defrauded would complain. Out of such complaint grand juries would indict and legislative bodies would impeach.

In recent years we have been engaged in raising up a new standard, one of affirmative disclosure by the officer, the legislator, and the judge. The disclosure required by such a standard should not deny a right of privacy as to those matters having no reasonable relationship to the performance of the duties of the office. On the contrary, the test should be whether a reasonable man would find any causal relationship between the official actions of the officeholder and his private interests.

A complete and total barring of all private assets and interests does not satisfy the test we are endeavoring to set up. It is not a disclosure of all assets and interests that is required. But only those which fairminded, disinterested, and reasonable men would judge of undue and wrongful influence upon the legislator in the performance of his office. That is the kind of causal connection required, in my opinion, between the legislator's official actions and his private interests to order to establish a conflict.

The problem of conflict of interest is

fought with difficulties for legislative branches of Government. A Member of Congress, for example, has a definite community of interest with his constituents. Every Member brings with him to these Halls viewpoints on public issues which are molded by his experience. We each bring with us the total experience of our own lives. We do not come to this House out of a vacuum. We are all of us successful men and women. If we were not, we would not be here.

Nor could we be representative of the people if by some magic we were divested of our life's experiences, or its accumulations and its debts, at the moment we are seated here. The people we represent are daily concerned about their property and their financial obligations. We would not be their representatives if we were different than they.

But we have a responsibility in our individual dealings they do not have. Since we are each charged with a public trust, we must be scrupulous to avoid even the appearance of taking personal advantage of our position for private gain.

Your committee, in struggling with the conflict-of-interest problem realized that no simple and sure solution exists. But we think that what we have come up with offers a fair, practicable, and reasonable means of treating with the problem. I refer to the Code of Official Conduct and the related financial disclosure rule, both of which the House adopted early in 1968, and to the pending resolution to tighten the financial disclosure requirements.

Our committee is unanimous in its support of the pending resolution to strengthen the financial disclosure rule. I hope you will see fit to give it your support.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID).

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of this Congress, I was honored by my colleagues to be elected to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. At that time this committee had already recommended and the House had adopted the present financial disclosure rule.

In reviewing the committee hearings and other records after this assignment, I noted that many, I am sure well-motivated, people had demanded "full financial disclosure" and, as my own inquiry progressed, I came to appreciate more fully the objectives of financial disclosure as a means of monitoring potential conflicts of interest.

However, I discovered that some so-called full disclosure measures do not go as far as the positions the committee recommends. The committee's approach was framed around a principle, subsequently expressed in the report of a special committee of the bar association of the city of New York.

That committee, after studying congressional ethics for more than 2 years, reported—and I quote:

If (financial disclosure) means Members should bare to the public every economic detail about themselves, their families, and their associates, then it is unprecedented and

unnecessary. Such requirements now exist nowhere in our law and are not essential to conflict-of-interest regulation.

On the other hand, the committee found need for a broader technique than that proposed recently by a Select Committee on Members Interest of the British House of Commons. In rejecting a so-called general register, in favor of stated declarations of interest at the time, the report said—and I quote:

A general register is directed to the contingency that an interest might affect a Member's action. The House's practice is, or should be, aimed at revealing an interest when it does affect it.

Our committee believes its approach to the question of financial disclosure, including the resolution now before you—to require Members, officers, and certain employees to report the sources of honorariums of \$300 or more and the identity of creditors to whom \$10,000 or more was owed for 90 days or longer without specific security during the reporting period—offers an entirely reasonable, as well as a more effective, solution for the monitoring of potential conflicts of interest.

I join my colleagues on the committee in urging acceptance of House Resolution 796 in the form in which we offer it.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I was elected to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in January 1969, almost 2 years after its inception. Until that time I confess I had thought more of the effects suffered by other Members of Congress when so-called problems of ethics arose than I had on how to prevent them.

In truth, Mr. Chairman, I was impressed from the very beginning of my service on the committee with the commonsense approaches the committee had devised to deal with the sensitive assignment the House had placed on the committee.

Let me just summarize. The committee in its initial report to the House recommended an eight-point Code of Official Conduct. The points were aimed at matters essentially peculiar to a legislator's role. Ones that were for all practical effect not covered by the statutes or were too remote from the ballot box for these historical remedies to provide a proper answer. The measures recommended did not seek to overturn or supplant rules that for 180 years turned out a pretty respectable performance by the Congress. The Code rather complemented these rules by attention to some factors that changing times had shown needed attention.

One of the points in this code says in effect that you cannot have a conflict of interest. I have heard that term for 30 years around here but with the exception of a few flagrant cases, which I might add were all dealt with very effectively, I cannot honestly say that I know exactly when one exists. More than that I do not believe any man can accurately measure what the motivation of any other man in any given situation may be.

Given this sort of imprecision I appreciate now, why some measure of fi-

nancial disclosure was indicated. The committee picked out those factors that might tend to consciously or unconsciously effect a Member's action and put it before the only people to whom he is accountable—his constituents. If they learned his interests were the same as theirs or vice versa, they then had the necessary information to make a judgment as to his stewardship of their voice in the Congress.

But, the committee did not go beyond that point and I believe they were right in the position on which they finally settled.

As all of you know, it is most difficult to design a perfect system when you are working entirely in the hypothetical. Experience points out where changes need to be made. I concur fully in the changes the committee unanimously proposes—now before you and I urge you to accept the collective judgment of my colleagues on the committee with whom I am honestly proud to serve.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I support House Resolution 796. This resolution provides for the filing of information on honoraria over \$300 or more from a single source and also the listings of unsecured loans in any calendar year in excess of \$10,000.

These provisions constitute a further step in the direction of tightening reporting requirements for Members of Congress in requiring disclosure in cases that might involve activities conflicting with the public interest.

This self-policing of the House was begun in April 1967 with the establishment of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The committee recommended an eight-point code of official conduct aimed at subjects relating to the legislation role. The code was adopted and incorporated as rule 43 of the House of Representatives. This rule is amended by the provisions in the resolution which we are considering today.

The other provisions of the resolution are technical changes.

I believe that these requirements are salutary and I subscribe to the proposition that Members of Congress should take the initiative in regulating their own body and in establishing their own standards of performance. At a time when there is alienation of some of our society from our established institutions and a lack of confidence in their integrity, it is more important than ever to take steps which will counteract this trend toward disaffection. In my judgment this measure which we are now considering will move in that direction and I hope that it will receive the support of the House.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to vote in favor of House Resolution 796 to amend the House rules relative to disclosure. It is my feeling, however, that even though this bill is a step in the right direction, the amendments contained in it do not go far enough.

First of all, the amendments relate only to disclosure by Members. It is my feeling that the provisions should apply also to officers of the House, principal

assistants to Members and professional staff members of committees. These people, as well as Members, are in a position of public trust, and, therefore, should be subject to the disclosure provisions.

Second, I do not consider the additional disclosure requirements which are embodied in this resolution to be inclusive enough to give our constituents a reasonable idea of our financial position. The new provisions apply only to honorariums from a single source in excess of \$300 and unsecured debts to any one individual in excess of \$10,000. The new provisions do not, for example, require disclosure of an interest in any business entity, or the amount of income derived from same; the listing of any professional organization in which the person receives income in excess of a given amount; income for services rendered, other than from the U.S. Government; a capital gain from any single source, other than the sale of a residence occupied by the person reporting, in excess of a given amount. All of these provisions are included in legislation which I have introduced in this session of the Congress.

As elected officials, we are held in high esteem by the majority of those who elect us to office. We enjoy such a status for the simple reason that we are trusted. Since we are in a position of trust we must take those steps which we deem appropriate in justifying the trust which is placed in us. Therefore, I feel that it is incumbent upon us to impose certain restrictions upon ourselves, and to make the public aware of the basic aspects of our financial posture.

As I said at the outset, Mr. Chairman, I voted for these amendments to the House rules, but I am of the opinion that we should go even further and enact more meaningful financial disclosure provisions.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I fully support the resolution under consideration today, and commend the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the initiative and leadership it has taken in ensuring a meaningful code of ethics and conduct for Members of the House.

Earlier this year I testified before the Standards Committee in support of House Resolution 796. I indicated at that time that I fully supported the provision to require of all honorariums of \$300 or more—and indeed felt there should be a flat prohibition against receipt of any gifts or remuneration of any kind which might lead to a conflict of interest. In my judgment, all sources and amounts should be reported, at the very least.

Section (2) of the bill would require all those reporting to list each creditor to whom he had been "indebted for a period of ninety consecutive days or more during the preceding calendar year in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000 excluding any indebtedness specifically secured by the pledge of assets of the person reporting of appropriate value." I also fully support this provision.

Mr. Chairman, these two additional requirements are important. They do strengthen the financial disclosure pro-

visions. Nevertheless, I continue to support full public disclosure of all assets and liabilities. Such a requirement would be, in my judgment, a political asset rather than a liability.

I urge the annual filing of financial statements by Members of the House—and believe it would be useful for the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or the Comptroller General to review such disclosures and advise the Member of any questionable item. If none are found, the reviewer should so certify to the Member.

Such a requirement—that there be an examination and certification—would substantially lessen any political damage which would be done to honorable public servants by unscrupulous charges not specifically brought to the committee's attention pursuant to its rules.

Mr. Chairman, enactment of House Resolution 796 would be an important step in providing more meaningful disclosure provisions and I urge all Members to give it their full support.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That (a) paragraph 3 of part A of rule XLIV of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "(d) Honorariums from a single source aggregating \$300 or more."

(b) Part A of such rule XLIV is further amended by inserting immediately after paragraph 3 the following new paragraph:

"4. List each creditor to whom the person reporting was indebted for a period of ninety consecutive days or more during the preceding calendar year in an aggregate amount in excess of \$10,000, excluding any indebtedness specifically secured by the pledge of assets of the person reporting of appropriate value."

Sec. 2. (a) Paragraph 2 of part B of such rule XLIV is amended by striking out the period at the end of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and the amount of indebtedness owed to each creditor listed under paragraph 4 of part A."

(b) The second paragraph following paragraph 2 of such part B is amended by striking out "shall file a report so stating" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall file a report, under part A only of this rule, so stating".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by the foregoing provisions of this resolution shall apply only with respect to calendar years beginning on and after January 1, 1971.

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to offer my support for House Resolution 796 which amends the rules of the House relating to financial disclosure. In its short life, the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has done an excellent job in a very difficult field. I know something of the problems and challenges the committee has faced, and I want to congratulate the chairman, the members, and the staff for the solid and distinguished

work they have done to improve the ethical standards in the House of Representatives.

Three years ago, a Gallup poll showed that 60 percent of the public believed the "misuse of Government funds by Congressmen is fairly common." That was a shocking statistic, especially when only a minuscule number of Members of Congress have brought the Congress into disrepute and dishonor. As a matter of fact, of the over 10,000 men and women who have served in either the House or Senate since 1789, only 32 have been disciplined—and only nine since 1900.

In recent years the integrity of Members of Congress has been in better repute than formerly. Since May 1967, none of the major polling organizations, for example, Gallup or Harris, have even conducted polls on the ethics of the Congress. That last poll in the general field was by the Gallup company, which showed that 69 percent of the American public favored disclosure of financial assets of Members of the House and Senate.

This improvement in the public's eye—the image of the institution of Congress—can be attributed in large part to the efforts of the Members themselves to lift the level of official conduct. In both the Senate and House we have good ethics committees which have performed constructive roles.

The recent committee advisory opinion on guidelines from House Members in their dealings with departments and agencies of the executive branch of Government clarifies and reminds Members and employees of their responsibilities to constituents and the public trust.

While I approve of the advisory opinion, I believe the House rules of official conduct could be strengthened by a prohibition on all outside earned income by Members and employees, especially in light of the recent pay raise. I feel that this bill will lead us in that direction.

Proposed additions to the financial disclosure rules of the House contained in House Resolution 796 are improvements on the existing law, and I support the resolution.

My legislative ideas in this field are contained in H.R. 958, pending in the House Rules Committee, and which was first introduced by me on August 1, 1967. The bill is titled the "House Financial Disclosure Act."

It provides for public disclosure by Members of the House of Representatives and by candidates for the House.

Each member would file a complete financial disclosure report, including income, assets, and liabilities to this committee and the Clerk of the House. A candidate for the House would file with the Clerk.

The reports would be available to the public.

Included in this disclosure proposal is a provision requiring a statement on all contributions and expenditures for political campaigns and for any fund maintained for the purpose of defraying expenses as a Member or candidate for the

House. A political committee working in behalf of a candidate would have to report its contributions and expenditures.

There is a criminal penalty attached to the bill for those who do not file a report or who file a false report. The House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct could also recommend disciplinary action for violators of the law.

Mr. Chairman, my bill is a strong disclosure proposal, but I believe it is fair and good. While the committee has recommended that sources of honoraria of \$300 or more be disclosed under the present law, my bill provides that the sources and total money or substance for any honorarium or compensation for services, including fees, commissions, salaries, and similar items be reported. The bill also requires any debt by a member, candidate, his wife or dependent children over \$5,000 be reported. The committee has recommended that only debts by Members without pledge or specific security totaling \$10,000 for more than 90 days be reported.

I am for the committee's recommendations, but favor a broader disclosure law as contained in my bill, H.R. 958. It is a compulsory disclosure provision, not unlike the voluntary public reporting many Members, including myself, have given to the Clerk.

The disclosure idea, it has been said, comes as close as anything to being the all-purpose cleanser of American politics. It attaches no moral overtones to the financial situation of a particular member or candidate. Rather, it recognizes that the final arbiter in any controversy is the public, who must have the knowledge of all such facts in order to express their opinions on the behavior of their elected representatives. As public office is a public trust, so must public disclosure be the responsibility of any public official. I urge approval of House Resolution 796.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. YOUNG, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Resolution 796, amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to financial disclosure, pursuant to House Resolution 971, he reported the resolution back to the House.

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

The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.



The question was taken; and there were—yeas 336, nays 1, not voting 92, as follows:

[Roll No. 143]  
YEAS—336

Abbutt  
Abernethy  
Adams  
Addabbo  
Albert  
Alexander  
Anderson, Calif.  
Anderson, Ill.  
Andrews, Ala.  
Andrews, N. Dak.  
Annunzio  
Arends  
Ashbrook  
Aspinall  
Ayles  
Baring  
Barrett  
Beall, Md.  
Belcher  
Bell, Calif.  
Bennett  
Berry  
Betts  
Bevill  
Blaggi  
Bligham  
Blackburn  
Boggs  
Boland  
Brademas  
Brasco  
Bray  
Brinkley  
Brock  
Brooks  
Broomfield  
Brotzman  
Brown, Mich.  
Brown, Ohio  
Broyhill, N.C.  
Broyhill, Va.  
Buchanan  
Burke, Fla.  
Burke, Mass.  
Burluson, Tex.  
Burlison, Mo.  
Burton, Utah  
Bush  
Button  
Byrne, Pa.  
Byrnes, Wis.  
Cabell  
Caffery  
Casey  
Cederberg  
Celler  
Chappell  
Clancy  
Clark  
Clausen, Don H.  
Clay  
Cleveland  
Collier  
Collins  
Colmer  
Conable  
Conte  
Corbett  
Corman  
Coughlin  
Crane  
Cunningham  
Daddario  
Daniels, N.J.  
Davis, Wis.  
Delaney  
Dellenback  
Denney  
Dennis  
Dent  
Derwinski  
Devine  
Dickinson  
Dingell  
Donohue  
Dorn  
Downing  
Dulski  
Duncan  
Dwyer  
Eckhardt  
Edmondson  
Eilberg  
Erlenborn  
Esch  
Eshleman  
Evans, Colo.

Fallon  
Farbstein  
Fascell  
Feighan  
Findley  
Fish  
Fisher  
Flood  
Flowers  
Flynt  
Ford, Gerald R.  
Ford, William D.  
Foreman  
Fountain  
Fraser  
Frelinghuysen  
Frey  
Friedel  
Fulton, Pa.  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Fuqua  
Gallianakis  
Gallagher  
Garmatz  
Gettys  
Gialmo  
Gibbons  
Gilbert  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Gray  
Green, Pa.  
Griffin  
Griffiths  
Gross  
Grover  
Gubser  
Gude  
Hagan  
Haley  
Hall  
Halpern  
Hamilton  
Hammer-schmidt  
Hanley  
Hanna  
Hansen, Idaho  
Harrington  
Harsha  
Harvey  
Hastings  
Hathaway  
Hawkins  
Hays  
Hébert  
Hechler, W. Va.  
Heckler, Mass.  
Helstoski  
Henderson  
Hicks  
Hollifield  
Horton  
Hosmer  
Howard  
Hull  
Hunt  
Hutchinson  
Ichord  
Jacobs  
Jarman  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jonas  
Jones, N.C.  
Karth  
Kastenmeier  
Kazen  
Keith  
King  
Kleppe  
Kluczynski  
Koch  
Kuykendall  
Kyros  
Landgrebe  
Langen  
Leggett  
Lennon  
Lloyd  
Long, La.  
Long, Md.  
Lowenstein  
Lujan  
McClory  
McDade  
McDonald, Mich.  
McEwen

McFall  
McKneally  
Macdonald, Mass.  
Madden  
Mahon  
Mailliard  
Mann  
Marsh  
Martin  
Mayne  
Meeds  
Melcher  
Meskill  
Michel  
Mikva  
Miller, Ohio  
Mills  
Minish  
Mink  
Minshall  
Mize  
Mizell  
Mollohan  
Monagan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Morgan  
Morse  
Morton  
Mosher  
Moss  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Myers  
Natcher  
Nedzi  
Nelsen  
Nix  
Obey  
O'Hara  
O'Konski  
Olsen  
O'Neill, Mass.  
Passman  
Patman  
Patten  
Pelly  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Philbin  
Pickle  
Pike  
Pirnie  
Poage  
Podell  
Poff  
Preyer, N.C.  
Price, Ill.  
Price, Tex.  
Pryor, Ark.  
Pucinski  
Purcell  
Quile  
Quillen  
Rarick  
Rees  
Reid, Ill.  
Reuss  
Roberts  
Robison  
Roe  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roudebush  
Ruth  
Ryan  
St Germain  
Sandman  
Satterfield  
Saylor  
Schadeberg  
Schneebell  
Scott  
Shipley  
Shriver  
Sikes  
Sisk  
Skubitz  
Slack  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Iowa  
Springer  
Stafford  
Stagers  
Stanton  
Steed  
Steiger, Wis.

Stephens  
Sullivan  
Symington  
Taft  
Talcott  
Taylor  
Teague, Calif.  
Thompson, Ga.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Tiernan  
Udall  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vander Jagt

Vanik  
Vigorito  
Waggonner  
Waldie  
Wampler  
Watkins  
Weicker  
Whalen  
Whalley  
White  
Whitehurst  
Widnall  
Wiggins  
Williams  
Wilson, Bob

Winn  
Wold  
Wolff  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Wylder  
Wylie  
Wyman  
Yatron  
Young  
Zablocki  
Zion  
Zwach

Mr. Yates with Mr. Powell.  
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Dowdy.  
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Edwards of California.  
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. McCarthy.  
Mr. Daniel of Virginia with Mr. Stubblefield.  
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Rogers of Colorado.  
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Ottinger.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the spelling of the word "assets" in line 1 on page 2 of the resolutions be corrected.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

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

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

There was no objection.

COMMENDING SPEAKER JOHN W. MCCORMACK ON HIS LENGTH OF SERVICE AS SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Will the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) occupy the Chair as Speaker pro tempore?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 1044) commending Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK on his length of service as Speaker, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 1044

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby extends congratulations to the Honorable John W. McCormack who has served continuously as Speaker of the House longer than any previous occupant of that high office and whose cumulative service in that position now surpasses that of all but one of his predecessors; and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby acclaims the manner in which the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK presides over its deliberations, expresses its appreciation for his impartiality, integrity and parliamentary skill, and commends him for his loyal devotion to his legislative duties in this House for over forty-one years.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) is recognized for 1 hour.

NAYS—1  
Camp

NOT VOTING—92

Adair  
Anderson, Tenn.  
Ashley  
Blester  
Blanton  
Blatnik  
Bolling  
Bow  
Brown, Calif.  
Burton, Calif.  
Carey  
Carter  
Chamberlain  
Chisholm  
Clawson, Del.  
Cohelan  
Conyers  
Cowger  
Cramer  
Culver  
Daniel, Va.  
Davis, Ga.  
Dawson  
de la Garza  
Diggs  
Dowdy  
Edwards, Ala.  
Edwards, Calif.  
Edwards, La.  
Evins, Tenn.  
Foley

Gaydos  
Goldwater  
Green, Oreg.  
Hansen, Wash.  
Hogan  
Hungate  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Tenn.  
Kee  
Kirwan  
Kyl  
Landrum  
Latta  
Lukens  
McCarthy  
McCloskey  
McClure  
McCulloch  
McMillan  
MacGregor  
Mathias  
Matsunaga  
May  
Miller, Calif.  
Murphy, Ill.  
Nichols  
O'Neal, Ga.  
Ottinger  
Pettis  
Pollock  
Powell  
Rallsback

Randall  
Reid, N.Y.  
Reifel  
Rhodes  
Riegler  
Rivers  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Roybal  
Ruppe  
Scherle  
Scheuer  
Schwengel  
Sebelius  
Smith, N.Y.  
Snyder  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Stokes  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Stuckey  
Teague, Tex.  
Tunney  
Watson  
Watts  
Whitten  
Wilson  
Yates

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Adair.  
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Bow.  
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Hogan.  
Mr. Carey with Mr. Reid of New York.  
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Reifel.  
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Rhodes.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Goldwater.  
Mr. Randall with Mr. Cowger.  
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Watson.  
Mr. Culver with Mr. Blester.  
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Cramer.  
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Riegler.  
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Del Clawson.  
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. May.  
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Kyl.  
Mr. Kee with Mr. Pollock.  
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Mathias.  
Mr. Foley with Mr. Ruppe.  
Mr. Ashley with Mr. McCloskey.  
Mr. Watts with Mr. Rallsback.  
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. McClure.  
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Schwengel.  
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. McCulloch.  
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Smith of New York.  
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Chamberlain.  
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Snyder.  
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Carter.  
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.  
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Scherle.  
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Sebelius.  
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. MacGregor.  
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Lukens.  
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.  
Mr. Brown of California with Mrs. Chisholm.  
Mr. Conyers with Mr. Scheuer.  
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Diggs.

## GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to offer today a resolution to extend the congratulations of the House to our distinguished and beloved Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK, who has served in that high office longer in continuous service than any previous occupant and whose cumulative service as Speaker now surpasses that of all but one of his predecessors.

JOHN McCORMACK began his service as speaker on January 10, 1962, and at midnight on May 24, 1970, he surpassed the tenure of Speaker Henry Clay, thus setting a new record of service in this house, second only to that of Sam Rayburn.

Knowing that this milestone was approaching, the distinguished minority leader and I planned the offering of this resolution long before the Speaker had announced his intention to retire from the House. This is not a farewell proceeding—it is a proceeding steeped in the gratitude of the House of Representatives.

JOHN McCORMACK's public service totals 51 years, more than 42 of which have been served in the House—as Member, whip, majority leader, and Speaker.

This, I think is an appropriate occasion to touch on the talents and achievements of our beloved Speaker who was and is the choice of his colleagues for the highest honor within the power of this body to bestow. The Speaker has consistently demonstrated throughout his long career those qualities which are essential to leadership. He has been eminently fair on all occasions. Every Member of this House knows that he has presided with utmost impartiality and with consideration for the rights not only of the majority party and the minority party but of every individual Member of this body.

He is a great advocate and a formidable opponent in debate as every Member well knows. When Vice President Alben Barkley died, Speaker Sam Rayburn told me that we had lost one of the two greatest debaters in the Democratic Party within his memory, the other being then majority leader, JOHN W. McCORMACK. When major issues were at stake, JOHN McCORMACK never shunned a battle and never lost one. During a single session he took part in the debate on more than 200 subjects ranging from matters of legislative substance to philosophies of government and politics.

The Speaker is today the preeminent legislator of the world. He has played a major role in building this country throughout 42 years which have changed the face of the globe and altered dramatically the circumstances of every human life.

Throughout his years of testing, JOHN McCORMACK held steadfastly to his course—determined to do his job to the best of his great ability. His progressiveness, his patience, his coolness under fire, as well as the product of his hand, assure his status as one of the greatest Speakers of all time.

While in this instance I speak the sentiments of the House, I hope I may be forgiven for adding a personal note. JOHN McCORMACK has been my friend and adviser ever since I came to the House. He has stood with me as he and Sam Rayburn stood with each other through the years. I owe him an eternal debt of gratitude. Thank you, thank you, JOHN McCORMACK, for all you have done for me.

I cannot properly conclude my remarks without recognizing the contributions of Mrs. McCormack who has devotedly stood by the Speaker's side throughout his long and demanding career as a legislator and statesman.

This House has paid JOHN McCORMACK its highest tribute in having elected and continuously reelected him as Speaker. We today reaffirm that tribute. We add to it our deep affection, and our congratulations upon having reached this milestone in his legislative leadership.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to have a reception for you in the Ways and Means Committee room in the Longworth Building at 4:30 this afternoon. All Members of Congress, in both branches of the Congress, will be there to honor you.

I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist the observation, at this time, that yours is a very, very comfortable chair. I find it hard to step down from it after only 10 minutes.

Seriously, I join with a full heart in the tribute of the distinguished majority leader and with all our colleagues in this fitting tribute to our beloved Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK.

We use these words a lot—"distinguished," "honorable," "gentleman." But when we refer to our Speaker, we really mean them.

Though there is no greater gentleman, I can assure those who were not here in this House before he became the Speaker 8½ years ago, who never heard JOHN McCORMACK in debate as majority leader or minority whip, that there were few who could stand up to him on this floor. He was a lion in battle when convinced of the righteousness of his cause, and he lay about his foes like a modern Joshua with the fierce and fiery rhetoric of his South Boston heritage. I was not always convinced, but I was always impressed.

What has impressed me even more, and I have served here over half of the Speaker's long and distinguished years as a Member, has been his unwavering love of the United States of America and his willingness to place the good of his country above everything else.

Never have I known JOHN McCORMACK to exploit a foreign policy issue for political advantage to his party—dedicated

partisan that he was and is. Every President of the United States since Herbert Hoover, be he Republican or Democrat, has known he could count on the support of the gentleman from Massachusetts when the chips were down in a time of international tension. President Nixon has said and will say again how much this means to him, just as Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower, Truman, and Roosevelt did before him.

The office of the Speaker is a unique one in the American Government. He is at once the leader of his party and the impartial Presiding Officer of the House. As his powers are great, so must his sense of fairness be extraordinary. As his position is exalted among his legislative equals, so must his tact and consideration—yes, his kindness and compassion—be constantly exercised.

Mr. Speaker, the office you have held so long and faithfully makes great demands upon a man, but you have met them all superbly. You have more than kept your pledge to maintain the great traditions of the House and protect the rights of every Member from the newest to the oldest.

When JOHN McCORMACK came here, already seasoned in the Massachusetts Legislature, what a different world it was. Lindbergh had just soloed across the Atlantic. The first all-talking movie was released that year—1928. Stalin ordered his first 5-year plan, and the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact, solemnly signed by 62 nations, outlawed war forever as an instrument of national policy.

Some will say our country never will be the same when JOHN McCORMACK leaves this House. I say it is infinitely a better and safer place, with all our current problems, because JOHN McCORMACK served here in this House. You can be proud, Mr. Speaker, that you have always done what you thought was best for the country. You can be proud too, Mr. Speaker, knowing that you have the love, respect and admiration of every man and woman here, or who has ever served with you in this House and in this Government.

As many may remember, I was elected floor leader of my party in January 1965. The distinguished Speaker could have made my new job far more difficult. Instead, Speaker McCORMACK was cooperative, and friendly. I will never forget his kindness. I am deeply grateful.

And I am proud, for my part, that JOHN McCORMACK is the only man alive who ever beat me three times in a free election.

Mr. Speaker, all of us hope and pray that you and Mrs. McCormack, your devoted partner through so many history-making years, will have many more years of companionship and happiness when you lay down that gavel for the last time. If anyone could ever contemplate a career of service and success with just satisfaction, you can, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. We all thank the distinguished minority leader for his beautiful and sincere tribute.

I am now happy to yield to the distinguished dean of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER).

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, after 42

years in the House and 8 years as Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK announces his retirement from the Congress of the United States. His is a record not easily matched.

Through his own efforts, working with the vigor he was to display in the years of service to the people of this country, he went to work as a \$4-a-week office boy for a law firm, and without attending law school passed the bar at the age of 21. Through his experience as a trial lawyer, as a legislator in the Massachusetts Legislature, through the years as a Representative in the Congress and as the Speaker, the quality of his humanity, of his concern for and with people, underscored everything he did.

The people of his district remember him as we do—a fighter for the rights of the less privileged, for legislation such as social security and other acts which helped to remove the indignities of poverty and dependence from the backs of people.

We oldtimers have much to be grateful for, that we for many years had the privilege to serve with this generous and able man. And we who will return to the 92d Congress will find the House a very different place without JOHN McCORMACK. We shall indeed sorely miss him.

During the many years that I have served with JOHN McCORMACK I have learned the pattern of his life, and I have viewed the diadem of his character. I find therein many precious jewels.

I discern in that diadem the precious jewel of perseverance. JOHN has ever persevered despite difficulties. He knows that if you have a bar of steel and you rub long enough you can rub it into a needle.

And there is the jewel we call the "breastplate of good temper." JOHN always has that even temper. He has a "heart for any fate." He does not despair. He does not despair of the darkness; rather, he lights a candle.

He has been beset with troubles and difficulties, but he knows that "this too shall pass."

He knows also that there is always a light at the end of the tunnel.

Finally, as we behold our Speaker—and we have seen him so often seated as Speaker below the glow of the American flag—well might we say that his hoary head is like a glowing crown. May contentment ever dwell with him.

As he leaves us, we now say, "hail and farewell."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the distinguished dean for his beautiful tribute to the Speaker.

I now yield to the distinguished Republican whip, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a memorable day, and I am indeed happy I can be here to participate in this tribute to an outstanding American and an outstanding individual. I am glad this day has come, not that JOHN McCORMACK has decided not to seek reelection and at the end of this session will be relinquishing his reign as Speaker of this House; but I am glad for this day because JOHN McCORMACK

is here today on the floor of the House and we can express to him personally, as well as publicly, the deep affection and high regard, admiration, and respect we have for him.

It is nice that you can be here, JOHN, to receive in person the heartfelt expressions of those of us who have had the privilege of serving with you for these many, many years and who have had the privilege of counting you as our friend. Regardless of the differences we have had, our friendship has been an abiding one. Knowing JOHN McCORMACK as I do, nothing means more to him than friendship. He exemplifies more than anyone I have ever known "being a friend to man."

JOHN McCORMACK, I, and four others in the House today, have had the privilege of serving with you longer than any other Member of this body. I can remember my initial meeting with JOHN McCORMACK. It was the first time that I ever met a Boston Irishman. I became a friend of his from that very moment. He immediately befriended me as a new Member of this great deliberative body. He immediately sought to help me.

As the floor leader on the other side of the aisle, JOHN McCORMACK was a worthy antagonist of anyone who opposed him on a measure he was supporting, and he advocated his cause to the floor with unusual skill and sometimes with unusual vigor, and always persuasively. I respected him for his diligence and his determination in putting through the kind of program he believed in during the years he served here when Franklin Delano Roosevelt was President.

Considering the many years he served as his party whip and floor leader I could not help but be happy for him when he became Speaker, for he had earned the position. He attained the highest position in the House and it was well-deserved.

I have served with many, many Speakers, starting back in 1936, but I had experiences with JOHN McCORMACK that I shall never forget. I recall them fondly.

May I say to you, my good friends—and you all know it—when JOHN stepped into that chair he became the most non-partisan and the fairest Speaker that we could possibly ask for. Speaker McCORMACK was our presiding officer who in all respects remembered that every Member was entitled to the courtesy of the chair of this great House. That is what we have received from him—patience, understanding, and fairness.

I shall remember that, Speaker McCORMACK. I shall always remember your fairness in presiding as the Speaker. It is because of men like you that this is a great deliberative body.

We are today not saying a farewell but taking this opportunity to say to you that you can sit down on your front porch sometime and rock whenever you get ready to and truly say, "I did my best." Somehow you should hear the whisper back to you, "Well done; well done, my friend. You were a great legislator."

So we rejoice with you today, JOHN McCORMACK, that this friendship of ours

can be expressed in this manner on the floor of this House, which means so much to you. You will occupy a high place in the history of the Congress and of our country. He occupies a large place in our hearts.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished Republican whip.

I am pleased now to yield to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS).

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, for more than 40 years JOHN McCORMACK has been one of the great leaders of this Nation, in passing the monumental social and economic reforms that have characterized that turbulent period in the history of our country.

I came here now almost 30 years ago. JOHN McCORMACK then was at the very epitome of leadership in this great body. That time coincided with a period of great division in this country with respect to World War II. In a matter of a relatively few months he guided through this Congress measures like the monumental lend-lease program which made it possible for the United Kingdom, then standing alone under the leadership of one of the great men of all time, Winston Churchill, to stand and stand firm against Hitler conquering all of the free world.

I remember the night so well when by 1 vote—by 1 vote—just months before Pearl Harbor, JOHN McCORMACK was able to marshal that hairline majority to keep the U.S. Army in being. So much of the work of the Speaker does not occur on the floor of the House. It does not occur in the Speaker's chair. It takes place in the quiet of his office. When in an effort to secure the adoption of a program, he quietly talks to his colleagues. I have sat in that office not once but hundreds of times, and watched him as we say, talk "head to head," on the telephone and, although he has used his fine logic on Members to obtain their help on a program to which he was dedicated, I have never seen him "twist a Member's arm" and ask him to cast a vote that that Member felt was not in his own best interest or in the best interest of his constituency.

He has been a leader who has led by using the things that are best in men. Some people use the forces that are bad—fear and force and fraud. But JOHN McCORMACK has appealed to those things that are good in us, what is good for the Nation, what is good for the people, what is good for the downtrodden, what is good for the dispossessed, what is good for the Members of Congress.

Those have been the characteristics of this man who has been my leader for 30 years and who has had, I am proud to say, a very profound effect upon my own life, because I came here as a mere boy.

I know that his counsel has been sought by every President since Franklin D. Roosevelt, regardless of party. All have found his judgment to be wise, trustworthy, prudent, and in the national interest.

Those of us who serve in the leadership with JOHN McCORMACK will continue in the months ahead to help achieve the broad legislative objectives

now pending in the Congress so that his career can be concluded at the height of success.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that both Mrs. Boggs and I share your concern about the illness of your dear wife, whom I know has been a pillar of strength to you. But you have matched that by being the model of a devoted and loving husband.

For your friendship, for your counsel, and for your help, I thank you.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished majority whip for his tribute, and I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult indeed, for one who has been in the House of Representatives for only 10 years, to find appropriate words to honor Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK of Massachusetts who for 40 years has served his district, his State and his Nation so selflessly in this Chamber. His dedication to duty and to the best interests of his country over one of the most troubled spans in our history will never be forgotten by his colleagues and friends in the House of Representatives.

It is with the deepest respect and affection that we are saluting him now at the height and at the close of a truly distinguished career of public service.

He has many outstanding qualities, certainly not the least of which is the fact that he is a man of deep religious faith, a man who during his lifetime has been devoted to his church, and he has lived that faith in abundant measure, and his probity and good character have distinguished his long career.

His announced retirement is truly one of those times when partisan lines must be crossed if we are to do justice, pay tribute to an idea, a cause, and a man. The Speaker should know and the Nation should know that his dedication to duty and to the best interests of his country will be long remembered on both sides of the aisle in the Chamber of the House of Representatives, for few men are privileged to leave their imprint so forcibly on the body of our Nation's law, and few have borne the heavy responsibilities of such high office with the grace, the wisdom and the dignity of the man from Massachusetts.

The U.S. House of Representatives is a fiercely partisan place, and never more so than in an election year, but there are occasions when partisan lines must be crossed to do justice and to pay tribute to a man. The announced retirement of our beloved Speaker, after 4 decades of selfless service in the House, is surely one of those times.

As Republicans we salute with affection and with respect a great legislative leader and a great Democrat.

Although, as I said as I began, it has not been my privilege to be associated with the Speaker of the House as long as those who have preceded me in the well here today, during the years that I have known him he has always treated me with unfailing courtesy, and I am grateful to him for his many acts of consideration and friendship. We will all miss him. More importantly, we will re-

member you, Mr. Speaker, with admiration, with respect, and with genuine affection.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for his beautiful tribute, and I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER).

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my friend, CARL ALBERT, the majority leader, for this opportunity to vent some of the feelings and emotions that arise within me on this occasion. If this were a test of ability to express one's respect and admiration and friendship for him whom we are honoring here today, I would possibly rank at the bottom.

But when it comes to a question of sincerity of the heart, I can assure you that in my own evaluation none would precede me.

I shall, Mr. Speaker, recognize the propriety of the occasion and that there are many here who would like to address their remarks to you for posterity as well as for your own edification. So I shall be very brief.

With two exceptions there are none in this body who have had the high privilege of serving in this body to which you have dedicated your life, sir, than I.

I would be less than frank if I should say, Mr. Speaker, and you would not believe me if I said otherwise that although Mississippi and Massachusetts alphabetically are very close—philosophically, they do not always remain so.

So, we have had our differences of opinion and of philosophy. But it has always been a pleasure to work with you.

Mr. Speaker, on one occasion, having served so long with you, and having engaged in social activities as well as in legislative matters with you, I took the liberty one day of saying to you, sir, that nature was a great equalizer of persons; that she did not give any one person all of the virtues and talents but that she dispersed them so that the common man, in which class I put myself, would have something to offset the brilliant one. But I then got personal enough to say to you, sir, that you had more than your share of the virtues that are given to one person; and that in your devotion to your beloved wife, your dedication to your church; your love for country and lastly your dedication to your party—that I thought you would find yourself in one pretty hard position if you had to make a decision between them.

I have never known a man—and I say this with all the sincerity in my heart—I have never known a man who has been more devoted to his good and beloved wife than you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am one among those who dislike to see you leave this Chamber. I know you are going to be missed. I am going to be honest and frank enough to say that, being human, you had your detractors. But that day will come when you will be fully appreciated as you should be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I could for a moment be an Irishman, I would just like to read something to you that has made a great impression on me. When this

assembly got together here a while ago, I sent over to my office to get this little plaque that hangs on the wall in my office. It is headed, "An Irish Blessing," and it reads:

May the road rise to meet you. May the wind be always at your back. May the sun shine upon your face, the rains fall softly upon—

And here I paraphrase "your wholesome presence."

Until we meet again, Mr. Speaker, may God hold you in the palm of his hand.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present this plaque for you for your own end.

Mr. ALBERT. We all thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for his beautiful tribute.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, Texas, by tradition, are supposed to be not altogether modest. We had thought that in the Speakership of Sam Rayburn, we had captured all the laurels and honors that could be captured here in the House of Representatives. But I find that while Mr. Rayburn served as Speaker longer than any man in history, far surpassing Henry Clay, Speaker McCORMACK has broken the record for continuous and uninterrupted service as Speaker.

Speaker McCORMACK has wrought well. He has wrought one of the great records in American legislative history. It is a record that will stand with time.

This man from South Boston has occupied the powerful position of Speaker during a period of enactment of some of the most far reaching and momentous legislation that has ever been adopted by the Congress.

Speaker McCORMACK is a man of action. He has been in the center of the action process.

He, like his predecessor, seems to have an almost passionate love, should I say, for the House of Representatives. Like Speaker Rayburn before him, Speaker McCORMACK has a fierce respect for the House of Representatives, and that has meant a great deal to the membership and to the House. It has made all of us more respectful and proud of the positions of honor which we hold—because JOHN McCORMACK loved the House, he loved its traditions, and he loved its Membership.

So today, in honoring JOHN McCORMACK, we are actually honoring ourselves. We are honoring the legislative process. And we are honoring the American two-party system when we honor JOHN McCORMACK.

JOHN McCORMACK is a partisan in the best American tradition. JOHN McCORMACK is loyal to his party.

JOHN McCORMACK has tended to knit together all portions of the Nation. He has undertaken to join the North with the South, to keep together the East and West. He has undertaken to unite us as a legislative body despite our many differences. That has meant a great deal in a world of disunity. I honor him for that, and I pay tribute to him for what he has meant.

History will record JOHN McCORMACK as a champion of great causes.

He will be remembered for his intense patriotism, along with his other virtues.

I also want to make public note of the fact that time after time in my chairmanship, in the handling of some 20 bills and resolutions a year out of the Committee on Appropriations, I have gone to the Speaker's office and counseled with him. I know of no man in the history of the Congress who has worked more closely with committee chairmen and sought to be more helpful to them in bringing legislation to the floor.

JOHN McCORMACK has done a great job here on the House floor. Perhaps his greatest job, however, has been done in his office in helping chart the course of legislative events.

Along with others in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I have seen him at many White House conferences, under several Presidents. It did not make any difference who was President. Whether the question was war or peace, or the general welfare was otherwise involved, JOHN McCORMACK took the position he thought was best for the country, supporting in every way he reasonably could the Chief Executive and the members of the Cabinet and the administration. I know that President Nixon and his distinguished predecessor, Lyndon B. Johnson, and others will share these sentiments.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, for years it was from South Boston to Bonham, the home of Sam Rayburn. Then it was from "Boston to Austin" with the very distinguished Lyndon B. Johnson. And now this Speaker works with the present administration in his untiring efforts to promote the welfare of our great nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken longer than I intended. Despite the inadequacy of language we can, in our hearts, pay high tribute to this courageous and able man—the man who has also served longest continuously as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

May God bless JOHN McCORMACK in his future service during this session and bless him and Mrs. McCormack in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow).

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I only wish I might have had an opportunity to carefully write and deliver all that is in my heart. What I say to JOHN McCORMACK today is but an expression of the deep affection that I have for him.

I think it was 24 years ago that I was counsel to a committee of this House of Representatives, the Harness Committee on Expenditures. The gentleman from Massachusetts was a member of the committee at that time. It was during the 80th Congress and we were having some real problems. The gentleman from Massachusetts asked me to come and see him as Republican counsel of that committee. I sensed that I was probably going to be taken into the woodshed and spanked. But I have never been received more kindly, nor has anyone ever been more gracious to me than that time when I was a young man. I remember it so very well.

Over the years we have always enjoyed a very close relationship. Perhaps at times our political philosophies have been across the horizon from one another, but this has never altered our affection for each other.

I have often said to people that I thought someone some day should write the story of the love of JOHN McCORMACK for his wife. I believe it to be one of the most romantic stories in the politics of contemporary America. More people should be aware of the contribution of this man, and of his love and affection for the lovely lady who shared his life these many years. This measure of love and affection might have a special meaning to many young people today.

There is so much to say about this great man—a real American. It does not make any difference whether one is a Republican or a Democrat. The things he stood for have been the things he believed in his heart are necessary to make America great. I only wish that some of the people who would like to disrupt the American system today would go back to read some of the remarks of this great Speaker—the things he has stood for and the things he has believed in. I am sure that many of them would reconsider their present approach.

His concern for this Nation goes back long before some of the other committees even talked about the infiltration of communism. I have read the gentleman's record. I just wish that we had more Americans like JOHN McCORMACK.

Again I say, we did not always agree on philosophies, but we always agreed on one thing—that this is the greatest country in the world, and that he and I would like to preserve it that way.

Mr. Speaker, I believe most of my colleagues know that I have suffered some illness in the past. One of the greatest assists to my period of recuperation was when JOHN McCORMACK came to the hospital to visit and helped to provide the necessary inspiration to return.

I will never forget that, Mr. Speaker. God bless you.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, thank you for yielding. Our beloved Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK, was elected to the Massachusetts House and Senate and served there from 1920 to 1926.

He was elected to the 70th Congress, and that session started on December 5, 1927. He was elected majority leader of this House September 1940 and served until 1947. Then at the change of the House Administration he became the whip in the 80th Congress and served there from 1947 to 1949. Then he was elected the majority leader in 1949 and served until 1953. Again there was a change of House administration, and he became the whip in the 83d Congress and served from 1953 to 1955. Then, on the death of our beloved former Speaker, Sam Rayburn, he was elected Acting Speaker in September 1961 and elected Speaker in January 1962. He has been elected in each succeeding Congress. It has already been said today that he has

served longer in continuous service than any other Speaker of the House, surpassing the service of the famous Kentuckian, Henry Clay.

It is with sadness that most of us who have been here a long time heard of his decision to retire. I wish today that I had the tongue of Demosthenes and the wisdom of Solomon so that I could say some of the things that are in my heart and which I know are in the hearts of many of our Members.

Mr. Speaker, 28 years ago I came to this House of Representatives, and from the very first JOHN McCORMACK was an adviser and a mentor of mine. In those 28 years we have never had an unkind word between us. We have had complete understanding, I believe, and on my part I have had complete respect. His assistance and advice to me has been invaluable.

There are many things that many of us can respect JOHN McCORMACK for. As was said today, he is a great believer in his religious faith and a devout practitioner of that faith. His love for his country has been surpassed by none. His devotion to his wonderful wife has been an example in this day of change, infidelity and uncertainty of marital arrangements. His life has been an example which millions should emulate. He has been a great American. He has always placed his country's welfare and security first.

I remember many times in the 28 years, in times of crisis and in times when authorization and appropriation bills which were vital to our Nation's security were on this floor, when JOHN McCORMACK took the well of this House and said:

If I am going to make a mistake, it is going to be on the side of safety for our country. If I am going to make an error of judgment, it is going to be in favor of continuing this system of government and preserving its liberties and freedoms.

We have all heard him say that, and many is the time that we heeded his advice and example and have voted as he advised.

I, too, as my friend, Congressman Bow, has said, when I look at some of the contemporary scenes, when I see the lack of purpose, the drift and disregard for the famous institutions which our country has long protected—and may God bless us and keep it that way for a long, long time in the future—when I see that, I sometimes wonder why these people are so impatient and why they are not willing to work within the system to preserve the liberties that we have and to make those liberties and freedoms more secure and to make the condition of life for our people more humane and more benevolent.

The history of this House is a great history. The history of its servants—and the Speaker of the House is the greatest servant of all, because we repose our trust and confidence in him and look to him for guidance and look to him for fairness to every Member of the House. The history of this House has been a great history, and JOHN McCORMACK has given us the leadership and the fairness that we have looked for. What greater honor could be placed to any man's name

than the simple epitaph, "He was a great American and he was fair." He has been fair to all of the Members of the House of Representatives and to all of the people that he contacted.

I will always have a warm place in my heart for this genial and wise Irish leader we have had for so many years.

He has chosen to retire after a long and illustrious service to his Nation and to the Members of the House of Representatives.

I could not conclude my words today without uttering a simple prayer, that Mrs. McCormack be given comfort in her illness, and that, if it be God's will, she may survive, and our Speaker may survive in good health, and they may continue to have each other for their allotted time on earth.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank my very distinguished friend from California for his beautiful tribute.

I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, our hearts are full today for we must contemplate with sadness the loss of the services of an outstanding Member of the Massachusetts delegation and a great Speaker of the House, and of the gracious presence of his beloved wife whom we all respect and admire.

When JOHN McCORMACK leaves the House we shall lose one of the ablest and one of the most effective legislators who has served in the Congress, a man who always has stood for a strong America; and for an America that does the right thing for all its people. No Member of the House is more respected or more beloved or has been during my experience in the Congress. No Member of the House has achieved more widespread recognition for his outstanding services to Congress and to our Nation.

Those of us who have been privileged to serve with him, and now they number into the thousands, have been honored indeed, for it has been a rare privilege to work with, to serve with, a great leader like JOHN McCORMACK.

These have been trying times, difficult times, but never has he shirked his responsibility or his duty or his obligation, nor has he quailed at the magnitude of the task before him and before the Congress.

I do not believe that any man in our time has contributed more to the preservation of representative government in America, and that is a most important consideration, a most important achievement.

Mr. Speaker, we on both sides of the aisle know that JOHN McCORMACK has been fair, he has attempted to be right as he saw the right, he has been true to his responsibility.

We who are Members of the House have been privileged to serve with an able man, a courageous man, a great American, whose services always towered high, and whose contributions have been above politics. Our love and our good wishes go with him and with Mrs. McCormack in all the years ahead.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his very beautiful tribute.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, as a relatively young Member of the House in point of service in comparison with those who have spoken before, having been here only a little over 20 years, I want to say that it has been one of the great privileges of serving in this body to have known, and to have been a pupil of JOHN McCORMACK.

I came here trained for and having been a teacher of history, one who was interested in it, one who was interested in current events, and I was impressed and awed when I first met Sam Rayburn, JOHN McCORMACK, and Joe Martin—whose names I had read many times in the public press. And I want to say to all of you that I have never been treated with more unflinching generosity and kindness in my lifetime by not only my friends and my relatives than I have been by our beloved Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK.

I could not quite agree with something someone said a little earlier—that he had never known the Speaker to twist anybody's arm—because he has twisted mine on occasion, but painlessly, with unflinching good humor and courtesy, and by kindly and subtly letting me remember that Members have certain obligations that go beyond their own constituency.

I can recall on an occasion or two when he has given me the argument that "this bill is bigger than your district." He has had his detractors, but in the main the man stands so big and so tall in the history of this country that long after many of us have been forgotten, including his detractors, his name will stand as a shining example of what we mean when we speak of an American patriot.

His public life and his private life have been examples that all Americans can well follow.

I missed Sam Rayburn very much when he was taken from among us, and I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that you are leaving. We are all going to miss you. We are all going to miss your guidance, your counsel, your wisdom and, not the least of all, we are going to miss that rare ability that you have of coming down in the well from the Speaker's Chair—and I remember when you did it as majority leader—when you thought that the fate of the country hung in the balance on some occasion, and used your impressive, impassioned and persuasive oratory to make a point.

It is a common saying around here that "no speech ever changed any vote" but, Mr. Speaker, you know and I know that that is not true, and I have seen you change them. I have never seen you change them except for the good of the country, the Congress and the world.

It has been a privilege serving with you, and we are all going to miss you.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for his beautiful tribute, and I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr.

Speaker, it has certainly been a proud occasion for all of us to serve under your leadership.

We in the United States Congress congratulate and honor Speaker JOHN McCORMACK of Massachusetts for his high ability and fairness to each and every Member of the House of Representatives.

It has been a wonderful privilege to serve under his leadership and share the hard work we put in on so many vital policies and issues that have faced the American people. Good legislation takes good hard work and requires good dedicated leadership. Speaker JOHN McCORMACK has fulfilled these requirements honorably and well. I respect his patriotism and his loyalty to our country and the American people.

JOHN McCORMACK had the vision and the foresight to realize the coming importance of science and space clear back in 1957 and 1958. He realized that progress in science and space exploration are vital to the American people, and necessary to U.S. security, defense, and peaceful progress in science and technology. He served as chairman of the original science and space exploration select committee of the House which laid the groundwork for our present United States tremendous successes in these fields.

In my opinion, without JOHN McCORMACK's leadership we would never have had a U.S. space program let alone the most successful one in the world. Our Apollo 11 and Apollo 12 moon landings would have been still far distant dreams. Our U.S. Space programs are the greatest U.S. foreign policy successes, due largely to the vision and dedication of JOHN McCORMACK.

JOHN McCORMACK saw the urgent need of a House standing legislative Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Because the legislation was actually written under his leadership in the House, with just a few changes in the Senate, it really could be called the McCormack bill, and probably the McCormack Space Agency.

He worked for unity and against partisanship in these fields cooperating with President Eisenhower so the United States is now the leading Nation of the world in science, space and technology.

During my recent illness, when in the Holy Cross Hospital intensive coronary care unit, there was held up for me to see a handwritten personal note from JOHN McCORMACK—what an encouragement to live, get better, and return to serve in the House.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA).

Mr. O'HARA. When, Mr. Speaker, each of us has completed his term of service in this House, I would suppose that each of us would like to be able to look back upon that service to some legislative accomplishment, and to be able to say to himself: "That legislation might not have been enacted when it was, or in the form it was, if I had not been a Member of the House when I was."

Even more, Mr. Speaker, most of us would like to be able to look back upon

such an achievement and say: "There are people who are today happier—or healthier—or more secure—or whose lives are somehow better—because of that bill of mine."

Each of us, Mr. Speaker, would like to be able to do that when his service in this House approaches an end. But no Member who has ever served in this body will be able to say that with an easier conscience than will the distinguished and beloved gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN McCORMACK.

He will not be able easily to select one milestone to remember from among his many accomplishments. Rather he will be able to look back upon most of the great legislative undertakings of our generation and to look back upon them in the secure knowledge that without JOHN McCORMACK, few of them would have been possible and none of them would have been precisely the same.

I shall not try to recount our distinguished Speaker's legislative record—there is not enough time in a day to do so. But for a moment I do want to pay tribute to JOHN McCORMACK the man—the man I have had the deep privilege of coming to know over the last dozen years.

He and I have not always been on the same side of an issue. Once in a while we would see an issue from different perspectives, but even when our judgments might vary on a substantive matter, I believe and I hope we were almost always together on the goals to be served.

In all of JOHN McCORMACK's dealings with me, he has been eminently fair—sometimes, I believe, more fair than I deserved, and often more patient than I deserved. In my own ignorance or inexperience and in my relative youth, I have sometimes made rather rash judgments. The majority leader of the 1950's, and the Speaker of the 1960's, in his experience and judgment, would not infrequently correct my enthusiasms and give me wise and unflinching courteous and patient counsel.

I have never known JOHN McCORMACK to do an unkind thing to another human being. I know of few other people of whom the same can be said—and I know of no higher praise which any person can earn.

As our leader, he has been all of the things you normally associate with leadership, but he has also, been loyal—loyal to each and every one of us who have been associated with him in this House. He has been loyal and faithful to the Democrats he led, he has been loyal and faithful to the Republicans he opposed. He has been, in short, loyal to the best traditions of this great and historic House.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I might say that we will all miss JOHN McCORMACK, but I think that misstates the situation ahead of use. Some Members of the House come here, serve out their years and leave. We miss them, they were honorable men and constructive Members, but they do leave. But once in a while there comes among us a legislative giant who never can leave this House, whatever the Clerk's Official List of Members says. Henry Clay, Joseph Cannon, Thomas Reed, Sam Rayburn, and JOHN Mc-

CORMACK, will never be ex-Members of this House; they will be here, inextricably mingled with the soul of this House, as long as free men gather here to govern themselves.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his beautiful tribute.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I could not allow this occasion to pass without joining my colleagues in the Chamber today in paying tribute to our Speaker, who has voluntarily elected to terminate his official services with this body at the end of the present session.

I was never active in politics until I came to Congress for my first term, but for many years before coming here I had a very special interest in political affairs. I doubt if many Members of Congress read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD down through the years with more avid interest than I did. I began doing so when my father was a Member of this body. He came to Congress right after Mr. McCORMACK was first elected to the House. With his service here I began to display a keen interest in the affairs of Congress, and kept up with Congressional procedures down through the years.

I well remember how impressed I was as I read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with the forensic ability of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I said to myself on many occasions, "Well, this man is a real fighter. He knows his subject, and he is an able and persuasive debater." But the thing that impressed me more than his debating ability was his uniform courtesy. He was more than kind and courteous to his opponents who engaged him in day-to-day debate, and before I came here I looked forward with keen anticipation to the privilege of knowing this man and working with him, even though I knew I would be doing so from the other side of the aisle.

I would not pretend that Mr. McCORMACK and I have been intimate friends down through the years, but I do not know of any Member of this body who has extended me more courteous treatment than he has and who has been kinder in his personal relationships with me than our distinguished Speaker. And I just want to say publicly today how much I appreciate that friendship, that interest, and that courtesy and kindness.

I had the privilege of serving on a special committee of the Government Operations Committee chaired by the Gentleman from Massachusetts, who was not then the majority leader, and we worked together closely during a year of hearings. He and I collaborated in bringing to the floor a bill which has been of tremendous benefit to the schools and other public institutions of the States. I learned to admire his superior qualities of leadership as I served under him on that subcommittee. And I also came to appreciate his fairness, his understanding and his uniform courtesy. No one could have shown more consideration to a very junior member of this

body that JOHN McCORMACK did to me and I am grateful to him for it.

All down through the years he has been a hard fighter. He has not given any quarter in debate, but I do not think any man can rise and say that he was ever taken advantage of or mistreated an opponent or that he failed to receive from JOHN McCORMACK the courtesy that one gentleman should expect from another.

I want to join my colleagues today in saying to Speaker McCORMACK, as he retires at the end of this session to a life of retirement and relaxation, when he can, I hope, write his memoirs and put down for history a record of some of the experiences he has had as a Member of this great legislative body, that I am sure all of our colleagues join me in wishing for him long life, good health, and peace of mind during the remaining years of his life.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his fine tribute.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I count it a great privilege and a distinct personal pleasure to join with the distinguished majority and minority leaders and others who have paid tribute to a great American, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives. My own life and my service in this body has been enriched by the opportunity to know, to serve with, and to serve under a great American, the presiding officer, the Speaker of the House.

I remember when I first met him. I had been elected in a special election. I came here and went by to pay my respects to him and make myself known to him. From then until this very moment he has been unflinching in his courtesy and his kindness to me. His hand of fellowship and friendship to me has often been and still is a source of strength to me. He is always accessible to Members of the House and always responds when Members call.

No man could be elected by his constituency for 42 years nor could any man be elected Speaker of the House of Representatives for five terms without possessing the qualities and attributes of a great leader, a great legislator, and a great American. JOHN McCORMACK has been chosen and honored by both his constituency and his colleagues. JOHN McCORMACK has been honored by his constituents for 42 years. He has been honored by his party in the House and by the House of Representatives by election and consecutive reelection so that he has served as Speaker longer than any other man has served as Speaker except his predecessor in that office, Speaker Sam Rayburn of Texas. He has served continuously as Speaker longer than any other Speaker in history.

JOHN McCORMACK, as a member of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives, whether as Speaker, leader, whip, or Member has been as fierce a partisan as I have ever known. Yet, when in his judgment the security and the strength of this country was at stake, I have seen him take the well of this House and advocate a position in support of a

President of the other party as strongly as he ever did in defense of the position taken by a President of his own party.

As a presiding officer of this body, he has always been eminently fair. He has leaned over many times on the side of impartiality and of fairness, for which we all admire, respect, and love him.

It is my hope—indeed, it is my reverent prayer—that Almighty Providence will see fit to restore his beloved wife to good health so that together they may share many, many more happy years as they have shared a half century of devotion and happiness.

It is certainly my hope and prayer that together they will be granted many more years of both health and happiness in his retirement, which is of his own choice.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that when the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Speaker of the House, next year will go into his voluntary retirement as Speaker and as Member he will carry with him the respect, the admiration, and the deep affection of each of us who have been privileged to serve with and under this great American.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his tribute.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE).

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving in this body during the period of the leadership of our beloved colleague from Massachusetts. Others who have served longer and who have served in most responsible positions of leadership have made reference to the great contribution to the Nation and to the world of these dedicated years of JOHN McCORMACK's service to his country.

I have had the privilege, as have so many, of knowing and admiring the gentle and considerate qualities of this man as he has upheld the dignity and the comradeship of this body.

I should like to share one personal memory which I believe symbolizes the greatness of this man. It has been my privilege for some years to welcome here to the Capitol a cavalcade of young people from the Utica Catholic Academy who charter a plane and come to the Nation's Capital for inspiration. Upon arrival on a Saturday morning, they would come into this Chamber. When it was possible, our great Speaker has seen fit to come into the Chamber to welcome these wonderful young people eager to catch a glimpse of the greatness of America as it might be expressed in this body.

I can recall the Speaker standing in the well telling them in affectionate and vivid language his feelings for this Chamber and this body. On occasion he referred to the center aisle and said, "To some this is the dividing aisle; on this side the Democratic Members of the House, on that side the Republican. But, young people, I wish to say to you that there is no dividing aisle in the service of the Nation."

That one thought which he so eloquently expressed has come back to me many times from these young people who have grown into responsible adult life. They caught the glimpse of the joint re-

sponsibility we have here in this body, the Speaker in a simple but effective way had planted the seed of understanding. These young people appreciated the greatness of the man and his simplicity.

I remember his reminding them that he better than most people understood the value of an education, it has been denied to him because of the early family responsibilities that had rested upon him. As he spoke of his limited formal education they glimpsed the true greatness of the man. I think they better sensed their privileges and became a little bit more appreciative of an education.

It has been mentioned how fair and impartial the Speaker has been. I recall a conversation with him shortly after he was elevated to Speaker in which he expressed in a very simple and direct manner his goal of fair and just presiding. I say that goal of impartiality has been achieved. He has earned the respect he so earnestly sought. He wished to do his job in keeping with the highest traditions of his office. He has been faithful to that purpose, and the example he has set as a man and husband has made a great impact on this Nation.

Millions join us in this expression of great affection and congratulations to a devoted couple in the hope that they can enjoy together their release from the heavy burdens that they have to gallantly carried together. I consider it a privilege to join in this well deserved tribute to this great man. I am proud to have him as my friend.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his fine tribute.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, your retirement announcement signals the end of an era in the House of Representatives.

For 8 years—the longest continuous record as Speaker in the Nation's history—you led this body with a sure and skilled hand.

It is no exaggeration to say you rank with Clay and Rayburn as one of the ablest Speakers of the House.

You chose reason, rather than force, as your chief legislative tool, avoiding the kind of bullying and browbeating lesser men might have used.

The legislation you have shepherded through the Congress during your 42 years as a Member, as majority leader, and Speaker, is monument enough, to the effectiveness of your approach.

Narrow partisan politics played no part in your actions when the country's future was at stake.

Your dogged allegiance to your country—under Democratic and Republican Presidents alike—yielded to nothing.

Your accomplishments as a man are even more impressive than those as a legislator.

The evenhanded fairness you have shown, to every Member of this body, is celebrated in Washington.

Few Members of Congress—indeed, few men anywhere who know you—cannot cite gestures of simple kindness and thoughtfulness you have extended to them.

Your constant concern for your own colleagues from Massachusetts has been a source of inspiration, joy, and benefit to all who have served the Bay State.

It is hard to measure the effect of a Christmas basket to a poor family in south Boston, a reassuring talk with a faltering colleague, a firm speech on the House floor in answer to expressions of bigotry.

Yet, as the test of a man, these things are probably the most significant of all.

You did them without smugness or sentimentality.

You did them because such things come instinctively to you.

I speak honestly when I say I am proud of my friendship with you and proud to have served with you in the Congress.

Let me also add that it will be many a moon, if ever, that our great State of Massachusetts will be better served in this House of Representatives.

Your retirement saddens me—just as it does everyone else who knows you well.

Yet, I know you now will have more time to devote to your beloved wife, Harriet, and to the deep faith you both share.

I offer my best wishes.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts for that lovely tribute.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, it is no small thing to be born an American citizen. It is a very great privilege to be elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. The distinguished Speaker with whom it has been our privilege to serve has demonstrated himself to be a great American, one who took his American citizenship seriously and cherished it and who has made the most of it through his long years of service to his country.

This House in which the voice of the people is heard and their influence felt at the highest levels of our Government has been an institution cherished by the Speaker and enriched by his presence in it.

Mr. Speaker, as an American and as a great Member of this House, he has also demonstrated himself to be an able leader of his own party, making that party stand for more by the leadership which he has given. In the great matters, as has just been said on the floor of the House, the Speaker was not a partisan but was an American statesman, a man who has always come to the defense of his country, its welfare and the national interest.

This man has stood tall and has spoken for all of our on many occasions.

One of the great privileges of my personal life has been to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives while JOHN McCORMACK was its Speaker. I am quite confident that every Member of this House feels, as millions of Americans across this land, deep gratitude for the life and service of this man. He has demonstrated himself to be a devout Christian and a devoted husband with a relationship to his lovely wife that has



been beautiful to behold. His kindness, his Christian character, his moral strength, his devotion to those principles which made our Nation great through years of crisis and of challenge, have made him an inspiration to us all. He has been an able and effective leader of this House and a great American. I thank God for JOHN McCORMACK.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. PHILBIN).

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, these exercises and the tributes that are being paid to our beloved Speaker today, coming from the hearts of our Members as they do with such fullness, strength and sincerity, constitute one of the most impressive occasions I have ever seen in this House.

Of course, it would be quite impossible for those of us who come from Massachusetts, particularly those of us who throughout the years have known, loved, respected and admired this truly great man, Speaker JOHN McCORMACK, to be in a position where we could adequately describe our feelings or pay fitting tribute to the tremendous contributions that he has made to our country and to this House, and the many outstanding accomplishments and achievements directed toward human betterment that he has made throughout the years during which he has held the great office as Speaker of the House and also as majority leader of the House.

The feelings of gratification that I experience today to hear the fine heartfelt tributes that have been presented here to our Speaker, are mingled for me, and for all of us with a deep sense of sadness due to the fact that he has decided to retire at the end of this term.

Surely, there could never be another like him in terms of inspired leadership, long years of outstanding, effective service far beyond the call of duty and typified by such rare legislative skills, rare talents and magnificent results for the Nation and the American people. In the best sense the brilliant career and sterling services of friend and Speaker JOHN McCORMACK are a great tribute and in the finest traditions of our representative democratic system of government as well as a personal triumph for the Speaker.

JOHN McCORMACK has made here a record that is truly imperishable, that will endure in the annals of our Government for many, many years to come as reflecting the finest, the best, the noblest and the most effective kind of service that could possibly be rendered by the illustrious leader of this body to the American people, and to the many causes of broad, forward-looking, progressive government, from which our people and the Nation, yes and the world have so greatly benefited as a result of the invaluable services this great man has rendered here.

There could never be another Speaker, who could combine precisely the qualities of leadership and achievement that JOHN McCORMACK symbolizes, because he is a man of great and incredible breadth of

vision and capacity for wise decisions and effective action.

His friendships are and always were broad and deep. He has the wisdom, experience and innate skill to grasp the great issues before the House and sense the needs of the times and the movement with unerring ability and precision. He can walk to any section of this House, not only on the Democratic side, but on the Republican side, and talk with the leaders and the Members whom he always knows so well, and who have implicit trust and confidence in what he has to say to them, and in the judgments he may present, and that they might make or urge their consideration. In that sense, he has a rare quality of leadership that has seldom, if ever, been found in this or any other legislative body. This extraordinary quality he demonstrates so brilliantly on many occasions, when it is necessary for him, in the course of his able advocacy to mobilize necessary support for many vital issues that are pending here, upon which so much depend for our country and for our people, and for the progress and well-being of the Nation.

Something has been said here of the Speaker's invariable courtesy, his open-mindedness, and his willingness to see leaders and all people, and give them counsel, consideration and assistance.

That has been true throughout his entire service in the House. His door has always been open to his colleagues and those who wanted to see him. His great mind and heart was always open to help those who needed his assistance, because he was imbued with a deep sense of humanity.

His devotion to the people of this country and deep compassion for their welfare is second to none. He is a great leader, who senses the needs of the people, and goes out of his way, indeed, makes many personal sacrifices to insure, insofar as he can, that he serves them devoutly, efficiently and to the best of his ability and effectiveness. And this, to be sure, he has done throughout all these years he has exemplified such high standards in the performance of his official and personal duty.

He presides over the House with dignity, impartiality and just consideration for all under the rules.

There are so many facets to the personality and the fine qualities and character of the Speaker that on this occasion, I do not have the time to recite them. But they are well known to all within the sound of my voice, and they are well known to his constituency, his great Bay State and to the American people.

I have known JOHN McCORMACK through many years of my life. I have watched with great admiration the course of his brilliant career, not only in Massachusetts, in the halls of justice, in the State legislature, and in the Constitutional Convention, but here in Washington where for years he has rendered such wonderful, memorable service and has been in the vanguard of virtually all the great governmental events of his and our times.

It gives me a great sense of honor and

privilege, although it is accompanied by a real tinge of sadness and regret, to join with my colleagues as Members of the House of Representatives in paying these all too inadequate words of esteem, admiration, warm affection, and genuine pride in this great national and world leader, who stands out in our history, and who will long continue to stand out in our history, as one of the greatest American leaders, and one of the greatest Speakers, who has ever served in this body or, in any representative body of this Nation.

One of the most important facets, probably the most important facet of this great Speaker's life is that of his family relationship, which every Member of the House knows so intimately and so well. He is totally devoted to his lovely wife, and life partner, Harriet. His affection and love for her, and her affection and love for him know no bounds, and no limits.

I think that this relationship is one of the most wonderful that I have ever seen in my lifetime, and I know that everyone in the House shares that feeling with me, as to the devotion, the love, the thoughtfulness and the deep-seated, warm, affectionate bonds, marked by the extraordinary loyalty which the Speaker possesses, and his wife reciprocates and that has existed so meaningfully throughout the years.

It is a most impressive and moving story that could be told, the love of this great man for his lovely wife, and a woman for her husband, that has been exemplified so beautifully by the life-long relationship between our great Speaker and his talented, gracious wife. God love and keep them for years and years to come.

So, today, while we are beset by mingled feelings concerning the retirement of our dear friend, our beloved friend and great Speaker, we have every reason also to be very proud of the record that he has made here and that he will leave here with us.

JOHN McCORMACK is a man of great faith and loyalty. He is devoted to his Nation. He is devoted to his Maker. He is devoted to his loving wife and his family, and his friends.

He is devoted to the good causes of American government and our free way of life.

Throughout his career, he had the foresight and the vision to see the dangers; and he had the courage, the stamina, the strength and the resolution at all times to stand faithfully in response to the demands and the call to duty, the wisdom to see the light in these days of peril, and in all the days of peril that he has been through, and they were numerous, to stand by and for his country always with unanswering firmness, and to make sure that his country has the strength, not only in a military sense, but in an economic and social and spiritual sense as well, to face every contingency that may confront us, to stand firm and unyielding against peril and danger from every and any source.

So I am proud, I am very proud to join so many of my esteemed colleagues today in these very splendid, unprece-

dented, glorious tributes that have been made to our beloved Speaker.

I know that they come from the hearts of everyone here, and I know that they will comprise a record that will go down for many years in the life of America, and in the proud annals of this body, which assert the greatness of JOHN McCORMACK, and of our gratitude for his peerless services to God and country.

I want to congratulate our Speaker on the tremendous and powerful leadership he has furnished here in the House of Representatives, and for all his magnificent achievements covering most perilous times in American history and life as well as the most constructive periods, in which we have as a Nation achieved greater progress, greater prosperity and greater compassion and justice for those unable to help themselves than ever before in our history.

It has been a period of rich fulfillment that must go on to much greater heights.

There are problems before us and ahead of us marked by dangers and uncertainty.

But the work and loyalty of JOHN McCORMACK will be here in this House, to inspire its lofty goals, and bring them to reality.

So let us stand firm by our posts of duty, and our work for peace, progress, and prosperity for all.

I am very sad that you are leaving, Mr. Speaker, but from the bottom of my heart, I want to express my profound thanks to you for the many things you have done to help me and my colleagues, and to stand for those things that are fundamental and just in American life—for the people and for our Nation, and for the peoples and the nations of the world—and for peace and for justice everywhere.

I hail and salute you from the bottom of my heart and wish you and your lovely wife many happy years together.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. SLACK).

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I join with those who view the retirement of Speaker McCORMACK as a mingled cause for sadness and regret. For all of us who are busy with our own direct concerns, he has set the tone and pace of the House. He has led us to an unsurpassed record of achievement during the difficult years when uncertainty often seemed to be dominant on the national scene.

The Speaker's chair requires a man of courage, skill, patience, and understanding. It is not enough to know the functions of government and the duties and responsibilities of Congress. The Speaker must have a keen awareness of "the art of the possible" in any situation, on any given day, in connection with any legislative proposal.

We are fortunate indeed to have enjoyed the leadership of Speaker JOHN McCORMACK in these trying times, because he combines all of these abilities with human traits of kindness and consideration for others, no matter how heated may be the controversy. I wish him well, as we all do, that he may enjoy for many years a time of repose and re-

fection so well earned by his great labors in behalf of the Nation and the Congress.

Service in the House under the leadership of Speaker McCORMACK has been a high point in my career. Like many others, I owe him much for his wise counsel. The most fitting tribute we can pay him would be to move ahead with solutions to the challenging problems which now confront us—moving ahead as he would with vigor and decisiveness. I am sure he will take the greatest satisfaction in retirement with the knowledge that his life's goals will be an activity pursued by those who share his philosophy and are determined to carry on.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, no marble monument could adequately enshrine the huge contribution that Speaker JOHN McCORMACK has made to this Nation. His enormous service to America's social fabric is a living monument which, in my judgment, shall survive into eternity.

We need only look at America today. If over the last four decades JOHN McCORMACK had not provided the leadership for bank insurance, insurance for our savings and loan associations, and strengthening the Securities and Exchange Commission as well as the Federal Reserve bank, what is happening in the stock market today would have this Nation in a panic that would make 1929 look like child's play.

This great Speaker of ours, who came out of the depression, saw the shambles America was in during the depression of the thirties and carefully provided the bold and courageous leadership to shore up the financial institutions of our republic. So I say, Mr. Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK shall be known as America's most distinguished Speaker for humanity, wherever freedom's cause was at stake, he was in the front line in its defense.

As one example of his contribution to America, despite his enormous responsibilities as Speaker of the House, JOHN McCORMACK, was but a heartbeat away from the Presidency itself after the tragic death of President Kennedy. At this time this Republic knew it was secure in the knowledge that should the burden of the presidency fall on JOHN McCORMACK's shoulders, this Republic would have been in good hands.

So today, as we pay tribute to JOHN McCORMACK for his great leadership, we are grateful that Providence brought him to this Nation. For four decades, every piece of social legislation, every great struggle for human dignity, carried with it JOHN McCORMACK's imprint.

Mrs. Pucinski joins me in wishing the Speaker and his lovely wife many years of happiness. I have only one little request. I hope that in his retirement, the Speaker will consent to document his many, many experiences in the four most hectic decades of this country. Later this year we are going to observe a trillion dollar plateau in our economy and Speaker McCORMACK has played a key role in helping bring this country to this pinnacle.

I hope for the young people of America

for all time to come he will record and document many of the steps that it took to bring this Nation of ours to the pinnacle of success that it enjoys today.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished majority leader for yielding me this time. When the 91st Congress adjourns sine die, our friend, Speaker JOHN McCORMACK, can say as Paul did:

I have fought a good fight, I have finished the course, and I have kept the faith.

Never could a man make that statement with more truthfulness than you could with the distinguished record that you have made here in this Congress. My whole congressional experience is wrapped around sweet memories of you, Mr. Speaker. I was sworn in here on the 21st day of March 1944, at 12:10, and at 1 o'clock my friends had a luncheon for me down in the Speaker's dining room. You were there.

One of the pictures that I prize most is the picture of that luncheon—you sitting by the side of my late sweet mother.

You have been a great Speaker, a great Congressman. I could speak all day about the many virtues that you have. I think I expressed my sentiment 2 months ago on the floor of this House when I said that come January 7, 1971, if the Democrats were in control of this House, I would vote for you as Speaker and use all the influence I had as dean of the Alabama delegation to see that you got every Democratic vote in that delegation.

You will be forgotten. I want to quote now my favorite poem, "The Heart of a Friend":

The heart of a friend never wonders or doubts,

No matter if years intervene.

The old faith is there

And nought can compare

With the comfort it gives though unseen.

Yes, the heart of a friend is one thing I prize

As life lengthens and twilight descends

It is the last boon I will ask

When I have finished my task;

That I live in the hearts of my friends.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that as long as any of us are in this Chamber who served under you or who served with you, you will live in our hearts, because you have been a really true friend—and God bless you.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

I yield now to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I come this afternoon not in any sense to take part in a formal proceeding but because I want to come and indicate my respect and my affection for you.

I am a relative newcomer to the House, as membership in the House goes, so my memory goes back to the time when I came and sought to take my place in this House and in my committee assignments. As the years went by, I had occasion to come repeatedly to you and ask your help and guidance and sometimes your support, and throughout you demonstrated the kind of fairness and open-

ness and warmness that I am sure has won a place for you in the heart of every Member of this House.

Mr. Speaker, even during those times when perhaps I diverged in my views and votes from those that you might cast, there was never the slightest hint of any change in the sense of fairness and openness and fair dealing which has characterized you as Speaker of this House of Representatives.

You have been a great leader and you have presided over enormous achievements which have benefited this Nation. I am proud to join with so many who are your friends, who are deeply indebted to you for your service to this House and to the Nation.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the able majority leader for the privilege he gives me of joining my colleagues in tribute to one of the greatest men and assuredly the best man I have ever known, Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK.

The record of this country, as long as it shall survive, will be replete with his contributions to this great land, but it will be not only a cold record in the archives that shall call his name blessed, but also countless men and women and children who have been the beneficiaries of what he has done for America in this House. Innumerable men and women and children are healthier and better educated and live in more happy homes as a result of his contributions.

Many men and many women have better jobs and receive better pay and have more job security and live in a land where the air and streams of water are purer—but they also live in a land where the spirit, too, is purer because of what JOHN McCORMACK has done for this America that he so much loves.

This House, Mr. Speaker, will not be the same nor will this Congress or this country be the same without JOHN McCORMACK in his accustomed place in this House which he has so long and so nobly adorned.

Winston Churchill said he was the child of the House of Commons. He also became its noble leader.

JOHN McCORMACK for over 40 years has been the child of this House. No man loved it more or served it better than he. But he also became its revered and beloved leader.

I can only say that when that day, remote, we all pray, comes when he shall move into membership in that higher house presided over by that God whom he has so long and so faithfully served, that all who knew JOHN McCORMACK will say of him, as Antony said upon the field of Philippi over the body of Brutus:

His life was gentle, and the elements  
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up  
And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his beautiful tribute.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN).

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want especially to join in this tribute to the Speaker today because it is no secret that on some questions we have disagreed, and it is important—if this occasion is to be what it should be—that those of us who have not always agreed with him make it clear that we are no less grateful for having known him than those who have agreed with him.

My wife's family is from Boston, and they have told me something of what JOHN McCORMACK has meant to that community, how diligently he has worked without fanfare through the years for the good of so many kinds of people. But I would never have known what he has meant to this body had I not had the good fortune to be here with him. I will always be grateful that we overlapped here so I could have the opportunity to know this man, generous, considerate, and fair to everyone, never vindictive no matter how great his disagreement or disappointment.

The rules of this body continue to dismay many of us who find them neither democratic nor conducive to efficient procedures. But within these rules, the Speaker has done everything he could to protect the rights of every Member, and for that alone he deserves the respect of everyone here. Imagine what this place would be like if unfair rules were unfairly enforced.

So I am here today to join in this salute to a fine and good human being who has made great contributions to his countrymen over more decades than many of us have been alive. We are fortunate to have served under him as Speaker of the House, and grateful to know him as a friend. His graciousness and conscientiousness in the Speaker's chair have set standards that his successors will have to strive to reach, and his patience and concern during these first months will abide, however long I am in the House, as challenge and guide for my own behavior toward other Members. We will miss him sorely, and we wish him and Mrs. McCormack all that is good in the years ahead.

Mr. ALBERT. I appreciate the fine comments of the gentleman from New York.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no one at any time more deserving of this tribute. The great happiness in it is that he is here with us to listen to what we all think about him. It is really a day of celebration for a great American.

It is a day, too, when all of us reflect upon all the wonderful things he has done for so many of us.

It is a day, too, for our country to be thankful, to be thankful JOHN McCORMACK was here to participate in so many of the great decisions of our times. No man participated more effectively in more decisions. No man was more a part of the great transition of history to a larger extent than JOHN McCORMACK. No man ever extended compassion, and courage, and hope to all who knew him to a greater degree.

As all the speakers before me have pointed out, there are many personal moments with JOHN I could talk about, as well as moments with Speaker McCORMACK we all delighted in.

I recall being at his side on the terrible night at Andrews Air Force Base when the body of John Kennedy was returned. The first man Lyndon Johnson walked over to was JOHN McCORMACK. They looked at each other through moist eyes and shook hands. I knew that in those terrible days, in that terrible time, the transition of American Government was in capable hands.

I know that other Presidents in other troubled times have benefited from his great courage. There are so many, many things that can be recalled and said.

I am reminded of the story of the election on Olympus when all of the gods voted and determined who was the greatest of all the Romans. They selected Marcus Aurelius, because he had caused injury to no man.

JOHN McCORMACK has caused injury to no man, but he has gone beyond that; he has given hope, and compassion, and courage to all who knew him. As the dome outside of this Capitol symbolizes the greatness of America, so the heart of JOHN McCORMACK symbolizes the greatness of America, so the heart of JOHN McCORMACK symbolizes the warmth, the love and compassion on the inside.

All of us who have served with him and known him as a friend well know that throughout the whole history of our country, as it is recorded from now on, the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts will never expire.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those fine remarks.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH).

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I have somewhat mixed emotions standing up here today to offer a few words of tribute to our great colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McCORMACK). On the one hand, it grieves me to think that his presence will no longer be physically felt in the daily operations of this body after the close of this Congress. But on the other hand, I can understand his concern over his wife's health and his desire to be closer to her than the daily demands of the Speaker's position permits.

Despite the fact that Speaker JOHN McCORMACK will no longer occupy the exalted seat at the head of this Chamber, his presence and spirit will be felt for the many years to come. In all my years of public service, I have never known a man who was more devoted to his constituency and his country than he was.

Like Joe Martin, he had the common touch that made him a true representative of the rank and file American; yet his superior intellect, commanding personality, and strong character made him invaluable as a counsellor and friend to the leaders of all ranks in both national and international circles.

One of the most extraordinary pleasures of my public career has been serv-

ing with this kind, good, and great man. I have never known him to refuse anyone the aid of his wise counsel and foresight. That spirit and that intellect and that kindness will be impossible to replace.

When the decade of the sixties are recorded in the chronicles of time, the tale will be one of change and turbulence, of war and great prosperity, of youth and a new way of life, and of conflict and the search for peace.

And when the chroniclers come to the name of Speaker JOHN McCORMACK they will record a tenure marked by calm in the face of national convulsion. A peacemaker in the face of war. A visionary midst a sense of national frustration. A youthful spirit in the garment of maturity. A statesman in the halls of politicians.

It is a pleasure to join my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in this fine tribute. And I, as many before me have said, express my personal thanks and the gratitude of my constituency for his dedication and devotion to the United States of America.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE).

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made here today about our beloved Speaker, JOHN W. McCORMACK. I have known JOHN McCORMACK all my life. He will be enshrined in the hearts of the people of our Nation, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts forever.

JOHN W. McCORMACK's record, in my opinion, will go down in history and he will be recognized as one of the greatest Speakers in this beloved Nation of ours.

JOHN W. McCORMACK has stood the test of time. Some men are born great; some men have greatness thrust upon them; other men achieve greatness. JOHN W. McCORMACK has achieved greatness.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity to join my colleagues in this tribute to the very distinguished and beloved Speaker.

It has been my pleasure and privilege to have served in this House during the entire time he has been Speaker of the House of Representatives and to know him and to respect him as a friend, one whose friendship I have cherished and will always cherish.

History will record the qualities of Speaker McCORMACK and particularly his able leadership during the days of the trials and crises during the administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the person I still consider to be the greatest of modern American Presidents.

I would note briefly some of the highlights of a remarkable political career spanning 42 consecutive years in the House of Representatives, 9 years as Speaker. But it is not length of tenure alone which history will record. Rather the battles he has fought and the ac-

complishments he has achieved truly mark his merit.

During the 1930's, he was one of the leading champions of the New Deal legislation which helped to bring this country from the depths of the Depression, and which marked the beginning of a social revolution in this country. His support of such measures as the National Housing Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Wages and Hours Act, the Wagner Labor Act was recognition of the fact that the needs of all the people must be served, and that Government exists to serve them.

In later years, serving as chairman of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration in 1958, Speaker McCORMACK sponsored the bill to create the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

In 1963, as Speaker, he used his well-deserved prestige to help influence enough votes to win a permanent enlargement of the Rules Committee, so that liberal bills would not continue to be bottled up there. The legislative breakthroughs of the Johnson administration followed.

Speaker McCORMACK has been in the forefront since he entered the Congress of those fighting for the progressive legislation which has become law over the last 40 years. The Nation is indeed indebted to him.

With affection and respect, I pay tribute to our Speaker JOHN McCORMACK. It will be strange indeed not to find Speaker McCORMACK in the chair when the new Congress convenes next January.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN).

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of pride that I join with my colleagues in paying honor and tribute so richly deserved to a truly great man, one of God's noblemen, Speaker JOHN McCORMACK.

I feel certain that all my colleagues, as well as I, have been enriched in spirit and soul because of association with the Speaker. His life's work embodies the spirit of dedication, brilliant and confident leadership, and unselfish devotion to the highest American ideals. He has been an unyielding champion of peace with freedom and justice for all men and nations. The Speaker has been a tireless fighter for human rights, equal dignity and equal opportunity for all people. He has been an unyielding foe of poverty, disease, illiteracy, injustice, and all forms of tyranny. For decades past and decades to come, people have been, and will be, indebted to Speaker McCORMACK for his contributions to our way of life.

Speaker McCORMACK will leave an indelible print on the Halls of Congress.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, what I have to say with reference to you would go on like Tennyson's brook, forever.

I think of the excerpt:  
They shall not grow old, as we that are left grow old;  
Age shall not weary them, nor the years condemn.  
At the going down of the sun, and in the morning,  
We will remember them.

In the past there has been one place in the world where a man could stand in the marketplace and say, "I am a Roman citizen and no one dared to dispute it."

The gentleman from Massachusetts can say with his last breath, "I am an American citizen and no one could dispute it."

As the Irish say, there are only a few of us left, oh, but what a few.

During recent discussions about the Speaker and some of the controversy I felt called upon to send a telegram and in the telegram I said this:

I am for McCormack, McCormack and McCormack.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS).

Mr. MILLS. I thank my distinguished friend from Oklahoma for yielding to me at this time.

It has been very difficult for me to find words that I can say to all of you and particularly to my good friend JOHN McCORMACK that express the deep feelings that I have and have had for him and toward him.

The Speaker was a Member of the House for 10 years when I first came here. His reputation was known even then in the great State of Arkansas. He was a member of the Ways and Means Committee. His membership on that committee and my admiration and respect for him had much to do with the great desire that I had to serve on that committee. He was a great source of strength and help to me when I first came here. He has forgotten, of course, the many little trivial problems that I had which I would discuss with him and some of the other Members who were senior to me. He remembers that I was confused sometimes in those days by some of the Members and even by the page boys, but not by him.

He always knew me. I was always "WILBUR." My problems were always most important to him. It is a great privilege to look back, Mr. Speaker, at having been a member of a delegation then of seven Members who supported your first election to the position of majority leader the first time you became majority leader.

I think I shall always remember—as I now do—the many, many pleasantries that have passed between us, but as I think of this I think my association with you, Mr. Speaker, has perhaps made—if I am a better man—a better man of me than I would have been, because my impression of you is that very few men, if any, have ever had the respect for religion that you have had, and put it into effect here in the Congress as you have.

As I think also about you I wonder how many of us have ever had that great respect for home life that you have demonstrated all the days that I have known you. Then, too, I think in terms of that great respect you have for honor. You may have forgotten, but you told me early in my career that one of the things a Member of Congress must always demonstrate in order to have the respect of his fellow Members was honesty. Be slow to say what you will do, but do it when you say it.

I could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, on the impressions that I have of you. After your retirement, this will not be the same place for me. The important fact is that there have been very few people who have ever had the honor of having served in the House of Representatives more than half their lifetime, and you have had that great honor. You have repaid the people of your district manifold for what I have always said in my own district was their patience and understanding of my demerits as well as the merits I claimed I had. Your people have been kind to you, and in return you have been kind to them.

I know that the reason for your retirement is that desire you have to be with your loved one. If it were not for that, those of us privileged to do so could expect to come back, as DAN FLOOD said, and rather than expect to be voting for CARL ALBERT for Speaker at the next Congress, we could expect to be voting for our longtime Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK.

I hope you will not forget us, as we will not forget you. I hope you will not find it impossible to get back to Washington from time to time, because very frankly I am going to be lost without your advice on occasions, as I have sought it so often—and so often you have given it to me freely, always the best advice I could get anywhere. I look forward to seeing you not only for the remainder of this Congress but in the days and beyond. Please come back to see us. Do not let us feel that your departure at the end of the year is an exit with no return—come back.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), for his moving tribute.

Mr. Speaker, several of our colleagues are out of the country and I have here a telegram from them extending their best wishes to Speaker McCORMACK, which I include in the RECORD at this point:

1. We deeply regret that we will not be able to be present today in Washington to join our colleagues in both parties in honoring our great Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK.

2. We do join you in spirit and we ask you both to express to the Speaker our highest admiration and affection and our warmest best wishes for the future.

EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR., PHILLIP BURTON,  
THOMAS S. FOLEY, DONALD E. LUKENS,  
ROBERT B. MATHIAS, THOMAS F.  
RAILSBACK, DONALD W. RIEGLE,  
PHILIP E. RUPPE, WILLIAMSON  
STUCKEY.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen such a demanding, persistent group of col-

leagues who would like to go on all night, in spite of the fact that we are all going to entertain you in just a very few minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is proof, if proof is needed, that although we have a political aisle it melts under the sunshine of the devotion of everyone on both sides of the aisle for you, the greatest living legislator in the world.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress in 1949 I felt challenged to find solutions and work vigorously for the many needs that confronted the eastern Kentucky congressional district which it was my privilege and is my privilege to represent in the Congress. At that time our distinguished Speaker, JOHN W. McCORMACK, was majority leader for the U.S. House of Representatives.

Even though I was an attorney and acquainted with legal procedures and versed with the parliamentary procedures that I had encountered in the general assembly in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, I found in JOHN W. McCORMACK a great ally of the freshman Congressmen, a distinguished gentleman who believed in liberal and progressive legislation, a gentleman who, in spite of the demands of his position in the House, was always willing to provide his experience and counsel and help to a Member who earnestly sought to reflect the needs of his district in legislation before the Congress.

I treasure those moments with JOHN McCORMACK the then majority leader of the House.

I treasure further the opportunities I have had for his counsel, for his wisdom, for his infinite legislative experience as he assumed the mantle of Speaker. In spite of the awesome responsibilities with which this title confers, JOHN McCORMACK has continued to be responsive to the needs of Members of the House, be they newcomers or be they Members with years of experience.

Throughout his legislative career, I have been greatly impressed with Speaker McCORMACK's driving sense of responsibility to meet the urgent needs of the American people. Regardless of their geographical location, regardless of the origin or creed, Speaker McCORMACK has been sensitive to the fashioning of legislation to provide opportunities for Americans to develop their full potential unrestricted by unfair competition and unrestricted by economic disadvantage.

Representative McCORMACK, Majority Whip McCORMACK, Majority Leader McCORMACK, and Speaker McCORMACK has served his Nation loyally, his constituency diligently and mankind with effectiveness that will be marked in the pages of history with greater emphasis than I or any other Member can convey at this time.

As a Member who has loved him and a Member who has treasured relationships with him I wish him well in what I know will be an effective retirement. A retirement that calls for his leadership abilities in many areas.

Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine pleasure and a deep sense of affection that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to

one of the most distinguished men that America has ever sent to this House of Representatives, our beloved JOHN McCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

Long before I ever came to Congress, JOHN McCORMACK's name was synonymous with progress, leadership, and a development of programs that are now an integral part of American life.

As I have worked with JOHN McCORMACK for 10 years, three things have come through sharp and clear: First, his understanding of the problems of Members and his reconciliation always of those problems; second, his integrity, gentlemanliness, and sense of decency; and, third, his fairness to every human being.

Women have not always been the most popular Members of the Congress, yet it was with no hesitation whatsoever that JOHN McCORMACK, as a majority leader and Speaker, has seen that women were treated fairly and equally. I sometimes fear that in our haste to change our fashions, we often forget enduring contributions made by our leadership, so I do want to speak for American women in thanking JOHN McCORMACK for his fairness and great sense of justice.

I salute our great and distinguished Speaker and wish him and Mrs. McCORMACK the happiest of years ahead.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this is my 12th year in the House of Representatives but, of course, I had heard a great deal about the great Speaker of this House long before coming to this House, in fact ever since I was in high school, at which time although he was not the Speaker he was a national leader. I consider it a great privilege to have had an opportunity to serve under both the present Speaker and the late Sam Rayburn, both of whom will certainly go down in the annals of legislative history. While there were differences in their approach they also have had many similarities. One trait being that they were known far and wide as men of their word and leaders who would always place the national security and national good above everything else. Seldom do two men with such great leadership and other characteristics serve in the same period of history.

Everything that I can say concerning personal relationships with the Speaker, personal observations and personal impressions will certainly have been said many times over by other Members speaking today and would, therefore, be trite. So let me merely join the many others here today who thank Speaker McCORMACK for all the help and guidance that he has given to his country for the many years that he has served his Nation; and my wife and I extend to the Speaker and Mrs. McCORMACK our very best wishes for the future.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of us in the Congress were greatly moved when our distinguished Speaker announced last week that he would not seek reelection to the Congress and would, therefore, relinquish the office which he has held for the second longest time in American history.

I believe, also, that no one in the Congress is unaware of the immense responsibilities which lie upon the shoulders

of the man who leads the House of Representatives in meeting its responsibilities to the American people in the writing of the laws of this Nation.

Finally, I believe everyone in this House recognizes that our present Speaker has carried that difficult burden with dignity and distinction.

I commend the Speaker for the work which he has done so unselfishly for so many years in leading this House as it works for the well-being of the people of America. Certainly history will note that in those years when he sat as the Speaker, some of the most important decisions in the history of this Nation were made here in the House of Representatives.

I wish him Godspeed and many, many years during which I know the leaders of this Nation will consult with him in retirement to give the American people the benefit of the wisdom he has accumulated through his long years of public service.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK has always made a big point of his friends, irrespective of which side of the aisle they come from. I enjoy the personal warmth of counting myself as one of his friends. Each time I have talked to him, I have received the courtesy and fairness from friend to friend.

I add my voice to these words in complimenting JOHN McCORMACK for the kind of a leader and the kind of a man he is.

God's blessing to our Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK, and his wonderful and devoted wife.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a simple fact of human existence that a man's life is shaped and influenced by those with whom he associates. This is especially true here in this Chamber of the House of Representatives, in Washington.

We the Members have perhaps one of the most interesting and unusual vantage points in the entire American Republic. For we are privileged to see what is, in essence, the face of this Republic pass before us, in the faces of our colleagues.

Of course this has to be the case. The phrase "If you cannot trust the voters, whom can you trust?" is often denounced as a cliché. It happens to be very true; each Member, to some degree, mirrors his constituency, or he would not be here.

Each Member also reflects something that is basic and integral to the very soul of our Nation. This is my 20th year of service in the House of Representatives. I wish to say at this time, as we now know the time of service remaining to the Speaker, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, is rapidly drawing to a close, that in all those 20 years I have never seen, known, or had my own actions shaped by, any other man who could be called more noble, more forthright, more honest—or more of a truly great son of our Republic.

Men are enjoined, in the Apocrypha, in Ecclesiasticus XXXIII, 22, that they should "Leave not a stain in thine honor." When JOHN McCORMACK leaves this Chamber for the last time as Speaker, he may leave with the quiet knowledge that the honor of the Cham-

ber, and the honor of each Member who has been privileged to know and work with him, is brighter than before—because he served here, because we knew him.

Let him reflect, then, both now and after he goes into retirement, on the phrase from Shakespeare's Othello:

I have done the state some service, and they know't.

Yes—and the American Republic will never forget it.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in participating in this public tribute to our Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McCORMACK), I speak as a Member of the minority. In many respects, an expression from the minority has deeper meaning. I can say that, because as Speaker your display of fairness and consideration to the House membership on both sides of the aisle was essential in order to merit the respect and praise which minority Members are expressing for the Record today.

Mr. Speaker, in honoring you today, I cannot help but recall the kindness and humility which you have always displayed when such qualities were appropriate.

On other occasions, you demonstrated your great eloquence, firmness, and persuasive qualities.

On many issues, Mr. Speaker, you have subordinated partisan interests in support of positions of statesmanship.

Mr. Speaker, you have been the Speaker of this House during the entire 8 years of my experience here. These are among the most precious years of my life and among the most colorful and dramatic years in the history of our Republic.

Mr. Speaker, I have prized your friendship, your confidence, and your assistance. In attesting to your greatness and your contributions of leadership and service, I add this expression of gratitude for having served here in this House of Representatives with you.

Mr. Speaker. Mrs. McClory joins me in extending every good wish for health and happiness to you and to Mrs. McCORMACK in the years to come.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the rest of my colleagues in expressing my deep appreciation for having had the opportunity of serving in the House of Representatives while the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK served as its Speaker.

There are many good things that can be said about Mr. McCORMACK. For one thing, he had a superb grasp of legislative proceedings, always acting to untangle procedural knots that developed and to keep the legislative events moving smoothly and swiftly. For another thing, he had an exceptional understanding of the ramifications of legislation, and he always had an accurate measure of the breadth and depth of a bill. He also had a facility for debate which everyone admired.

But as he was a skilled craftsman in his legislative workshop, so was he a total human being, having a great capacity for fairness and understanding. As he managed the affairs of the House, he always gave every Member a fair chance to be heard, for he believed that

the best legislation was that kind which flowed from a dynamic interchange of views.

Mr. McCORMACK always contended that the greatest service anyone could perform was service for one's country. He excelled in this regard, setting up a standard for other public-conscious persons to follow in the future.

Undoubtedly history will record him as one of the foremost Speakers in the House of Representatives, both for his talent and his service. In this respect, he has become a legend in his own time.

The House of Representatives will not be quite the same legislative chamber when JOHN W. McCORMACK leaves the Speaker's chair. It is a better Chamber, however, because of his occupancy of that chair.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I know that my words today will in no way match those of my distinguished colleagues, but after all their words, as true and as deserving as they might be, are not the words of respect for you, our Speaker JOHN McCORMACK, that I find in my heart. Let me not be misunderstood, because I would like to adopt the words of those of my colleagues who preceded me as my own, and to add what follows now from my mouth as words truly from my heart.

You, Mr. McCORMACK, are a great man. I have been privileged to observe your conduct during the time that I have been in the Congress. You, Mr. Speaker, are a dedicated American, and an American that all Americans should appreciate.

You have said on occasion that when you leave the Speaker's chair to speak on the floor that you always acknowledged your dedication to your country and to your party, but you said you hoped that you would always sit in the Speaker's chair fairly and impartially. This you have done, Mr. Speaker; you are indeed a fair and honest man.

I am not a true veteran of the House as compared to many but since I was sworn in by you in January 1967, you have always treated me as an equal. You have encouraged me, like you have others, to work in a manner to earn the respect of, not only my constituents at home, but of my colleagues in the House as well.

Mr. McCORMACK, your record of big accomplishments, as a Member of the Congress and as Speaker of the House of Representatives, is well documented. Few, if any Americans, have a greater record of service to God and Country than you. Few, if any Americans, could have accepted the responsibility placed upon you in the outstanding manner that you have.

But it is not only the big things you did that made you a great person. No; it is because you are a kind man and never forget the little things, such as remembering a birthday or someone who is ill. I remember shortly after I came to the House that I went to the hospital with a serious throat infection. You did not have to, since I am a Republican and you are a Democrat, but you came to the hospital to see me. No, Mr. Speaker, you did not have to, but you did and I was grateful.

I am indeed grateful that I had the honor and pleasure of serving with you. I am even more grateful that I had the chance to get to know you.

Mr. Speaker, may God bless you always.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, we have had many proud moments in the House during my short 8 years here when our great Speaker has risen to great heights of statesmanship and parliamentary wisdom.

One great, proud moment for me and for my mother was the occasion of her meeting her fellow "down-easter" in the Speaker's chambers a year ago.

And it was a proud moment for me, also, some months ago, when, after hearing members of the Massachusetts delegation rally to the Speaker's defense over some newspaper comment over an extraneous and irrelevant matter. I took pen in hand to say to him that no one ever need rise to his defense, that his outstanding record would always speak for his greatness and nobility of character.

The bad that men do lives after them, and the good is interred with their bones.

It is so fitting and deserving that this great American public servant can hear from us with satisfaction the high esteem and fondness which we hold for him, that he can carry with him to his retirement a sense of fulfillment in a job so well done and that cheer and comfort which comes from the sincere professions of love and brotherhood of his colleagues.

When I have retired from the Congress, one of my satisfactions will be in being able to say "I served with him."

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, no person in this Congress has been treated more kindly and more fairly than I have been by Speaker McCORMACK. I cannot begin to express my gratitude to him for giving me the breadth of opportunity to serve which he has given me.

All of us will miss you, Mr. Speaker. I join with all of the rest in thanking you for your service to our country and this body, and I wish you and Mrs. McCORMACK the happiest retirement.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to add my words of tribute to one of this country's outstanding public servants, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK of the Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts, who came to Congress 42 years ago in the 70th Congress following a splendid career in the Massachusetts State Legislature.

When history records the story of JOHN W. McCORMACK's tenure in the Congress which will end with his service as Speaker of the House of Representatives, the highest honor that can come to a Member of either House of the Congress as a whole, it will state that he served as chairman of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration. After the Soviet Union succeeded in placing Sputnik I in orbit on October 4, 1957, a select committee composed of 13 Members of the House and 13 Members of the Senate was named and after conducting hearings for a period of 1 year prepared and passed through the

House and the Senate the legislation creating the Space Agency and shortly thereafter the necessary resolution setting up the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

On the initial select committee we had seven members on the Democratic side composed of JOHN W. McCORMACK, chairman, together with Representatives OVERTON BROOKS, BROOKS HAYS, LEO W. O'BRIEN, LEE METCALF, WILLIAM H. NATCHER, and B. F. SISK. On the Republican side we had as the ranking minority member, the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., together with Representatives LESLIE C. ARENDS, GORDON L. McDONOUGH, JAMES G. FULTON, KENNETH B. KEATING, and GERALD R. FORD.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to say that, in addition to having served a long and honorable record in the Congress, history will indeed record the fact that one of the outstanding assignments performed by JOHN W. McCORMACK during his entire tenure in political life was when he served in his important capacity on this particular select committee.

The chairman of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration in the Senate was Lyndon B. Johnson who, at that time, was the majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate having this opportunity to pay my respects to one who has served so long both as a majority leader and Speaker during many of the most crucial and momentous years of our Nation's history.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass without adding my deep-felt appreciation for the leadership and friendship provided by our beloved Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK. In a quarter of century of service in this body, I have known many men with many viewpoints. My friendship in each case was not determined on the basis of whether they agreed or disagreed with me. I look for other qualities in them by which to judge their work.

Today, I feel it is a privilege, yet personally a sad occasion for me, to join with other Members in paying tribute to a man whose intellectual and personal qualities stamp him as one of the truly great men of this generation.

Anyone who can pass the constant scrutiny of his constituents and of his colleagues in this body as Speaker McCORMACK has consistently done must have a capacity for leadership. He has steadfastly put his country above his party; he has exercised the prerogatives of his high office in a manner that shows his devotion to the traditions of this great body.

His departure from this Chamber will leave a void that no other man can fill. I can only wish him the best of everything in his remaining years.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Speaker JOHN McCORMACK has always been close to Texas and Texans. It was my privilege to serve in this Congress with Sam Rayburn as Speaker and JOHN McCORMACK as majority leader. They were a team. They were not only a team in their official capacity, but one could observe the personal friendship which existed between them. The House of Rep-

resentatives operated under these two like a well oiled and highly tuned machine.

From a personal standpoint I have had years of warm and valued friendship with Speaker McCORMACK.

I trust that in your retirement, Mr. Speaker, you and Mrs. McCORMACK will find a quiet and peaceful happiness and that you may enjoy good health for years to come.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in grateful appreciation for the great leadership of Speaker McCORMACK through the many years of his dedicated service to our country. In doing so, I also pay tribute to his beloved wife, who has been a part of the team which our country loves and is deeply grateful for. Few people in history have had the responsibilities of our Speaker, and he has met these responsibilities with courage and optimism, in a way that has made our country, and in fact the world, a better place in which to live. All of us are grateful.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the keenest judges of character that I know is my wife, June, who has been my partner in life for 26 years.

I have never known her to misplace her confidence in or to misjudge the character of, a man or woman whom she got to know well—although some might say her judgment slipped considerably when she agreed to become Mrs. Edmondson.

This is preliminary, Mr. Speaker, to saying that my wife has long contended that JOHN McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, is one of the finest men she has ever met—and Mrs. McCORMACK is one of the loveliest and most gracious women she has ever known.

In this judgment I wholeheartedly concur.

Speaker McCORMACK, from the day in 1953 when I first met him, has been a strong friend, a wise counselor, and a constant inspiration. I am sure that many, many thousands of Americans who have known this great Boston patriot will agree with me in the judgment that JOHN McCORMACK is one of the truly great Americans of the 20th century.

The House of Representatives, and the Nation, are stronger and better in many ways because of the leadership, vision, courage, and ability of JOHN McCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

It has been a great privilege to be associated in the House of Representatives with JOHN McCORMACK. It is an even greater privilege—one of the greatest of my life—to know and be warmed by the friendship of this good man.

To JOHN McCORMACK, and to his lovely lady, I extend the heartfelt appreciation and best wishes of the Edmondson family.

May the years ahead be years of beauty and of peace.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, my words today shall be simple and short, but boundless.

One of the treasures of my 30 years service in Congress is the reflection that I can call JOHN McCORMACK my friend. What else can I say now or at any time but that JOHN McCORMACK was a man of

deep devotion and love for his wife and his country.

Who among us is not better for having been privileged to walk in his shadow? To all the elaborate phrases, to all the superlatives, to all the hyperboles, to all the tributes, to all the accolades, I can only say, truly deserved, truly earned, truly merited.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to support this resolution paying tribute to the life and service of Speaker JOHN McCORMACK. Since I first came to the House in 1959, I have felt that JOHN McCORMACK was a friend as well as the leader of our party in our Chamber.

His life has been one of devotion to his principles and he has lived in a restrained and ascetic way that has been the wonder of many people in this self-indulgent age. His personal pleasures have been few and simple and his virtues have been many. Perhaps his greatest virtue has been that of loyalty. This has been demonstrated in his loyalty and love for his wife and his family connections and in his fierce devotion to the Democratic Party and to the church of which he is a member.

His support has always been open and courageous and energetic and he can take credit for playing a prominent role in the social legislation of the New Deal days which have since become a landmark in the history of this country. He also played a prominent role in helping the country prepare for World War II, and his lifelong devotion to the cause of religious and racial tolerance and his work to protect minorities from persecution and discrimination have been noteworthy.

A man of honor, a man of courage, and a loyal friend. What more can one say of any individual?

I am happy to pay my tribute to JOHN McCORMACK and to support the corporate action of the House in this resolution which we consider today.

Mr. CORDOVA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to participate in acknowledging and applauding the leadership of our Speaker, JOHN McCORMACK, who has become second in length of service in that distinguished capacity only to the great Sam Rayburn.

Although I am yet a beginner in legislative public service, I feel indebted to our Speaker for his understanding of the problems I have faced, for his counsel and for the generous and ready cooperation that he and his well-trained staff have extended whenever it was needed.

More than appreciate this assistance, so important to a freshman Member of Congress, I am deeply grateful for it. Moreover, I am confident that herein lie at least some of the qualities of JOHN McCORMACK which have made him a respected leader and a persuasive one.

I join, therefore, with enthusiasm and esteem in saluting him as a man and acclaiming his record in the service of our country.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in 3 days you will have served longer continuously as Speaker of the House than any other man in American history.

That record is an indication of the high esteem in which you are held by the people who know you best, the men who serve with you here in the Congress.

During your service as minority whip, majority leader, and as Speaker of the House, this Nation has seen the greatest record of progressive legislation of any time in the Nation's history.

JOHN McCORMACK has led the fights that produced medicare, aid to education, civil rights legislation, antipoverty programs. Programs of foreign assistance, such as the Marshall plan, NATO, Food for Peace, and the Peace Corps, exist only because he believed in them and worked for them.

This Nation is greater because JOHN McCORMACK has served it so well. The good of the Nation was always his guide to action. JOHN McCORMACK came from a tradition that put public service in an honored position, for it meant just that. He who could help his fellow man was fortunate. For our beloved Speaker, the people were what mattered. He wanted to accomplish that which would help those people who did not share fully in the wealth of this great Nation.

JOHN McCORMACK's work was always directed toward that goal of allowing all the people of this Nation to share equally and fully in our society.

Our Speaker is a man of great love for humanity and for the liberties and rights of this Nation. He is a man of absolute integrity and honesty, and whose sense of duty is perhaps greater than any I have ever seen.

All the good of our Nation has accomplished in the last 30 years has been due to his dedication, his perseverance, and his love of his fellow man.

Because JOHN McCORMACK loves his fellow men he has made America a better place in which to live. He has enriched the quality of American life.

I have been privileged to call JOHN McCORMACK my friend. He is my leader and I am thankful for his tutelage and his help.

JOHN McCORMACK knows that this Nation is indebted to him for his great service. But I know, that he does not care for plaudits or honors, his satisfaction comes from seeing the good he has accomplished. Our beloved, Speaker, I think, is pleased not by praise, but by knowing that for millions of people, he has made life better and more worth living. In reality, there can be no greater reward.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I feel so inadequate and shallow when I try to think of proper words that would adequately describe your life and service here today.

As I have sat by your side all afternoon and listened to these beautiful and highly deserved tributes, I think one thing stands out above all else and that is, Mr. Speaker, that every person has pointed out in glowing terms your love and dedication to your country, your family, and your fellow man. I know of no loftier heights to which one could aspire than to reach that station in life. You not only have reached it, but have far surpassed it.

When I came to Congress in 1955 as the youngest Member, you and the late

Speaker Rayburn, took me under your wing and gave me counsel and advice far beyond expectations. For whatever good I might have been to my district and my country, I owe much of it to you.

In behalf of my family and my staff, I want to dedicate the following poem to you, entitled "The Bridge Builder":

#### THE BRIDGE BUILDER

I saw an old man going down a lone highway, when he came to the evening cold and gray. To a Chasm, vast, deep, and wide—the old man crossed over to the other side. When safe on the other side the old man turned back to build a bridge to span the tide. O' man, said a fellow pilgrim near, you are wasting your strength with building here, your ending may come with the passing of the day, you may never again come this way—you've crossed the chasm vast and deep and wide, why build you this bridge on the other side. He lifted his old gray head—good friend down the path I have come, he said, there follows after me today a youth whose feet must pass this way—he too must cross in the twilight dim—good friend, I am building this bridge for him.

Mr. Speaker, you have built so many bridges in your 42-year career that it would be impossible for me to enumerate them here today. You have built bridges both in national emergencies and in peacetime progress. Every American lives freer and has a better way of life because of you.

Speaking personally and for the 487,000 I represent in southern Illinois, we love you and want to say "A job well done." We wish for you and Mrs. McCormack the best of health and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, today we have most appropriately set aside some time for this great body to honor you personally and your 42 years of service in the congress of the United States.

I speak first from the point of view of a four-term Member of the House who has served totally under your Speakership. For this privilege I am highly honored. Also, I am deeply appreciative of your courtesies, your fairness, and your assistance. Your leadership has been apparent, it has been dynamic and meaningful to all of us who have served with you either in the majority or in the minority.

Today, I also speak as the chairman of the National Committee of one of our great political parties. The rules of the House have been designed to enhance the effectiveness of the two-party system. The rights and interests of a minority, wherever it exists, are the basic trusteeship of this great institution, the House of Representatives. Your keen awareness of this trusteeship, the fairness with which you have administered the responsibilities of your office, and your deep understanding of the purpose of the legislative branch has meant a great deal to us Republicans who have worked with you in an effort to bring a better life for people throughout this land.

In a personal way may I extend heartfelt best wishes to you and Mrs. McCormack as you bring to a close a long and productive career in public life. I hope that the years of your retirement are many and that they are healthful and rewarding, for they are richly deserved.



Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in support of the pending resolution and applaud the majority and minority floor leaders for giving the House the opportunity to note this important event. This fine man, JOHN McCORMACK, deserves the gratitude of his party, his State, and his country. Few men have had the privilege of serving this country through such a long sweep of history. And throughout that service he has been tenacious and resourceful in fighting for those goals in which he believed. While I have had a few differences of opinion with our distinguished Speaker, I have never had anything but praise for his exemplary fairness, his keen mind, his integrity, his kindness toward his colleagues, and his devotion to duty.

I know he will especially enjoy the remaining months of his speakership as he receives the praise and commendation of the Nation. I wish for him and Mrs. McCORMACK the best of everything in the years ahead.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to add my voice to the many of my colleagues paying tribute to one of the most progressive and effective Speakers ever to lead the House of Representatives in its 181-year history, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK.

He has served this body more than 40 years, and has been one of its elected leaders for more than 30—as majority whip, majority leader and finally Speaker. His election in 1962 marked the beginning of a new era of effectiveness for the House of Representatives as a progressive governmental body. Under his courageous leadership some of the most difficult national problems were faced and great pieces of legislation were the product: The Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, The Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1967, and the list could go on and on. This most distinguished native son of Massachusetts, which has produced so many of America's greatest statesmen, has sensed the direction of this Nation and helped give life to its dreams of equality, justice, and self-fulfillment for each of its citizens. Five Presidents have sought him as a trusted adviser and junior Members of both the House and Senate have listened well to his learned counsel. He has often said:

If I had a choice to be known either as a great man or a good man, I would choose to be known as a good man.

I am sure that schoolchildren generations from now will know Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK as both good and great.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, when the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, whom we all loved and respected, exceeded the record of service as Speaker previously set by Henry Clay, there was deep pride among all of the Members of the House in his great achievement. Few of us expected to see the Clay record broken a second time in our congressional lifetimes, because it had stood for so many decades until Mr. Sam reached and exceeded it.

Now we are privileged in having a Speaker who has duplicated the Ray-

burn feat of exceeding the Clay record, and it is particularly proper that the honor should fall to the successor to Sam Rayburn as Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK—a worthy successor, indeed, to Sam Rayburn in all respects.

Mr. Speaker, the Office of Speaker is the most important in our Republic next to the Presidency. The Speaker makes democracy function in the House of Representatives, which is the bastion of our democratic system. It is a position of great power, and also of great opportunity. Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK has filled that mighty office with dignity, with courage, with effectiveness, and with grace. He has brought added honor to a most honorable position of public service.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to you and to your beloved wife my warmest personal congratulations on this historic milestone in a great congressional career—one which has not only spanned a great era in our history but which has contributed immeasurably, and monumentally, to the great achievements of that era. Congressman JOHN W. McCORMACK of Massachusetts has been, throughout his service in this body, an undaunted and courageous leader of liberal thought and action, and I stress the word action.

No Speaker has ever done as much for each individual Member of this body, on both sides of the aisle. And no man has ever been higher in our esteem. I am deeply grateful to our Speaker for helping me find a home in the House—making me feel a part of one of the greatest instruments of government ever devised.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that I speak for all of the House when I say that it genuinely saddens me to learn that Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK will not be with us next year.

When I first came to Congress in 1944 Mr. McCORMACK was already an accomplished legislator and a proven congressional leader. Over the years since then he has become my close and personal friend, and he has always been generous in his help and counsel. I shall miss his presence.

During 40 and more years in the House of Representatives JOHN McCORMACK has consistently worked for what he likes to call "progressive" legislation—legislation with direction, purpose, and effectiveness, legislation which has benefited every member of this country.

There is no need to describe in detail the legislative accomplishments of Mr. McCORMACK, because the statutes are full of his achievements, and almost every piece of important legislation since Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal bears the imprint of his efforts.

On Friday of this week Speaker McCORMACK will have served as Speaker continuously for almost 8½ years, longer than any other Speaker in the history of this body, and for a longer total time than any other man except for his friend, the late Sam Rayburn.

The true measure of his leadership as Speaker can be found in the respect accorded him on both sides of the aisle. He has always been unswervingly fair and impartial as Speaker, and for that

he has rightfully earned our respect and admiration.

All his other achievements notwithstanding, however, I believe Mr. McCORMACK's greatest achievement is that he has lived the life he believes in. His utter devotion to his wife, to his faith, and to his duties as legislator and Speaker is known to all of us. Throughout his years of service in Congress he has set an example of integrity to belief that few will accomplish, and none will forget.

Because of his example, his fairness, integrity, and untiring efforts, he has been a man whose counsel and whose respect we have sought, and it is hard to say more or better about a man than that.

Mr. McCORMACK has often said:

If I had a choice to be known either as a great man or a good man, I would choose to be known as a good man.

He is both, and we shall miss JOHN W. McCORMACK.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a warm and nostalgic feeling that I join in this tribute to Speaker JOHN McCORMACK.

As a man and as a boy, I have known Speaker McCORMACK to be a good friend and a wise counselor.

During the time of my late father's service in the House of Representatives, he worked closely with his colleague and friend Congressman McCORMACK in behalf of the many great legislative accomplishments of the 1930's, the 1940's, and the early 1950's.

Speaker McCORMACK has an unequalled record in support of progressive and compassionate legislative accomplishment. He has moved forward with the times and he has not waived in his dedication to social and economic justice.

He came to the House of Representatives during the course of the 70th Congress and the people of Boston have wisely returned him to the House in each Congress since that time. He has repaid the trust of his constituents many times over and has won recognition throughout the United States as an outstanding legislative leader.

Despite his many obligations as Speaker of the House of Representatives, Speaker McCORMACK always found time to take a personal interest in each Member of the House and to extend to each of us kindness and courtesy.

I have great respect and affection for Speaker McCORMACK and he shall leave a great void in the House when he steps down from the Speaker's chair. We all shall miss JOHN McCORMACK when the 91st Congress draws to a close.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a particular personal privilege and pleasure to join with the Members here this afternoon in congratulating my Massachusetts colleague, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, on this special occasion marking his continuous occupation of the Speaker's chair longer than any other person in our history and in acclaiming him as one of the greatest Speakers and legislative leaders of our time.

Since 1928, which may be currently remembered as the eve of another great

crisis in our country, the heart, the voice, and the hand of JOHN McCORMACK has been influentially associated with the advance and adoption of every substantial legislative measure for social progress that has occurred from that time to this day.

Through these years, and by virtue of his recognized character and integrity, diligence and dedication, competency, and compassion, he was consistently endorsed by his party colleagues for progressive positions of legislative responsibility and leadership up to the third most powerful and important office in the U.S. Government.

JOHN McCORMACK has spent the greatest part of his long and stalwart life in public service of his country and commonwealth. Few men or women will ever approach and none could ever surpass the tremendous contribution his personal devotion, talents, and leadership have made toward improving the quality of life for his fellow Americans and, indeed, for untold millions of people throughout this distressed world.

The great achievements of his legislative knowledge and leadership are indelibly written upon the brightest pages of our legislative history and they will shine there forever as a glorious tribute to the genius of Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK.

However, to those of us who have been privileged to serve with him through these past several years, it is the human qualities of the man, JOHN McCORMACK, that have endeared him to us most. His personal kindness, tolerance, encouragement, ever-ready willingness to be of assistance in particular difficulties, his sympathy with and understanding of personal concerns of others, his approachableness, in a word, his demonstration of brotherhood to all his fellow Members irrespective of party affiliation, has earned him the lasting admiration and respect of every individual who has ever occupied a chair in this Chamber during the tenure of JOHN W. McCORMACK.

That is why, although we understand the reasons he has given, with characteristic courage and abstraction, for leaving the speakership and this House, we are, nevertheless, deeply saddened at the contemplation of the tremendous loss his going will mean to this Nation, to his State, to this House, and to those of us who have been privileged to serve here with him.

In announcing his intention to close his public career at the end of this session the Speaker said that—

Mrs. McCormack and I have been looking forward to a period of rest and relaxation for some years.

No two persons in the world have ever been more deserving of "a period of rest and relaxation" and, as we salute this great man today, I know our prayers are joined in appeal to the good Lord to bestow every blessing, throughout a long and fruitful period of "rest and relaxation," upon Mr. and Mrs. John W. McCormack, when Speaker McCORMACK departs this House later this year.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in saluting the long and distinguished service of the gentleman from Massachusetts, our respected Speaker of the House, JOHN W. McCORMACK.

It has been my privilege to serve in the Congress for nearly 14 years, and while this comprises only a brief span in the public life of JOHN McCORMACK it has been more than ample enough time to come to know him as an eminently fair and dedicated Member of this body. His service to his country has been more than long. It has been devoted. It has been effective and patriotic. A strong adversary for the causes he has supported and for the party which he has served so well, Speaker McCORMACK has demonstrated time and again his consideration for all Members in the Chamber regardless of which side of the aisle they are on. This is the true test of the speakership. In this he has attained one of the highest ideals of our representative form of government.

Speaker McCORMACK's accomplishments and the long list of honors that he has received are a matter of record. Today I wish to express publicly my own personal appreciation for the courtesies and kindnesses that the Speaker has extended to me and to assure him of the maximum high regard with which he is held.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have had the rare privilege of meeting and becoming acquainted with great men of history and I include in that category with great pride Speaker JOHN McCORMACK. Mrs. Cunningham and I also had the privilege of meeting Mr. and Mrs. McCormack at a White House reception during the Presidency of the late John Kennedy. Our prayers are with the Speaker and Mrs. McCormack and their host of friends in the hope that this beloved woman will regain her health.

The speaker before me (Mr. O'HARA) mentioned something which struck home to me, and that is when we leave the Congress can we look back upon legislation which we authored and which became law. One such case was the major breakthrough of a bill I had worked on for many years having to do with the stoppage of filth moving through the mails. This was a difficult piece of legislation because of the various constitutional and other obstacles involved. But I consulted with our beloved Speaker in order that this legislation might be passed by the House of Representatives. He was most kind and helpful to me and due to his efforts this bill did pass the House and finally the Senate and it became law and was recently upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court.

I cite this example as one way of saying to my fellow Members that the Speaker is helpful and when legislation is presented which will benefit the country, no partisanship is involved so far as he is concerned.

I have a poem which has always been before me and which I have taken comfort in, and I know it would apply to this great and good man. It is a poem I know you are all familiar with, and it reads:

I shall pass through this world but once.  
If, therefore, there be any kindness I can show  
Or any good thing I can do, let me do it now.  
Let me not defer it or neglect it,  
For I shall not pass this way again.

This great and good man, our beloved Speaker McCORMACK, has done this great good as embodied in this famous poem. Mrs. Cunningham and I wish him and Mrs. McCormack many years of happiness and good health.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been said with much truth that the hours of a wise man are lengthened by his ideas. On this historic occasion, I am honored to join with our distinguished majority leader, Mr. CARL ALBERT, in paying tribute to such a wise man—a man whose hours have been lengthened by the force and strength of his ideas, our beloved Speaker, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK.

With the convening of this legislative day, Mr. McCORMACK has continuously served longer as Speaker than any of his respected predecessors. We, his colleagues in the House, and this entire Nation are the happy benefactors. Expressing what I know is the sentiment of the entire Fourth District of Wisconsin, I am honored to join in this resolution and thereby express congratulations to Speaker McCORMACK.

Only last Wednesday, on the occasion of his announcement not to seek reelection in deference to his beloved wife, Mr. McCORMACK perhaps most accurately expressed the basic outlook which has guided him during his 42 years as a Member of the House and the last 8 as Speaker:

I have tried to be kind and I have tried to be decent to people.

Certainly during the 22 years which it has been my privilege to work with Mr. McCORMACK, he has in all ways and at all times lived up to that self-imposed principle of life. The wisdom and ability which he has shared with us daily these many years will be sorely missed. Our sense of loss can be mellowed only by the hope that even in retirement he will periodically come back among those who love and respect him.

The record he sets today of serving as Speaker of the House for the longest continuous period of time in the history of the United States may some day be exceeded. Never to be excelled, however, is the love which he holds for this country and this House—both of whom he has served with selfless dedication.

The office Speaker McCORMACK holds is one of honor and its title has and always will be respected. However, titles of honor have not as such added to his worth since he is himself an honor to his title.

I join with all his colleagues and his many friends and admirers in wishing him and Mrs. McCormack continued happiness and good health for many years to come.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a high privilege to be able to join in this salute to you today. As president of the Republican 90th Club, I speak for some 45 Members of the House who deeply ap-

preciate your great fairness as presiding officer of this august body since our arrival here in January of 1967. There has been no occasion when any of us sought recognition from the Chair that you have not granted it with courtesy and respect.

Complete fairness and determination to protect the rights of the individual Member are the hallmarks by which you are known, and no matter how embroiled in debate the House might find itself, your unfailing capacity to maintain dignity and decorum through courteous and correct example has brought distinction to this body.

A mere handful of legislators have ever served in this Chamber as long as you have, and no American has served here with greater dedication or distinction.

These final two terms which the 90th Club has shared with you are not a very substantial part of your long tenure of more than 42 years. But we are all very fortunate to have arrived upon the legislative scene in time to be able to say proudly that we were among those who served under one of the greatest of Speakers, JOHN W. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we wish you and Mrs. McCormack the best of everything as you approach the end of your distinguished legislative career.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues in the worthy tribute being paid this afternoon to our beloved and respected Speaker and colleague, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK.

For almost 28 years it has been my pleasure to serve here with Speaker McCORMACK during which time he has been my floor leader, my whip and my Speaker. In each capacity he has served energetically, with earnestness, distinction and fairness.

He has been the spearhead to passage of scores of pieces of lasting legislation benefiting peoples of all segments of this Nation. As Members sometimes find themselves, the gentleman from Massachusetts and I have not always been in full agreement; but when we were not in agreement, nothing personal came between us. It is this spirit in which he has worked with all of his colleagues in this great legislative body. I have always appreciated the privilege he accorded me of counseling with him regarding numerous matters of interest to my people, to my State and to me personally.

Speaker McCORMACK has not only been a powerful force in the activities of the House of Representatives, but he has been just as forceful in the activities of his political party. Throughout the years he has strongly supported and led the nominees of his party to the heights of political success.

As one possessed of a keen mind, a strong body, a powerful debater and a winning personality, historians will record the career of JOHN McCORMACK in this body as that of a truly great leader of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to serve here with you. I have greatly appreciated your friendship, your courtesies, and your counsel. I look forward to serving out the remainder of this, your final, term in the House of Repre-

sentatives. And when you and your beloved wife retire to your home in your great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I trust that each of you will enjoy good health and the most comfortable and pleasant retirement possible.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today in paying tribute to our beloved Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, who has announced that he will retire from Congress at the close of the present session.

My relationship with Speaker McCORMACK dates back to my earliest days as a Member of Congress, in January 1965. From the very beginning, I found him to be a warm and wonderful human being, always willing to take time out to counsel and advise me as a newcomer to Congress. During the years, I never found him wanting.

On several occasions, during my annual local officials conferences here in Washington, he has taken the time to come and speak to my officials, when others were too busy. At other times, when friends and supporters have honored me at various functions, he has come forward and lent prestige through his attendance, and through his praise of my efforts in Congress.

During his third of a century in Congress, and during his 8 years as Speaker of the House, Mr. McCORMACK has been in the forefront of every major battle for progressive legislation. He has held one of the most powerful offices in our Government, but he has remained a humble man, never too busy or too important to lend a helping hand.

I am proud to have served in the 89th, 90th, and 91st Congresses under his leadership, and I am grateful to him for his advice, his counsel and his friendship.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, your announcement that you would not seek reelection to the House of Representatives represents a personal loss to each of the Members of this great body.

Since you came here to complete an unexpired term in the 70th Congress you have observed history in the making, and you have made history. The service which you have rendered to our Nation in this body has made you a living legend in your own time.

On a more personal note, I remember when I first came to the Congress nearly 8 years ago and met with you in your office. No one could have been kinder nor more helpful than you were to me at that time.

In talking with my colleagues since that time, so many of them have made the same statement. You have presided firmly and fairly in all of our deliberations and every Member of the House, no matter what his philosophy or party, knew that JOHN W. McCORMACK would attempt to be fair and would protect the basic rights of every Member of this great institution.

There have been so many measures passed over the 22 terms in which you have served that it would take a book to list all of them. You have made a lasting imprint on this Nation and for all time to come the people of this great Nation will benefit from what you have accomplished.

Might I add another personal note and

tribute to Mrs. McCormack. Her health is of concern to all of us who admire and respect the two of you so much. I know full well that all you have accomplished has been made worthwhile because of the lovely lady who has shared this productive life with you.

The House of Representatives will never be the same to me without JOHN W. McCORMACK as a Member. But, I know full well that your inspiration and guidance will stimulate me as long as I am permitted to serve our Nation as a Member of the Congress.

You are one of the giants of our period of history and I will always proudly proclaim that I had the privilege of serving with one of the truly great leaders in our Nation's history.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that we of the House of Representatives bid adieu to one of America's great, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK.

JOHN McCORMACK has given longer continuous service than any other Speaker, and, I might add, probably fairer continuous service. Although we differed widely in our political philosophy, there has never been a time in his years of service that I might even feel that he did not treat me with the same respect and the same consideration that he treated any of those of his own party.

JOHN McCORMACK will be listed among America's great.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, how can a man summon the appropriate words to say what is in his heart when he thinks of a great man of whom he can say "he is my friend"? For 26 years JOHN McCORMACK has been my friend. It is evident from what so many Members have said here this afternoon that the warmth of the Speaker's character leaves us all with this feeling of closeness to him.

I came to the Congress in January of 1945. JOHN McCORMACK was already majority leader. Yet he was as approachable to me, a new Member, as though I had been a veteran Member with long association with him. Quick to lend a helping hand and give guidance to younger Members, he was always to retain his policy of making himself available when his advice and counsel were sought. Under JOHN McCORMACK the door of the Speaker's office was always open.

Others have already reviewed the vigor of JOHN McCORMACK's support of the legislative programs of the several administrations that came and went during his 42 years of service in the House of Representatives. During his tenure as majority leader and as Speaker more far-reaching and important legislation was enacted into law than during any other periods of our Nation's history. He was always to be found on the side of the people, because early in life he identified himself with causes he believed necessary to preserve his country's strength by guaranteeing the welfare of the people of the country.

The resolution before us is to give official recognition to Speaker McCORMACK's long tenure as presiding officer of this body—a record for continuous service in the Speaker's chair outdistancing Henry Clay and Sam Rayburn.

JOHN McCORMACK's great strength lies

in his personal life. His dedication to his country and to his religious beliefs. Every Member of this House knows of his great devotion and love for his wife, Harriet.

My wife, Garry, and I join in expressing congratulations to the Speaker and we join in offering our prayers for Mrs. McCormack's recovery.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join in the many tributes being offered today to a noble American, Speaker JOHN McCORMACK.

When I first came to Congress in January 1955, it was Majority Leader JOHN McCORMACK who helped me in my orientation and preparation for the legislative tasks ahead. With great patience and understanding he provided candid counsel and advice.

Fairness is the hallmark of Speaker JOHN McCORMACK's leadership. Whether he agrees with an action or whether he opposes it, he always protects the right of a Member. His loyalty to the House of Representatives is second only to his loyalty to America. No other American outranks him in this dedication.

My earnest hope is that Speaker and Mrs. McCormack may share many happy years in the knowledge that their constructive contribution to America have earned them the loyalty, gratitude, and affection of millions of their fellow Americans. There is no greater honor that can be paid to a citizen of our great country.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of pride that I rise to give my enthusiastic support to the resolution commending one of the most conscientious and dedicated public servants with whom I have served during my more than 30 years in public office.

During his long tenure in the House of Representatives, Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK has provided us with a shining example of fine representation not only to the people of the Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts, but more important, to all the people of this great Nation of ours.

No one has been more faithful, more dedicated to his responsibilities in the House of Representatives than Speaker McCORMACK. His vision, his leadership, and his willingness to battle for that which he believed is responsible for some of the most progressive, humanitarian legislation this Nation has known.

Speaker McCORMACK's aggressive leadership during the long years he served as majority leader caused some to wonder when he became Speaker if he could shed his partisanship and be fair. Certainly no one could have been more fair, more just to all Members of the House of Representatives than the Speaker has been during the record period he has served us in that capacity.

This is a sign of his greatness.

Speaker McCORMACK is a man of the people, a man devoted to seeing that this world is a better place for his fellow man to live.

I am proud to have been able to share, as a Member of the Congress, in his efforts to achieve this goal.

I am proud to have served with Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK and I want to express my deep appreciation and the

appreciation of the people of the Second Congressional District of California for the assistance, counsel and guidance which he has given me during eleven and a half years I have been privileged to serve in the same legislative halls as he.

Congratulations, Mr. Speaker, upon achieving a fine record of achievement as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to join with my colleagues who have spoken today about the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK. Previous Speakers have spoken about the length of service, the dedication to this country and her institutions, and the love and esteem which he has shown, especially for the House of Representatives.

While mindful of his responsibilities to his own party as one of the great leaders of it, he has never failed to put first the welfare of our country. All of these attributes, coupled always with a deep religious motivation, made him indeed one of the great leaders of our times.

I wish Mrs. McCormack and him many happy retirement years.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, since it was my honor and privilege to become a Member of Congress in 1947, I have known many great Americans and many world statesmen, but I have never known one more dedicated and devoted to our country than Speaker JOHN W. McCORMACK. Mr. McCORMACK is a great Democrat for which I respect and admire him, but above all, he is a great American.

I first remember Mr. McCORMACK as a boy and as a young man from the news media, one who stood stanchly by the program of Franklin D. Roosevelt which brought the United States out of the depression and into a new era. Then I remember Speaker McCORMACK as a prophet crying in the wilderness of propaganda and confusion against the raving Hitler, Mussolini, and the war lords of Japan. If we had listened to JOHN McCORMACK in the late 1930's, I believe through strength we might have avoided the carnage, the destruction, and disaster of World War II.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress in January 1947, it was my great privilege to meet Mr. McCORMACK as one of the minority leaders, along with Sam Rayburn, of that Congress. Immediately I admired, loved and respected Mr. McCORMACK as a partisan leader, yes, but more than that, as a statesman who loved our Nation and who was dedicated to the preservation of those principles and ideals which made America great.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to know many leaders of this era of world history including Winston Churchill, Douglas MacArthur, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Sam Rayburn, Jimmy Byrnes, and many others, but I believe when the final chapter of this era of world history is written, JOHN W. McCORMACK's name will be enshrined not only in the pages of history, but in the hearts, affection, and love of the American people. He will be exalted and revered along with these other leaders of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, I will remember appearing before the National Democratic Plat-

form Committee and being warned that we might not be heard with respect and decorum, but that I was confident and optimistic because I knew that JOHN McCORMACK was chairman of the platform committee. I well remember those whom I introduced being received with the utmost courtesy and respect as long as JOHN McCORMACK was its chairman.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said of Mr. McCORMACK's fidelity and love for Mrs. McCormack, for their family and friends. Much has been said of the Speaker's love for the House of Representatives as a great institution, but JOHN McCORMACK has also loved the American people—north, east, south, and west. Many have spoken of Andrew Jackson as the typical American, or of Abraham Lincoln as the typical American, but Mr. Speaker, I believe more than any other, that JOHN McCORMACK, the Boston Irishman, best typifies the hopes and aspirations and true patriotism of the American people.

Mrs. Dorn, my family, and my constituents join me in wishing for Speaker McCORMACK and Mrs. McCormack much happiness and every success in the years ahead.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to you for the 42 years you have spent in service to the House of Representatives and to these United States.

Throughout those years, you have continuously worked for the betterment of this Nation which you so dearly love. You have not only been a representative of all the people but have been a leader in fostering the progressive legislation on which this Nation has thrived.

In the 9 years you have served as Speaker, Democratically controlled Congresses have enacted legislation and initiated social programs which will be remembered as some of the finest in our history. The outstanding achievements of the House in this past decade are a result of your leadership and ability to unite the varying viewpoints of its Members in working toward a common goal.

Mr. Speaker, to say that your leadership will be missed is far from being an adequate expression of the loss your retirement brings to Congress and to the Democratic Party. You have brought both pride and honor to your party and to your country. We shall always be grateful for the unselfish contribution you made in our behalf.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the many Members of this body who rise today to pay tribute to you, not only as a great Speaker of the House of Representatives, but as a dear friend and an outstanding and distinguished American.

As one who has served in this body for the last 6 years and as one who regards himself as a younger Member, I must in all candor say that your leadership and your wise counsel have inspired me to do the best possible job in representing the people of my Seventh Illinois Congressional District and the people of America.

I have found that being a younger Member did not affect my status either in

the House or in committee because I was willing to roll up my sleeves and to work hard. Mr. Speaker, your own example of hard work and dedication to your legislative responsibilities was the example that I followed.

I want to congratulate you on behalf of the thousands of people who reside in my district and to commend you for your selfless service to your country. You served our Nation at a time when we faced one of the greatest economic crises in our history. You served our Nation when we were challenged by totalitarian forces throughout the entire world. You were the leader of your party. You served your President and you served America, and because of your untiring efforts and devotion to duty, America today is the strongest, most powerful Nation in the world. We are strong economically and militarily. Our people are better fed, better housed, better educated—all because of the efforts of the leadership in the House of Representatives working in conjunction with the President to bring about the greatest social revolution that any country has ever experienced. Today, our people enjoy unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation, social security benefits, veterans benefits, and many, many other benefits brought about because of the legislative process.

So many people today are attacking our democratic form of government. I want to recall to these people Winston Churchill's words in support of democracy:

Many forms of government have been tried, and will be tried in this world of sin and woe. No one pretends that democracy is perfect or all-wise. Indeed, it has been said that democracy is the worst form of government except all those other forms that have been tried from time to time.

The Speaker has presided over the House during an extraordinary period when Congress has enacted landmark legislation in so many fields including civil rights, education, health care for the elderly, and welfare. His vision, energy, and courage have been basically responsible for the enactment of this progressive legislation during the span of 42 years that the Speaker has served in the House of Representatives.

When Sam Rayburn became Speaker 30 years ago, Mr. McCORMACK was elected majority leader and has held a top leadership post ever since. After Mr. Rayburn's death, Mr. McCORMACK was elected Speaker in January 1962. On May 29 of this week he will have served longer as Speaker than any man except the late Sam Rayburn. He has been an unwavering supporter of New Deal legislation, and as Speaker, he has always been fair, just, and impartial. His personal consideration for the Members of this body has earned the gratitude of all of us and has inspired our wholehearted affection and support. His ability, his integrity, his courage, his compassion for the little people, and his outstanding leadership will be sorely missed when he lays down the gavel at the end of the 91st Congress.

As long as I live, I shall always be grateful to the Speaker for his profound understanding of the needs and wants of the American people. I know

that the Members of this body shall continue to rely on his democratic philosophy of government and his lofty ideals to guide us in the turbulent years ahead.

On the eve of the Speaker's retirement, Mrs. Annunzio joins me in extending to him and to Mrs. McCormack our sincerest best wishes for their good health, good fortune, and great happiness in the ensuing years.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the accolades that are being showered upon the distinguished Speaker of the House in recognition of his exceptional record of service to the Congress, to the State of Massachusetts, and to the country.

Of all the great and good men it has been my privilege to know during my time in this body, no one has made a greater impression upon me than has the distinguished presiding Speaker of the House, whose record of tenure in the chair is exceeded by only one previous Speaker of the House.

Coming from humble beginnings and largely self-taught, the Speaker's life story is a remarkable tale of success that could happen only in this land of individual opportunity and freedom.

The distinguished Speaker is respected and revered as a good man, an honest man, and a fair man. My best wishes go with him as he prepares for what I am sure will be a satisfying and rewarding retirement. I know that the immense knowledge and wisdom he has gained during his one-half century of service to this country will still be available whenever it is requested by our Nation's leaders.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, for 42 years the U.S. House of Representatives has known the dedicated service of a man—a man to whom we now offer tribute. In those 42 years—almost half a century—his colleagues, his State, and the Nation have benefited from his wisdom, his experience, and his counsel. For 8 years, this body has looked to his leadership as Speaker of the House, and we are indebted to him for it.

We honor JOHN McCORMACK not only as Speaker, but also as a just and fair man. I recall with warmth and with gratitude his kindness to me as a freshman Member of this august Chamber. And it has been a special source of pride that I have been able to serve with him as a member of the Massachusetts delegation.

Although he is retiring from the House, he will never really leave it, for his name and the devotion and loyalty with which he has served these many years will continue to be an inspiration.

There are few men who have served so ably and so long; there are few men who enjoy the sincere friendship and the deep respect that his colleagues have accorded JOHN McCORMACK.

JOHN McCORMACK is a friend, a devoted public servant, a true patriot. JOHN McCORMACK is a great man, but more than that he is a good man.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my own personal remarks to those of my colleagues today who are paying tribute to a great legislator and an outstanding American who has served his country so well, so long, and so faithfully.

JOHN W. McCORMACK personifies the title of "gentleman." In my judgment, he will be recorded in history as one of the kindest, most compassionate, and most considerate men to ever occupy the chair of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Throughout his long and distinguished service in the Congress, Mr. McCORMACK has consistently demonstrated a firmness in his resolve to preserve, defend, and protect democratic institutions on a par unparalleled in modern government. He has given unwavering loyalty to a host of Presidents of both political parties and his deep devotion to his country and to the people of the Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts is unique in the annals of public service.

In remembering Speaker McCORMACK, I shall never forget when I came to the Congress in 1963 following a special election in California. As I stood there in the well and faced JOHN W. McCORMACK to singularly receive the oath of office, I knew well that this was the proudest day of my life. Following the swearing-in ceremony, the gentleman from Massachusetts invited me to visit with him privately in his office and, as we chatted, I soon realized that, as a freshman Congressman, I had just met a great man and one of the outstanding legislators of our time.

Throughout the years, I became better acquainted with the distinguished Speaker. He has always found and taken the time to meet with us, our friends, and our constituents either in the Speaker's lobby or in the corridors of the Capitol. Certainly, he has extended himself and gone out of his way to accommodate Members of Congress and to share with us the many benefits of his experience, advice, and counsel, as well as his personal philosophy of life.

Speaker McCORMACK is a man of high principle and deep convictions. Many of us will remember him best for his kindness, compassion, and consideration to each of us and to all those who came in contact with him. He is truly a gentle man.

If I may add one personal note—when the House considered the Redwood National Park bill in 1968, it was my profound pleasure, on behalf of the people of my congressional district, to present the Speaker with a "redwood burl gavel". On the day this landmark legislation passed, Mr. McCORMACK once again demonstrated his consideration and thoughtfulness by presiding over the House of Representatives with the gavel we had presented him as a gift.

It is my hope that this memento from the people of the redwood empire district of California, will occupy a prominent place in the John W. McCormack Library, along with the great works, documents, and historical remembrances of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

JOHN W. McCORMACK is a tall man in many ways, and he stands tallest with those of us in the Congress who have known him over the years and to his constituents whom he served so faithfully. A very appreciative Nation will remain eternally grateful for the outstanding manner in which this great American has served his country and its people.

Of the many friends we make throughout our lifetime, I am proud, indeed, to list among them—JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERALD R. FORD). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(The SPEAKER resumed the chair.)

The SPEAKER. With the permission of the House, I would like to speak from the Chair and express my deep appreciation for the very kind remarks made about me, particularly the references to Mrs. McCormack, which touch me very deeply.

I am very much moved by the remarks made by my colleagues and it is difficult for me to find words to express adequately my feeling of deep appreciation.

But my heart has always been in the House of Representatives. Without boasting, I think I could have gone to the other body as far back as 1932. But my heart was in this body and it has been here throughout the years. I have an intense love for the House of Representatives and I have a proud feeling of respect and friendship for all Members present and past with whom I have served.

Since these proceedings have had to do with a resolution relative to the performance of my duties as Speaker, in which position I have the longest continuous service in the history of our country, I want to keep it on that level. I am going to be a working Speaker for the remainder of this session.

There is one thing that I would like to be remembered for by my colleagues and that is that JOHN McCORMACK was always the Members' Speaker. I would rather be remembered by that characterization than by almost any other. It is because of the intense love I have in my heart for the House of Representatives and the deep respect I have for all Members. And also for the fact that whenever a Member takes the chair as Speaker he represents all of the Members without regard to political party; to protect their rights under the Rules of the House of Representatives; and, even more, protecting their rights on a broader scale where that is necessary. I have always tried to impartially carry out the Rules of the House of Representatives.

So for myself and Mrs. McCormack on this day of jubilation, when I have served continuously as Speaker for the longest time in the history of our country, I want to extend to all of you, my dear friends and colleagues, our deep and profound thanks.

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 17802, INCREASING PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT, UNTIL MIDNIGHT THURSDAY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent that the com-

mittee may have until midnight Thursday next to file a report to accompany the bill (H.R. 17802) to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### PROTESTERS COULD HELP WAR PRISONERS

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. John Dortch Lewis, who served with the RAF during World War II, was shot down twice and was confined for many months as a prisoner of war.

Recently he wrote a letter to the editor of his local newspaper and it prompted an editorial entitled "Protesters Could Help War Prisoners." I am inserting this editorial in full at the end of my remarks.

Mr. Lewis is absolutely right in his suggestion that the American antiwar protesters obviously could be a significant influence on Hanoi if they pushed for more humane treatment of our prisoners there.

It is obvious that Hanoi has paid great attention to the antiwar demonstrations and is cognizant of the efforts now being made by our young people. For this reason, this group, perhaps more than any other in the Nation, could have a significant effect in inducing the Hanoi government to release our prisoners, arrange for a mutual exchange of prisoners such as we had during the Korean truce; or, at the very least, treat the American prisoners in accordance with the international standards established by the Geneva Convention.

Hanoi has never released a list of prisoners—many families do not even know whether their husbands and fathers are living or dead. From information we have obtained from prisoners who have been released, we know that our prisoners are being confined in solitary, tortured, improperly fed, given inadequate medical treatment, and not permitted to send or receive mail on any regular basis. Hanoi has not opened its prisoner-of-war camps to inspection by the International Red Cross.

It would seem to me that a group as concerned with humanity and the sacredness of human life and dignity as the antiwar protesters are would champion this cause and if they would do so, I am certain their voices would be heard.

The editorial from the Goldsboro (N.C.) News-Argus follows:

#### PROTESTERS COULD HELP WAR PRISONERS

In a letter to the editor appearing in yesterday's News-Argus, John Dortch Lewis noted: "The war protesters have made their point. If they will now direct their protest against the inhumane treatment of prisoners of war held by the North Vietnamese they will better identify as concerned Americans."

Mr. Lewis was not being flip. He was sincere. He recognizes that many of the stu-

dents demonstrating against the war are sincere.

He also feels that this group could have more influence than any other on pressuring North Vietnam to either treat the prisoners humanely or, preferably, to release them.

The North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong have a strong affinity for the anti war demonstrators in this country.

They regard them as a significant and possibly decisive second front against the United States effort in Southeast Asia.

Unfortunately, while the sincere doves, the radicals, the blatant communists, the professors and all the other protesters have decried every U.S. action, not a word has been raised by them in behalf of the prisoners held by the communists.

From the few who have been released—always for propaganda purposes—we know that the prisoners are being tortured and poorly fed. They are kept in solitary confinement. The vast majority have not been permitted to communicate with the families. Some of the men have been held this way for six years.

Mr. Lewis knows first hand of life in a prisoner of war camp. He was in infamous Stalag III, scene of "The Great Escape". Mr. Lewis, who twice was shot down while flying with the Royal Air Force, three times escaped only to be recaptured. On his fourth attempt, he made it to allied lines.

He is a member of a group of survivors or Stalag III who have concerned themselves with securing humane treatment or release of the downed airmen and other prisoners.

The question whether enough effort has been exerted and whether, indeed, if the effort that has been made has not been misdirected.

Mr. Lewis sees in the organization and the energy and enthusiasm of the students and other protesters the possibility of the first significant step toward decent treatment and possible release of the prisoners.

Surely if their cause is sincerely one of humanity, they cannot divorce themselves from this important aspect of it.

#### THE TRANSITION FROM WAR TO PEACE

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I note that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are holding press conferences to cry doom and gloom about our economy. I am as concerned as they are about maintaining a strong level of economic progress in our Nation. However, I must point out that they are engaged in a clumsy bit of political prestidigitation, hoping their imagination about today's 4.8 percent unemployment will erase the public's memory.

Let us look at the record. Under J.F.K. in 1961 there was 6.7 percent unemployment, but I did not see my colleagues across the aisle holding press conferences then. Then in 1962 it was 5.5 percent; in 1963, 5.7 percent and in 1964 under L.B.J. it was 5.2 percent. The difference between then and now is that during their administrations, the Vietnam war was revving up. President Nixon is winding down the war, which is bound to cause economic adjustments.

The Nixon administration has no intention of solving the unemployment problem by sending a half-million men

off to war and turning the Nation's productive facilities to making bombs and bullets.

In order to meet the budget requirements for fiscal year 1971 the Defense Department must cut back a total of 682,000 military and civilian positions, and in addition the reductions in military procurement will result in 600,000 less jobs in industry. Of that total 1,282,000, one-third or approximately 400,000 must be accomplished by June 30.

It is ironic that many of those across the aisle who have been howling for the dismantling of our military-industrial establishment now are the first in line to yelp about unemployment. The transition from war to peace will require sacrifices on the part of all of us. We have long-neglected domestic problems that received scant attention in the past. Our job here in Congress is to help gear up our country's government and economy to move forward toward solving these problems. Our job is to help, not hinder this adjustment. We have a strong and adaptable economy that I am certain will take in its stride the change from war to peace.

#### ON THE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have heard some very peculiar statements in defense of the policy, but I did not know you were winding down a war by expanding it. I thought when you wound it down you contracted it. Apparently I am either reading the wrong papers or hearing the wrong messages, but it seems to me that the war lines have been extended further than they have been at any time since this sad situation took place over in Indochina.

Also, I am not quite sure that the gentleman is reading the same statistics that I have been reading on unemployment. What is not understood is that many hundreds and even thousands of persons who were counted as unemployed in the period mentioned by the previous speaker are now on what is known as trade adjustment relief. Last Friday, the Tariff Commission and the Secretary of Labor approved my displaced glass workers for so-called adjustment relief for a year. During this time they will not be considered unemployed. But if they were considered unemployed, the unemployment in that particular community would be 17 percent of the work force. However, since we have found a new gimmick by keeping them paid out of the public Treasury, they do not appear on the so-called unemployment rate.

Let me tell you all, if you have not had an opportunity to go into your districts and measure the unemployment, then you should not come up with figures that are handed to you by just anybody. I can assure all of you that the unemployment rate in my district is as great as it has been in the last 15 or 20 years counting persons who are no longer employed in the jobs that they had in the particular industries.

#### OUR WAR POLICY

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to my good friend from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) that somebody had better advise the Republican publicity arranger who is putting out these releases that if they keep on calling the expansion of the war into Cambodia the Democrats' war, that some of the Democrats who are trying to support the President may well walk out on him and let it become his war and see how well he gets along without the majority of the Congress.

I have tried to be responsible as one person in this, but I am getting a little tired of the propaganda being cranked out in the Congressional Hotel. I can just pretty quickly decide that I might be a little bit more quick on the trigger than some of them are, and I would advise them to be a little careful about that, or the President may find himself holding the sack up here on the Hill and wondering how he got into that position.

#### LEHIGH UNIVERSITY STUDENTS PROVE DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES DO WORK

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in all the campus turmoil, we should pay attention to what has been happening at Lehigh University in my district. Campus unrest has many causes. But I am convinced the chief concern of students, even at the great universities like Lehigh, is that the system does not respond to their legitimate needs, particularly in the areas of the quality and relevance of their own education.

At Lehigh, the faculty and administration responded by giving students their proper role in the system. To my knowledge, what Lehigh did is unprecedented. Lehigh students now have a significant part in the governance of that fine institution.

Most important, however, is that change at Lehigh came through the democratic process, through debate, discussion, and negotiation. Not a rule was violated. Not a stick of property damaged. All this is a credit to the intelligence of Lehigh's students, to the guidance of its distinguished faculty, to the leadership of its president, W. Deming Lewis, and to the responsiveness of its board of trustees.

Their new constitution should serve as a model for the Nation, and I am inserting that document in the RECORD at this point for that purpose:

#### CONSTITUTION OF THE LEHIGH UNIVERSITY FORUM

Article I. Name: This organization shall be named the Lehigh University Forum.

Article II. Purpose: The purpose of the Lehigh University Forum is to promote the welfare of Lehigh University and the attainment of a true sense of community by bringing into direct discourse students, faculty

and administration to set policy, to review, and to review with policy recommendations in areas specified below.

#### Article III. Function:

A. The University Forum shall have legislative authority; that is:

1. To set policy with respect to the following matters:

a. Extracurricular activities, such as social life and regulations, and athletics.

b. Academic environment, such as admissions, registration, calendar, residence and dining, bookstore, buildings and grounds, library, and computer.

c. Academic program and planning involving special educational opportunities, such as HIR courses, Freshman Seminars, Creative Concepts courses, and pass-fail grading.

2. To review the following and where the position of the Forum differs from that of the President, both such positions shall be presented to the Board of Trustees:

a. Long-range planning, such as academic development, staff requirements, and facilities.

b. The overall budget.

c. Community relations.

d. All administrative appointments at the rank of Dean and above.

3. To review with policy recommendations to the appropriate body:

a. Curriculum.

b. Research policy.

c. Academic discipline.

B. All actions of the Lehigh University Forum shall be consistent with the principles of academic freedom which Lehigh University endorses as a member of the American Council on Education. The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his subject, and is entitled to freedom in research and in the publication of the results. The student is entitled to freedom of speech and of the press, and to protection under the same principles of academic freedom applied to the faculty.

#### Article IV. Organization:

A. Two students and two members of the faculty shall be chosen by the Lehigh University Forum from its membership to serve as non-voting participants at all meetings of the Board of Trustees.

B. The faculty shall have the primary responsibility in the areas of: curriculum; course content; methods of instruction; conduct and method of research; faculty hiring, status, and tenure; and academic discipline. The faculty shall have the authority to recommend the awarding of degrees.

C. Wherever possible, decisions shall be made at the departmental or college levels. At each level, there shall be created joint committees and common councils which reflect the purpose and principles which guide the Lehigh University Forum. This system shall converge at the top in the Forum.

The Lehigh University community served by the Forum consists of: (a) all graduate and undergraduate students; (b) academic faculty-tenured and non-tenured; (c) administrative personnel; (d) non-academic employees; (e) trustees; (f) alumni. Although not formally part of this community, the public, in particular the residents of Bethlehem and other neighboring communities, shall be respected as having a direct interest in and a mutual concern for the University and, therefore, the actions of the Forum.

#### D. Membership:

1. The University Forum shall consist of 125 voting members, 60 of whom shall be elected academic faculty, and 60 of whom shall be elected students, plus the President, Provost, Vice-President for Student Affairs, and two members of the administration to be appointed by the President. At least one Trustee and one alumnus shall be invited to attend as non-voting participants.

2. The 60 elected faculty members shall be apportioned in accordance with the prin-

principle of one man, one vote in a manner to be determined by the Faculty at a meeting of the University Faculty.

There shall be reapportionment at the end of the first year and thereafter every three years in a manner to be determined by the University Faculty.

3. The 60 elected students shall be apportioned in accordance with the principle one man, one vote in a formal referendum in a manner to be determined at a meeting of the University student body, both undergraduate and graduate. Length of term, and nomination procedures shall be determined by the student body at this meeting.

There shall be reapportionment at the end of the first year and thereafter every three years in a manner to be determined by the University student body.

4. Elections shall be held each year during the two-week period prior to Spring Vacation. Vacancies in any position shall be filled for the unexpired term in a manner to be decided by the Forum.

E. Officers: The Chairman of the Forum shall be a member of the Forum elected by the members of the Forum to a one-year term to which he cannot succeed himself. The Forum shall select other officers as it deems necessary. The Forum shall provide for a Recorder who shall not be a member of the Forum. The Recorder shall record the minutes of all meetings, disseminate them to Forum members, and make them available to the University Community.

#### F. Meetings:

1. All meeting of the Forum shall be held on the Lehigh University campus at a time and place to be decided by the Forum.

2. The Forum shall determine the frequency of its regular meetings, which shall occur no less frequently than three times per semester. Notice of the time, date and place of regular meetings shall be announced publicly at least one week before the designated time.

3. Special meetings may be called by the chairman on his initiative or upon presentation of a petition to the chairman signed by ten members of the Forum requesting a special meeting and stating its purpose. Notice of the time, date and place of special meetings and the purpose for which the meeting is called shall immediately be sent to all members of the Forum and announced publicly.

4. All meetings of the University Forum shall be open unless closed by a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote of the Forum. The privilege of the floor shall be afforded to all members of the Lehigh University community upon recognition by the Chairman of the Forum.

5. A quorum of the Forum shall be a majority of the Forum comprised of at least 30% of the student representatives, 30% of the academic faculty representatives, and two administration representatives.

#### Article V. Procedure:

A. The Forum shall determine its rules of procedure.

B. The Forum may delegate any of its responsibilities to an officer of the University to a committee, or to any other group in the Lehigh University community.

C. All actions of the Forum shall be subject to approval by the Board of Trustees. Actions of the Forum shall be sent to the Board of Trustees by the President of Lehigh University.

D. There shall be convened a meeting of the entire university community at least once a semester, the purpose of which shall be to receive from the University Forum a report on and evaluation of the operation, structure and actions of the Forum. The Spring Convocation shall be held within two weeks after Spring Vacation at which time newly elected representatives shall take office.

The Forum shall devise a method for evaluating and reporting on its operations and structure by May, 1972.

Article VI. Parliamentary Procedure: The rules contained in Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the Forum in all cases to which they are applicable, and in which they are not inconsistent with the by-laws or the special rules of order of the Forum.

Article VII. Amendment of the Constitution:

The Constitution of the Forum may be amended provided the members of the Forum are given written notice of the proposed amendment at least ten days prior to the meeting at which the amendment is to be considered. A vote of three-quarters of the members present is necessary to amend the Constitution.

Amendments of the Constitution must be ratified at an all-University Convocation. Ten days notice of time, date and place of the meeting and the amendment adopted by the Forum shall be made public. A simple majority of the faculty votes cast and a simple majority of the student votes cast are required to ratify the amendment.

Article VIII. Authority of Board of Trustees: The Board of Trustees is the ultimate legal authority of the University. This constitution and any amendments hereto shall be subject to approval by the Board of Trustees and shall become effective upon their approval.

(Adopted by the Faculty April 27, 1970. Approved by the Board of Trustees May 2, 1970, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015.)

### STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE W. BALL BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs has just heard a statement from the Honorable George W. Ball, who was Undersecretary of State in the last administration. The statement which he presented to the committee was filled with common sense. It was one of the most articulate and carefully stated positions with respect to American interests in the Middle East and southeastern Asia that I have heard for a long time.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE W. BALL BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 26, 1970

#### I

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Committee for inviting me here this morning to express a few purely personal views with regard to the President's message entitled: "Foreign Policy for the 1970's."

Ever since the Second World War the foreign policy of the United States has been guided by the central objective of preserving the peace by maintaining a precarious balance of power with the Soviet Union and, more recently, also with mainland China. To achieve this, we have felt compelled, with the help of our allies, to resist the fracturing of those *de facto* lines established by the play of forces during the early postwar period.

That has been our purpose, but, unfortunately, we have not always expressed it in such a simple and straightforward manner. For, while practicing balance of power politics, we have felt compelled to disavow it.

Perhaps some of the fault should be placed on the founding fathers of the American Republic who implanted the original delusion. To them the balance of power, alliances, and spheres of influence or interest were all part of the cynical European baggage they had left behind. Then, much later, Woodrow Wilson expansively proclaimed that the world could rid itself of all such outmoded concepts if it would only embrace the new universalism of the League of Nations—and an eventful quarter of a century later Secretary of State James Byrnes said exactly the same thing about the United Nations.

We compounded these extravagances in the postwar period when we promulgated what has since become known as the Truman Doctrine. The United States, President Truman stated, would help any nation, anywhere, defend itself against aggression from whatever source, and this premise was expressed with even more rhetorical exuberance by later Presidents. Thus, we find President Kennedy in his memorable inaugural address promising that we Americans will "pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty." These were stirring words, as we all remember, but they gravely overstated what we could, or even intended, to do.

Thus, we have gone steadily forward, talking one game while playing another, until, in the end, it was almost inevitable that we should confuse ourselves by our own false formulation. This is the way we blundered, step by faltering step, into the dark morass of Vietnam.

We mistook Tonkinese aggression for Chinese imperialism and, falling to scrutinize the menace in terms of its marginal relevance to the power balance, we committed the power at our command to a terrain where, for both physical and political reasons, it was impossible to use it effectively.

It was this, presumably, that led President Nixon to announce in his message of February 18, what he refers to as the "Nixon Doctrine." Since the United States, the President asserts, cannot "conceive all the plans, design all the programs, execute all the decisions and undertake all the defense of the free nations of the world," it will hereafter help nations in distress only "when it makes a real difference and is considered in our interest." This is justified on the grounds that "others now have the ability and responsibility to deal with local disputes which once might have required our intervention." Thus, for the United States "to insist that other nations play a role is not a retreat from responsibility: it is a sharing of responsibility."

#### II

One can have only sympathy for the President's desire to limit the future engagement of American resources and responsibility; yet, the merit of doctrines, like New Year's resolutions, can be appraised only when tested by experience. Just as the abstractions of the American constitution gained substance through decades of interpretation, so the utility of the Nixon Doctrine will be measured by its application to the actions America takes in specific and practical situations.

The first test of the Doctrine has, of course, come with the decision to send our forces into Cambodia. The wisdom of that decision is now seriously at issue; yet, it is not a question to be approached in any partisan spirit—nor do I intend to approach it in that way. I had the experience for more than six years of watching, at first hand, while two administrations made what I regarded as serious errors in South Asia; and, if I regret the decisions that the Nixon Administration has so far taken with regard to Cambodia, it is because they repeat so faithfully earlier decisions taken by its predecessors.

Certainly, the problems posed by the overthrow of Prince Sihanouk were not easy for



any American Government to deal with, and I am fully conversant with the military arguments for American intervention. To disrupt troublesome sanctuaries is a sound military objective and, while it was always clear that we did not have the manpower to invest those sanctuaries permanently, a military case can certainly be made for exploiting the chance to seize caches of food and military supplies.

Yet my intensive past experience leads me to doubt how long such seizures are likely to deter effective North Vietnamese actions, no matter how much is claimed for them. Again and again, to my knowledge, we refused to take proper account of the exiguous logistic requirements of the other side, thus discovering that our sweeps and air strikes, our tactics of preemption and interdiction, proved less profitable than had been hoped. Again and again we also learned that in jungle warfare sweeping an area yields only a transient benefit, since the bulk of the enemy gets out of the way, only to return once the sweep has passed through.

Nevertheless, the contention that the passage of force through the edges of Cambodia should keep the enemy off balance for a limited period is not one to be disregarded, provided such result could be achieved without serious political costs. It is here, however, that I would most seriously question the Cambodian decision, since its political consequences have already been far-reaching and grave.

### III

I shall not speak this morning of the effect of that decision on the homefront, though I regard its contribution to the angry division of our country as a most lamentable development. What I do wish to underline is its probable impact on our plans for disengagement and on the future peace of South East Asia.

Whatever our official statements may say, the movement of American forces into Cambodia definitely extends the geographical area of our commitment, since it implies a pledge that the United States will defend the present Cambodian Government and people from North Vietnamese attack. Like South Vietnam, Cambodia is listed in the protocol to the South East Asian Treaty, and, to the extent that our SEATO obligations are cited to support our involvement in South Vietnam, that can be cited with equal force (or lack of it) to support our responsibility to defend Cambodia. But, regardless of legal niceties, acknowledgement of such a commitment was necessarily implicit in our decision to cross the border, for we can hardly be in the position of saying to the Government in Phnom Penh: "Thanks for letting us use your real estate without asking your permission, and for our own purposes, but understand that whatever happens to you from now on is your own problem."

Nor is it plausible to argue that the addition of Cambodia to the theatre of combat improves our military posture. Guerrilla warriors inevitably profit from the enlargement of space—the addition of a new vast area of jungle and paddy in which to hide and maneuver. What the Cambodia affair has contributed are six million more people to defend, with no real addition to fighting power, since the Cambodian Army is a pitiful military instrument that could scarcely be brought even to a minimal degree of fighting effectiveness only by months of intense training by American instructors.

Finally, I have the gravest misgivings about the announced intention of the South Vietnamese Government to keep its troops in Cambodia after our departure, and our failure to reject that announcement firmly and effectively.

I cannot make this last point too emphatically. Vice President Ky's rude dismissal of our own official statement that Vietnamese troops would be withdrawn from Cambodia along with American troops as "a silly argu-

ment of silly people" has ominous overtones. Today there are thousands of South Vietnamese combat troops in Cambodia. ARVN forces are already stretched thin at many vulnerable points in South Vietnam, and for those troops to remain after the American withdrawal would gravely weaken the South Vietnamese ability to take over the defense of their own country. Thus, it could hardly help but delay the withdrawal of American forces consistent with the commendable objectives President Nixon has announced.

More important even than that, however, are the implications of Ky's flamboyant statement in the light of the long history of suspicion and hostility between the Vietnamese and Cambodian peoples. How can one overlook the massacres of South Vietnamese at the hands of the Cambodians a few weeks ago, or the Saigon Government's feeling that it was necessary to send a marine rescue expedition to prevent the Vietnamese now in Phnom Penh from being killed, or at least mistreated.

For years South Vietnamese and Cambodians have been, for ethnic and nationalistic reasons, mortal enemies, and unquestionably, over the years, a succession of Vietnamese leaders have coveted Cambodian territory. History, thus, raises a cautionary finger when the leaders of the Saigon Government announce their intention to maintain their military forces in Cambodia, against the expressed intention of the American authorities. Quite evidently, this is one more instance where the ambitions of General Ky and his friends are not fully congruent with the interests of the United States; and, unless we are prepared to insist on the ARVN troops getting out while we still have some measure of influence over their actions—an influence that will progressively diminish as we proceed with our withdrawal from South Vietnam—we may well find ourselves a complaisant accessory to changing the map of South East Asia by coercion, to the manifest disadvantage of those Cambodian people we are purporting to help.

This, in fact, seems to me one of the fallacies in—or at least exceptions to—the assumption of the Nixon Doctrine that the combined action of regional powers can supplant United States effort. Certainly the eleven-nation conference of Asian and Pacific Missions which met last week in Djakarta showed no interest whatever in coming to the defense of Cambodia, contenting itself with the pious demand that all foreign forces should be withdrawn from that beleaguered nation without discriminating between the attackers and defenders.

Thus, I see very little promise in the notion that Cambodian independence can be secured by a combined force of South Vietnamese and Thai troops. Thailand and Cambodia have been conducting an emotional border argument for years, and there is serious danger that any Thai force sent to Cambodia might be more interested in acquiring disputed territory than in driving out the North Vietnamese.

### IV

I would not feel so strongly about our Cambodian adventure if it involved only the future of South East Asia; but I think it quite clear that by broadening the theatre of combat, implicitly extending the geographical scope of our commitments, and gravely widening the fissures in our national life, we are encouraging the Soviet build-up of strength and influence in the Middle East. That is a development which poses far more danger for American interests and for the peace of the world than anything that could possibly occur five thousand miles away in Asian jungles.

How can anyone doubt that Soviet leadership is consciously factoring into its calculations about the Middle East our increasing entanglement in the gluepot of South East Asia and the rising violence of a divided and

angry America? Yet any objective look at the larger interests of the United States and the West must make emphatically clear the dangers piling up from Egypt to Lebanon.

For the first time since the Second World War, Soviet military personnel are flying military missions far from Soviet territory. NATO military circles report increasing concern that Soviet activities in Egypt have already so altered the military situation that Israel may not be able much longer to defend all of her frontiers, while certain of our own American military experts see the serious possibility that the Soviets may seek—and, indeed, be able—to neutralize the Israeli air force, which is the indispensable instrument by which two and a half million Israelis have so far defended themselves against ninety million Arabs.

For the United States, the implications of these possible developments are immensely serious; because, apart from the sentimental ties of the United States to Israel or the support and encouragement we have given the Israeli people—and these cannot be disregarded—the prospect of the possible destruction of Israel with Soviet assistance is not one that we could, in our national interest, accept. Such a disaster would turn the whole southern littoral of the Mediterranean into a Soviet sphere of influence; it would shift the balance of power catastrophically against the West.

Yet, I gravely fear that our continued obsessive concern with Indochina and particularly the recent enlargement of the war are rendering us indeed a "pitiful helpless giant," floundering in the mud of South East Asia, while our interests are being rapidly undermined in a far more strategically significant part of the world.

### V

Our most real and imminent danger, as I see it, is that in our deep absorption with Indochina we have tended to lose sight of the fundamental objective of our policy, which I stated earlier in this paper, and that this has resulted in a dangerous distortion of our interest and effort. In finding a way out of this predicament, the Nixon Doctrine, as it is now formulated, seems to me to be more an expression of mood than of substance. It is a mood with which I am basically sympathetic; indeed, I have for many years contended that we should systematically constrict our commitments. But, rather than trying to depend on anything so elaborate as a formal doctrine, I would hope that we could develop some practical guidelines that would reflect simple common sense. Thus, in approaching any conflict or threat of conflict that might call for deployment of our military forces, we should make sure that we can adequately answer a series of quite simple but relevant questions:

- (1) Is the geographical area at issue vital to the United States national interest?
- (2) Does the struggle threaten to result in the extension of the power of one of the great Communist powers beyond the post-war lines and in a manner that could seriously affect the power balance on which world peace still unhappily depends?
- (3) Is the physical terrain such that the military power of the United States could be effectively used?
- (4) Does the political regime governing the area under attack have a sufficiently solid base to support the introduction of United States military power?

The attempt to seek serious answers to these questions—and to others, for there are many—should force us, over the years ahead, to distinguish situations reflecting primarily the forces of indigenous revolt from instances of external aggression. That is important, since I think it altogether likely that we may see more and more ambiguous situations—local wars dominated by nationalism, where the insurgent side depends for help on one or both of the great Communist powers, but where the success of the

revolt would not result in a material extension of great Communist power domination.

Primarily, the discipline of such questions should enable us to distinguish the critical from the marginal, and thus avoid new chances of bogging down in endless local wars, which many of our citizens do not regard as vital to our interest. In this way, we might avoid a repetition of the critical danger we now face—that our preoccupation with the marginal may lead us to ignore the all-important, while, at the same time, encouraging our major antagonist, the Soviet Union, to undertake a brash extension of its military presence into a strategically critical area of the world, on the assumption that a distracted and internally divided United States will do nothing about it.

#### CATFISH FARMING

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, there was an article in the September 30, 1968, issue of the Wall Street Journal which began by saying, "Advice for Agriculturists: Plant Catfish."

I could not agree more with this admonition. In the last decade the catfish industry has made tremendous gains in production for such a young and loosely knit organization.

As evidence of this growth, I would cite a total of over 39,000 acres for catfish farming in 1970 as compared to a total of only a little more than 2,000 in 1963. The wholesale value of the 1969 crop was more than 33 million dollars, a figure which approximately corresponds to a \$75 million retail business.

Some may ask what relation this developing industry, sometimes called "aqua-agriculture," has to field crops. An answer may be found in the Lower Mississippi Valley, where fish farming is a basic part of the agricultural program of the area. In the past generation, fish is the only crop developed that will offer an opportunity for diversification of the basic agriculture of the area. The most rewarding factor, however, is that fish farming can be profitable, sometimes yielding gross income and net profits exceeding those of rice.

Catfish farming holds great potential in terms of the needs of a growing population. More than 70 percent of all fish products used in the United States are imported. Growing consumption of fish products and more consumers will increase the need for fish.

In terms of money, confidence in the fledgling industry by financial groups assures landowners that fish farming has considerable promise of success.

A most exciting aspect of growing fish is that it could prove beneficial in America's fight to save its environment. The water used by the industry would be in keeping with the philosophy of total conservation of natural resources, while at the same time allowing the harvest of a cash crop, producing large poundages per acre of needed animal protein, and beautifying the landscape.

Fish farming could increase recreational values of land for duck hunting, sport fishing, frog hunting, and trapping, and esthetic values for biologists, photographers, and nature lovers.

Another theory for environmental improvement involves taking the warm water effluents of nuclear reactor electrical generating plants and growing catfish in the warm water run-offs. It is thought that fish grown in these waters will grow six times as fast as normal fish and produce a rather remarkable return for the grower. This procedure cools the warm water and diminishes thermal pollution.

Growing fish in cages may allow this Nation to utilize better its flowing streams for additional production. Fish can be cultured in intensities as great as 250 pounds of fish per cubic yard when intensively cultured in cages, while at the same time increasing the fertility of lakes and streams.

Research is now being directed at solving the problems and limitations which the fish farmer is now facing and will face in the future.

Fields of research cover a wide variety of subjects, including nutrition, practical diets for fish, stocking and feeding rates, harvesting, spawning, behavior, cage culture, silo culture, hybridization, and disease.

There are also logistical problems in loading, handling, and transporting the fish to market before spoilage sets in. In the distant future there may be a lack of water. Abandoned lands now available may be impossible to convert to fish farms because of high accumulation of harmful pesticides.

The Catfish Farmers of America, composed of over 600 members in 30 States, was founded in July of 1968. Its purpose is to further the catfish industry and secure better working environments. The organization has made great progress in the processing of catfish, and has requested the Department of Interior to set standards and specifications and establish an inspection system for their products.

The future of fish farming will depend on the success and implementation of this research, as well as its acceptance by the industry. According to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, There is little doubt that fish farmers will accept the new research results, thereby bringing us better quality fish at a lower cost and in an improved environment.

Despite its reputation as a delicacy in the South, the catfish is not as well known or as widely enjoyed by people from the North and West. It was my pleasure a few weeks back to introduce some of my colleagues to the succulent taste of the catfish at our annual House gym dinner. I can assure you they went away singing the praises of the catfish.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would again like to point out the tremendous advances that have taken place in the catfish farming industry and the important role the catfish farmers of America have played in this progress.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in April, Capitol Hill's most propitious yearly event, the annual House gymnasium party, was held under the chairmanship of Congressman SONNY MONTGOMERY of Mississippi.

The gastronomical hit of the evening was the catfish, which our colleague from Mississippi provided. Those of us

not familiar with this taste feel fortunate to have discovered one of the great gourmet finds of the century. The fish was plump, tender, and tasty. Veteran catfish connoisseurs, such as our colleague JOE WAGGONNER, of Louisiana, not only came back for seconds, but thirds and fourths.

I wish to express my appreciation to SONNY MONTGOMERY for this superb introduction to the catfish, a savory experience I hope will be repeated often.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Mississippi for yielding. I want to add my comments concerning catfish. I had learned prior to our annual dinner that farm-bred catfish are a gourmet's delight. I was not disappointed. The fish was as light, tender, and tasteful as any I've ever eaten. My congratulations to the fish industry for developing this delicious catfish.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying in the South that if there is anything better than catfish, the Good Lord kept it for himself. Our colleague, SONNY MONTGOMERY, proved the point during our annual gym party recently when they were made the high point of the evening's menu.

SONNY was chairman of the party and I think the House owes him three cheers for a job well done. Since cheering here in the well of the House might be indecorous even in such a worthy instance, I suggest we settle for a handshake or a pat on the back for both SONNY and the catfish farmers of America who made the menu possible.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on Congressman MONTGOMERY'S Special Order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. EDMONDSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### FEDERAL INSURANCE GUARANTY CORPORATION

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a constructive, needed piece of legislation, which I have cosponsored with my colleague, Representative MOOREHEAD, creating a Federal Insurance Guaranty Corporation—FIGC—in an effort to protect consumers against insurance company insolvencies.

The FIGC would be modeled after the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—FDIC—which insures deposits in Federal banks up to \$15,000.

The need for the creation of the FIGC is readily apparent. In the past 10 years, the most affluent decade in our history, 125 property and casualty insurance companies have collapsed. The resulting loss to the consumer has been over \$200 million.

The Federal Government cannot literally guarantee that a firm will not go

bankrupt, but Federal backing reduces the risk while protecting the consumer.

Since the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was founded in 1934, only 475 banks out of some 15,000 insured by FDIC have gone under, costing the general public \$12 million. By contrast, in a similar period over 750 of 500 property and casualty insurance companies were declared insolvent with losses to policyholders of \$600 million.

Under the legislation I support every property and casualty company doing business in more than one state, and a few who operate in only one, would become members of the FIGC. Total membership in the beginning is estimated to be about 3,000 companies.

The FIGC would work in cooperation with the state insurance authorities in overseeing the operations of the insurance companies. In the event a company collapses, the FIGC would take over all the responsibilities of the company, including the adjustment or settlement of any claim pending against either the company or the policyholder. The FIGC also has the right to defend suits brought against the policyholder or insured party.

This corporation would create some security for the consumer who purchases insurance, and would cost him about 12½ cents for every \$100 he pays each year in premiums.

#### STATEMENT RELATING TO THE WAR

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I have received many communications both opposing and supporting recent U.S. military moves against the Cambodian sanctuaries. I much appreciate the large citizen interest in this issue and thank those who have contacted me. It is infeasible to write individual responses. Therefore, I am making this general statement of my views.

When President Nixon took office last year he inherited a full scale war in Southeast Asia in which approximately 542,000 U.S. military personnel were engaged. Whether this was a "moral" or a "legal" war was irrelevant. It existed and he had to deal with it intelligently.

Already he has brought one out of four Americans home, a total of 112,000. He said he would do it and he did. To date the President has done precisely what he said he would do and has done it within the time tables announced. To reasonable people this should be ample assurance that he will continue to do so.

President Nixon states that by next spring another 150,000 will be out, force levels will fall below 280,000, making almost a 50 percent cut from the high mark. He states that by that time we shall, for all practical purposes, have withdrawn our combat troops and that the forces remaining will be primarily supply and logistics units.

That means we shall have disengaged and turned the fighting over to a well-trained, million-man South Vietnamese Army. Our non-combatants also can come home as this Army develops its

capability to handle the supply and logistics tasks. There is no magic button here in Washington, unfortunately, which can be pushed and accomplish all these things instantly.

There is no question that all of us want out of this war as fast as possible, and surely, most of all, the President of the United States. If anyone thinks differently, he must be out of his mind. Whatever dispute there is, it is not about whether to get out of the war. It is about how to do so. And, it is about the minimum amount of time required to do it without inviting costly consequences disproportionate in value to any time saved.

Some people say "cut and run" this instant "to stop the killing." That is fine. But what about the 11 million South Vietnamese, at least half of whom the North Vietnamese regime would liquidate if they get their hands on them? To abandon them just a few months before the South's capability is developed to prevent it invites a bloodbath. It would not stop the killing. It would facilitate it. It would make the U.S. a passive accessory to an act of genocidal immorality.

Also, the fate to which it would relegate over 1,500 American POW's is a highly uncertain one. Moreover, the United States has maintained, ever since World War II, many mutual security treaties with countries in this area of the world. Running out on Vietnam could encourage the communists to move in on any and all of them. We could soon be forced to choose between a wholesale repudiation of solemn treaty obligations or facing half-a-dozen new major crises.

The President has chosen the alternative to this which is to withdraw in stages while building the South's independent ability to defend itself. This strategy was placed in harm's way when, immediately following his April 20 withdrawals announcement, Hanoi ordered its 40,000 troops in the sanctuaries to take over most of Cambodia. In particular, Hanoi wanted to re-open the Port of Sihanoukville through which 80 percent of its munitions used against two-thirds of South Vietnam had reached the sanctuaries while Prince Sihanouk was in power. Had it succeeded, an intolerable situation would have stretched for 600 miles along South Vietnam's western border.

The action against North Vietnam in the Cambodian sanctuaries is proving extremely crippling to its future ability to interfere with our orderly withdrawal and with the South's developing strength. Already, 8 million rounds of small arms ammunition have been seized and over 20,000 mortar rounds and 2,000 land mines. This and other captured communist war material won't be used to carry out Hanoi's orders to its troops in the sanctuaries to kill no less than 100 Americans per week to keep the political pressure on Washington. It won't be available to keep us pinned down in a far away place we desperately want out of.

Despite assertions to the contrary, this move against the North in the sanctuaries is legal both under article 51 of the U.N. covenant and under international law. Cambodia's inability to enforce its neutrality gives injured parties the right to take commensurate action. The U.S. and South Vietnam did so and notified

the U.N. Their right of action does not depend on a declaration of war. War is a fact which may legally exist independently of a declaration. When war exists, declared or undeclared, the rules of war apply. Any illegality in this instance is on the part of North Vietnam which invaded this territory and took it from Cambodia for its own use.

Some people believe that passing the so-called amendment to end the war will make the war disappear. By withholding money, the amendment would restrict how, where and when action is taken to get us out of this mess. Frankly, I think the idea is dangerous and counterproductive. Hamstringing the President will not make it any easier or quicker to cool off the fighting and breathe life into the Paris talks. And, a lot of men in uniform could get killed waiting for Congress to repeal restrictions on things they may have to do to protect themselves. Can you imagine how long World War II might have dragged on if Congress had badgered General Eisenhower that way?

In expressing these views I do not feel at all omnipotent. I have a decent respect for those whose outlook differs from mine. I am prepared to change my mind if I am in error and trust that other people would do likewise. Pride is not important here—ending this war and keeping out of others is. I think it is also important in the dialogue on this subject to maintain a decent respect for our country and its President and a balanced perspective on the deep responsibilities of North Vietnam for perpetuating the war.

#### FARM SUBSIDY COSTS

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long been concerned about the runaway cost of our farm subsidy program, I am deeply concerned that the Department of Agriculture has committed itself to maintain payments essentially at 1970 levels for at least 3 more years.

I made this clear earlier, in a recent floor speech—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 16, 1970, page 12119—where I pointed out that large subsidies over \$25,000 increased by 60 percent since 1966 and by 30 percent in the last year alone.

Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to analyze the consequences of continuing this trend by focusing on what it will mean to one of our large cotton producers.

According to ASCS records, the Delta & Pine Land Co., a British-owned corporation, in Bolivar County, Miss., received farm program payments of \$731,772 in 1969. Obviously, this is no way to improve our chronic balance-of-payments problem.

These payments were largely cotton production subsidies and indicate the corporation produced about 10,000 acres of cotton which sold for more than \$1,000,000.

Cotton producers were given subsidies of \$76 for each \$100 of cotton sales last year, for planting within their cotton al-

lotment and avoiding the heavy penalties that are imposed for overplanting their allotments.

I am told that, on a pro rata basis, this British corporation can expect to receive about \$750,000 in 1971 under the new set-aside program which Secretary Hardin has proposed. This, of course, is based on the assumption that there will be no payment limitation. While I am confident that this body will enact a ceiling, there is great doubt that the House Agriculture Committee will include a limitation in the bill it reports to the floor.

I suggest, therefore, that it is well for all of us to consider the implications of a new farm program which does not include this reform. I know of no better way to illustrate the undesirable consequences of such a development than to consider the happy fate of this British corporation.

Since the cotton allotment on the average Mississippi delta farm is 40 percent of the cropland, on a pro rata basis, the Delta & Pine Land Corp. should have about 25,000 acres of cropland. In order to qualify for \$750,000 in subsidy payments in 1971, this British corporation would be required to set aside one-third of its domestic cotton acreage allotment, which is 65 percent of the total allotment, or about 2167 acres. It could then plant as much cotton as it wished on the remaining cropland, 22,833 acres.

Cotton is the most profitable crop in the Mississippi delta and analysts in the Department of Agriculture expect many more delta farmers to increase cotton plantings by as much as one-half under the set-aside program. They could do this by reducing their production of the lower valued crops, soybeans, winter wheat and oats, even though they set aside the required acreage to qualify for maximum subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that under the set-aside program in 1971, the British Delta & Pine Land Co. will produce and sell over \$1,500,000 of cotton in addition to receiving a subsidy of as much as \$750,000.

At most, \$65,000 of the \$750,000 this corporation may receive in 1971 under the proposed set-aside program could be

considered payment for resource adjustment for holding some 2,000 acres out of production of lower valued crops. This leaves \$685,000 as an income supplement payment.

What is the justification for proposing a 3-year program that gives a foreign corporation with over \$1.5 million in farm sales an annual income supplement or welfare payment of \$685,000? What is the justification for giving 106 other cotton producers in Bolivar County annual income supplements or welfare payments in excess of \$25,000 each for the next 3 years totaling over \$5 million annually? Mr. Speaker, I submit there is no justification.

In spite of the decline in cotton exports and prices, land prices in the Mississippi delta have more than doubled in the past 10 years, largely because of increasing farm subsidies. Cotton subsidies have increased almost 20 percent in the past 5 years. Secretary Hardin has given this as one reason why existing subsidies should be continued. But surely this cannot justify continuing subsidies at 1970 levels plus freedom to grow as much cotton as desired. If they are continued at 1970 levels for another 3 years, with the current restrictions on cotton production eliminated, land values will skyrocket in the Mississippi delta and in other high-yield cotton areas. To continue in this direction will only compound the problem.

The most startling and, I submit, inexcusable evidence of the need to end this situation becomes clear when we contrast the wealth of these privileged few with their less fortunate neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, farm program payments of \$5,000 or more were made in 1968 to 2,164 cotton producers in the 11 delta counties of Mississippi, totaling in excess of \$49 million.

Yet 31,400 families, about 40 percent of the approximately 79,500 families in these 11 counties, were classified as poor, having incomes of less than \$2,900 in 1966, according to official economic surveys. Expenditures for Office of Economic Opportunity Programs for these poor families averaged about \$400 per family and totaled less than \$13 million in fiscal

year 1969. This is little more than one-fourth the subsidies paid to the 2,164 wealthiest corporations, landowners and farmers in these 11 delta counties. Can any of us here justify this appalling imbalance in our priorities?

Recent USDA publications report that the entire Mississippi delta area, consisting of 43 counties in Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Missouri, has been characterized as the largest single poverty area in the United States. The region is also characteristic of some of the most extreme types of poverty found anywhere in the country.

I would like to make clear, Mr. Speaker, that the contrast I have drawn is between only a handful of wealthy farmers and the great numbers of poor in the delta. It does not involve the overwhelming number of small and medium-sized farmers. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has just prepared a table, which I will include at the close of these remarks, showing that only 1.3 percent of all farm producers will be affected by my proposed ceiling of \$10,000 per crop. In Mississippi itself only 3.5 percent of all producers will be affected.

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that a limitation on giant farm subsidies will, by itself, materially improve the condition of these desperate citizens at the bottom of the economic scale.

But the amendment I have proposed to limit these subsidies to \$10,000 per crop will save up to \$338 million—funds that clearly could be put to better use helping the rural poor.

We will not have these funds if we have no limitation. Under these circumstances—with acreage controls lifted and the set-aside adopted—our British friends at the Delta & Pine Land Co., and all of the giant cotton interests will reap further bonanzas.

I submit we can no longer justify the glaring inequity of a farm program that has rightly been described as socialism for the rich and capitalism for the poor.

Mr. Speaker, while I am confident we in the House will not go down this road, I hope these remarks have helped make clear where it would take us.

The table referred to follows:

PRODUCERS RECEIVING PAYMENTS OF \$10,000 OR MORE FROM COTTON, FEED GRAINS AND WHEAT PROGRAMS AND ALL PRODUCERS RECEIVING PAYMENTS, BY STATES, 1969

States	Cotton	Feed grains	Wheat	Total, 3 programs	All producers receiving payments	Percent of all producers receiving payments	States	Cotton	Feed grains	Wheat	Total, 3 programs	All producers receiving payments	Percent of all producers receiving payments
Alabama	777	32		809	82,683	1.0	Nebraska		806	99	05	98,108	.9
Alaska					82		Nevada	13		4	17	1,741	2.3
Arizona	847	78	13	938	8,616	10.9	New Hampshire		6			1,525	
Arkansas	1,680		5	1,685	46,355	3.6	New Jersey		1			5,045	.1
California	1,652	242	136	2,030	18,764	10.8	New Mexico	320	274	196	790	12,637	6.2
Colorado		200	457	657	26,824	2.4	New York		11	8	19	35,269	.1
Connecticut					1,757		North Carolina	150	88		239	113,356	.7
Delaware		5		5	1,874	.3	North Dakota		46	490	536	72,674	.7
Florida	13	34		47	16,056	.3	Ohio		166	7	173	110,367	.7
Georgia	709	194	5	908	67,694	1.3	Oklahoma	170	50	371	591	70,408	.7
Hawaii					779		Oregon		6	326	332	15,613	2.1
Idaho		5	442	447	23,280	2.0	Pennsylvania		16	2	18	44,316	.04
Illinois	2	822	10	834	135,962	.6	Rhode Island					300	
Indiana	1	485	4	490	105,392	.5	South Carolina	619	36		655	52,906	1.2
Iowa		1,016	2	1,018	152,325	.7	South Dakota		81	210	291	59,556	.5
Kansas		343	773	1,116	135,443	.8	Tennessee	413			437	92,673	.5
Kentucky	11	74	2	87	85,624	.1	Texas	6,077	2,044	824	8,945	187,339	4.8
Louisiana	786	4	1	791	30,246	2.6	Utah		1	54	55	9,701	.6
Maine					4,635		Vermont					3,307	
Maryland		25		25	9,366	.3	Virginia		21		21	46,138	.04
Massachusetts					1,877		Washington	11	1,143		1,154	18,445	6.2
Michigan	52	1		53	84,657	.1	West Virginia					15,682	
Minnesota	499	50		549	117,205	.5	Wisconsin		94		94	71,025	.1
Mississippi	2,459	12	3	2,474	70,939	3.5	Wyoming		1	28	29	6,854	.4
Missouri	309	468	12	789	117,613	.7							
Montana		6	1,117	1,123	27,271	4.1							
							Total United States	17,008	8,378	6,797	32,183	2,517,304	1.3

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

### CONGRESS AIMS AT ORGANIZED CRIME'S MONEYBAGS

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

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday Star on May 24 carried an excellent article entitled "Congress Aims at Organized Crime's Moneybags," which deals with the adverse financial effects passage of certain pending crime bills would have on organized crime. The bills described in the article are H.R. 15073 and S. 3678 which deal with the disclosure of secret foreign bank accounts; and H.R. 10312, which I introduced on April 19, 1969, and title IX of S. 30 which deals with racketeer influenced and corrupt organizations.

Through the use of secret foreign bank accounts organized criminals can evade paying income tax and finance their numerous illicit activities such as narcotics trafficking, smuggling, black market currency operations, and illegal trading in gold. The profits from these criminal activities often go into secret foreign bank accounts only to wind up in the United States for investment in legitimate businesses. The disclosure provisions of the foreign bank account measures would furnish important leads on the organized criminals who are using secret foreign accounts to further their nefarious aims.

As the Star article points out, the aim of title IX of S. 30 and of H.R. 15073 is to remove the leaders of organized crime from their sources of economic power. These proposals would make it unlawful to use income from "racketeering activity" to buy an interest in or establish a business in interstate commerce. It would also be unlawful to acquire or operate such an enterprise through a "pattern" of racketeering activity. Any organized criminal who goes into legitimate business with racketeering money and methods could be fined up to \$25,000 or imprisoned up to 20 years, or both. More importantly, however, a convicted racketeer could be made to give up his business by criminal or civil forfeiture. Under criminal forfeiture provisions such an individual would lose his business to the Government. Under civil forfeiture provisions, similar to antitrust provisions and novel as a method of combatting organized crime, a convicted racketeer would be ordered to divest himself of the business and not to return to it under another name or in a different part of the country.

S. 30, of which title IX is an integral part, was subjected to lengthy indepth hearings and passed in the Senate on January 23, 1970, by the near unanimous vote of 73 to 1. The House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5 conducted hearings on S. 30 last week and is due to resume further hearings May 27 for 1 day, and have scheduled a 2-day session for June 10 and 11.

Mr. Speaker, these are vital and necessary pieces of legislation in our battle against organized crime. The President has asked for expeditious passage of organized crime legislation. It is my hope that we can this year give law enforce-

ment these additional tools to combat the forces of organized crime.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the newspaper article to which I referred earlier at the conclusion of my remarks.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 24, 1970]

#### CONGRESS AIMS AT ORGANIZED CRIME'S MONEYBAGS

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Two measures now moving through Congress could deal organized crime's overlords the body blow they fear most—right in their overstuffed moneybags.

Although the bills come from different committees, it's their combined effect that counts. One would force Americans to disclose how much money they've socked away in secret foreign bank accounts. The other would get the tainted money of the mobsters out of legitimate business.

The disclosure provisions of the foreign bank account measure could provide important leads to the racketeers now funneling their millions out of illegal gambling, loan sharking and narcotics into Swiss bank accounts and from there into legitimate business.

Both measures are pioneering efforts to protect honest people from what organized crime can do to them. Most of organized crime's profit-making crimes are the kind with willing victims—dope addicts, gamblers, borrowers from loan sharks. But people don't willingly consent to what organized crime can do and is doing to them in the market place. They don't like shoddy, often counterfeit products or prices forced down to get rid of honest businessmen and then pushed up higher than ever. They like to be able to choose where they buy, not to have one product or one service forced on them.

And as taxpayers, if they knew about it, they would resent the people in and out of organized crime who manage to duck paying taxes on the greatest of their gains by banking them in a numbered Swiss account or in the Bahamas or any other country where bank accounts are shrouded in secrecy.

To lift that veil of secrecy for American taxpayers, the Senate Banking Committee will open hearings June 8 on legislation bringing secret foreign bank accounts under greater public scrutiny. Similar legislation has cleared the House Banking Committee and now awaits House action.

#### BUSINESS PARASITES

As for ridding legitimate business of its illegitimate parasites, the House Judiciary Committee opened hearings last week on the Senate-passed Organized Crime Control Act.

A key section of that 99-page anti-crime package has as its target "racketeer influenced and corrupt organizations." It would be against the law to use income from "racketeering activity" to buy an interest in or establish a business engaged in interstate commerce. It would likewise be unlawful to acquire or operate such an enterprise through a "pattern" of racketeering activity.

"Racketeering activity" is defined in terms of the laws characteristically violated by members of organized crime—murder, kidnaping, gambling, arson, robbery, bribery, extortion, narcotics trafficking, counterfeiting, embezzlement, fraud and white slave traffic.

By "pattern" the bill refers to two or more racketeering acts, one of which must have occurred after the measure becomes law. The other could have taken place many years earlier but there must be a close relationship between the two. As sponsors of the measure point out, the fact that a mobster hasn't been caught all these years shows his means of cloaking his crimes have been virtually impenetrable and therefore more dangerous to the community.

Any racketeer who goes into legitimate business with his racketeering money and methods could be fined \$25,000 or imprisoned up to 20 years. But more important to his crime "family" is the loss of his business, and the pending bill has two alternative ways of seeing to that.

One is by way of criminal forfeiture. The convicted racketeer would lose his business to the government.

The other route—brand new in dealing with organized crime—is civil forfeiture, similar to antitrust proceedings. The court could order the racketeer to divest himself of the business and not to return to the business under another name or in another part of the country. The racketeer wouldn't lose his money but the community would be freed of the racket-dominated business.

Sen. John L. McClellan, D-Ark., in his report on the measure he sponsored, noted that the Supreme Court had used the same anti-trust remedy to force DuPont to give up its General Motors ownership "almost without regard for the economic consequences."

If the court could do that to DuPont, McClellan commented, "then it must surely follow that removal of criminal elements from the organizations of our society by divestiture is justified."

The goal is to remove the leaders of organized crime from their sources of economic power, rather than just remove the leaders and leave the racket-dominated business to flourish under their successors.

As President Nixon commented in his organized crime message last year: "As long as the property of organized crime remains, new leaders will step forward to take the place of those we jail."

That property runs into billions, nobody knows just how many billions because most of the wheels of organized crime hide behind "fronts" or "nominees" while putting their profits into secret bank accounts.

Just counting reported business interests, a survey in one midwestern city shows racketeers in that city control or have large interests in 89 businesses with total assets of more than \$800 million and annual receipts in excess of \$900 million.

William A. Kolar, director of the Internal Revenue Service's Intelligence Division, reported a new study of 1500 leading racketeers shows 80 per cent of them admittedly were engaged in some form of legitimate business.

Of course, he added, nobody knows the extent of their hidden interests. Uncovering them would take a lot more manpower than the 1,800 men now assigned to IRS Intelligence.

Of the 1,800 special agents, only 25 percent devote their efforts to organized crime work because of the need to investigate a substantial number of tax frauds not involving racketeers.

Kolar, who is retiring this month after 26 years of federal investigative assignments beginning with the FBI, said one of the major problems he faced as director of IRS intelligence was trying to track down the hidden money of the racketeers who infiltrated legitimate business. He's leaving government to join William Hundley, former chief of the Justice Department's Organized Crime and Racketeering Section, and Robert Peloquin, who headed the government's first strike force against organized crime, in a new enterprise, International Intelligence Inc. Their mission will be to help businessmen protect themselves against racketeer take-overs.

#### THE METHODS

Kolar cited these methods used by organized crime to acquire control of legitimate business, methods the proposed legislation is designed to block:

1. Racketeers make outright buys of legitimate businesses, using the untaxed profits from gambling (\$6 billion to \$7 billion an-

nually); narcotics (\$350 million); loan sharking (\$350 million); prostitution (\$225 million) and untaxed liquor (\$150 million).

2. They "accept" business interests in payment of the owner's gambling debts. The owner of a beer distributing firm with an uncontrollable urge to gamble at first pacified his gambling creditors by letting them use his company offices as the headquarters of their lottery operation. Eventually, the mobsters gained control of the company.

3. They gain control by foreclosing their usurious loans, which had been made with untaxed illegal income. IRS has evidence showing how the mob took over several brokerage houses through foreclosing loans. They used the brokerage firms to promote the sale of fraudulent stock in a swindle which cost the public more than \$2 million.

4. They use extortion, threats, beatings, bombings or the sly mention of an underworld "enforcer" to terrorize businessmen into giving up their business or accepting the product or service they force upon him.

In a typical case, a large food chain suffered more than \$10 million worth of arson damage and two store managers were murdered because organized crime wanted the chain to stock a brand of detergent distributed by a racketeer-operated agency.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce cited that case in its recently compiled "Desk Book on Organized Crime," which was issued to help businessmen, their families and their communities protect themselves from the ever-present threat of organized crime.

The Desk Book cites these practices of racketeer-dominated companies:

Bribing inspectors to accept defective construction materials, threatening pharmacists as part of a "sales pitch" for mob-distributed and often counterfeit prescription drugs, setting fires to stores which balk at buying racketeer-promoted products, corrupting public officials to obtain local, state and federal contracts, counterfeiting state and federal tax stamps.

Typical of a hoodlum-bossed business in operation is the case of a New York trucking company controlled by John A. Masiello, a Cosa Nostra "soldier" and leading loan shark, indicted with his son, a racket associate, and four postal officials on charges of conspiracy and bribery.

The postal officials were accused of taking bribes from Masiello to overlook complaints about service under mail trucking contracts worth \$2 million awarded to firms controlled by Masiello and others.

The criminal habits and attitudes which the McClellan bill strives to get out of the marketplace are reflected in the activities of some offspring of Mafia bosses. Salvatore "Bill" Bonanno, son of former Mafia boss Joseph "Joe Bananas" Bonanno, was convicted of mail fraud and conspiracy for using a Diner's Club credit card extorted from a New York travel agent. Soon after a store seized the card from Bonanno, the henchman with whom Bonanno had conspired to get the card was shot to death in Brooklyn.

Joseph J. Colombo, Jr., son of the reputed Brooklyn Mafia boss, was arrested a few weeks ago and charged with two others of conspiring to melt down \$500,000 in U.S. silver coins and sell the silver. The senior Colombo is awaiting trial on income tax evasion charges.

Although no one in law enforcement knows the extent of organized crime's invasion of legitimate business, there are occasional indications of multi-million-dollar holdings. For instance, various Mafia mobs are said to control one of the largest hotel chains in the country, dominate a bank with assets of from \$70 to \$90 million, operate a commercial laundry that grosses over \$20 million yearly, own real estate interests valued at \$300 million and, in some parts of the coun-

try, own nearly 90 percent of the private waste-disposal industry.

Often bankrolling both the legitimate and illegitimate activities of organized crime are numbered accounts in Swiss banks. It is known, for instance, that money stashed away in secret Swiss accounts financed drug counterfeiting operations which one drug company executive estimated could run to nearly \$100 million annually. Preparations of underworld origin are said to have been found intermixed in almost every type of commonly prescribed medication.

The secret bank accounts are an integral part of the heroin trade. Money received for the sale of heroin in the United States is either carried to Europe by a courier or hand carried to a New York bank or money exchange where it is forwarded to an account in a Swiss bank. There, the money is transferred to the account of the heroin supplier.

Former U.S. Atty. Robert Morgenthau cited a recent heroin case where as part of the payoff for smuggling heroin, \$950,000 was sent to the Swiss bank account of a Panamanian corporation with offices in Geneva.

For organized crime, the secret bank accounts are used to conceal the profits of crime and to facilitate carrying out such international crimes as narcotics trafficking, smuggling, black market currency operations in Southeast Asia and illegal trading in gold.

Eugene T. Rossides, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement and Operation, says there's strong evidence of a substantial flow of funds from U.S. racketeers, particularly those associated with gambling, to certain foreign banks.

"Some of these funds," he said recently, "appear to have been brought back into the U.S. under the guise of loans from foreign sources. This may be providing a substantial source of funds for investment by the criminal element in legitimate business in the United States."

#### "CLEAN MONEY"

The mobsters profit two ways. First, they've got "clean money" to use for their investment. If any investigator asks where they got the money to start this business, they can say it's a loan. Second, they can take an income tax deduction for the interest they're paying on the "loan." Of course, they don't report the interest their money is accumulating in its Swiss hideaway and since the account is secret, the government can't prove they have a cent there.

In addition to the diversion of illegally-acquired funds to foreign havens, secret accounts can be misused to duck paying income taxes on large capital gains in the stock market, to violate the securities laws that are designed to protect the stock-buying public, to push the stock market up and down and to mask the takeover of American businesses by persons unknown to American authorities.

In testimony before Chairman Wright Patman's House Banking Committee, Irving M. Pollack, director of the Securities and Exchange Commission's Division of Trading and Markets, warned that cases already known to the SEC are not at all atypical and they suggest that hundreds of millions of dollars are being furnished annually by foreign sources to assist in efforts to gain control of American companies.

One thing that's of particular concern to American authorities is the takeover of American companies with defense contracts by unknown individuals dealing through secret foreign bank accounts.

Usually this happens when controlling stock in a company is put up as collateral on a loan made by a foreign bank for one of its secret customers. When the borrower defaults on the loan, unknown interests take over the company.

Swiss bankers are the shadowy figures behind an increasing number of cases involving major frauds. In one recent case, two Swiss bankers supplied hundreds of false documents from a string of sham companies which helped an American group—including a Washington attorney—swindle the U.S. government and channel more than \$4 million into secret Swiss bank accounts.

Equally shadowy are the activities of a long-time associate of Racketeer Meyer Laskey, a former bootlegger named John Pullman who is said to manage the flow of American organized crime's millions into and out of Swiss bank accounts.

A one-time courier for the mob, Pullman renounced his American citizenship to handle the mob's investments from his headquarters in Lausanne, Switzerland. He stays out of the United States, out of reach of the subpoenas that would greet him here from information-hungry investigators.

Money funneled to secret accounts in Switzerland often comes back in the form of stock purchases carried in the name not of individuals but of banks. Last year alone, foreign stock purchases amounted to \$12.4 billion and sales reached \$10.9 billion.

Pollack emphasized that during the past few years, legitimate foreign investments have been welcomed and as a result have increased substantially.

Aside from this massive legitimate foreign investment, nobody knows how many of the individuals for whom Swiss banks bought the stock are violating two of the key laws created to protect American investors—one forbidding "insider" trading, the other setting margin requirements.

Some executives of U.S. corporations, barred by law from trading in their company's stock on the basis of inside information, are known to be trading secretly through their secret Swiss accounts.

Some American investors, who would have to put in enough cash to cover 65 percent of the cost of the stock they buy under American law, are buying shares through numbered Swiss accounts with as little as 10 percent down in cash.

Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., recognized the questionable foreign stock transactions when he included in his secret foreign bank account bill two sections specifically dealing with securities.

One would prevent U.S. broker-dealers from trading in U.S. securities in behalf of a foreign bank or broker unless the foreign bank or broker discloses the individual for whom it is acting or certifies that it is not acting for a U.S. citizen or resident. That would remove the cloak of secrecy from the foreign stock transactions.

#### PLAY BY RULES

The other section would require U.S. citizens who place stock orders through foreign banks or brokers to give the foreigners permission to disclose the person's identity to the U.S. broker-dealer who ultimately handles the transaction. That permission would allow the foreign banks or broker to disclose the U.S. citizen's identity without violating the foreign country's secrecy laws.

The rest of the Proxmire bill follows the House measure which provides:

Domestic financial institutions would have to maintain records of checks and other financial transactions under Treasury regulations.

Unusual or sizable deposits or withdrawals of U.S. currency would have to be reported by financial institutions and individuals making the deposit or withdrawal.

Movements of U.S. currency into or out of the country would have to be reported when they exceed \$5,000 on any one occasion or \$10,000 in any one year.

Individuals who have transactions with foreign financial agencies would have to report those transactions.

The penalties for violating the margin requirements on securities loans would be extended to the borrower in order to prevent circumvention by a foreign lender.

An increasing number of Americans—some of them American hoodlums—now own and control banks in Switzerland and the Bahamas. The pending legislation would force them to play by some of the same rules as the people who never left home.

#### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. The United States is the world's largest producer of jet fuel. In 1966 the United States produced 27,267,000 metric tons of jet fuel compared to 2,190,000 metric tons produced by the United Kingdom, the second-ranked nation.

#### THE COMPETITIVE STATE OF OUR FOREIGN TRADE

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, again I feel compelled to call to the attention of Congress the increasing peril to U.S. industry and its work force. With the help and cooperation of O. R. Strackbein, president of the nationwide committee on import-export policy, I am presenting some sobering facts on a decade of U.S. trade deficit.

The United States has suffered a spectacular defeat in its foreign trade during the past decade and particularly during the past few years.

With the exception of a very few lines of products we find ourselves in a growing deficit position in our trade with other countries of the world. So great is our general competitive disadvantage that it can no longer be ignored or hidden. Some dramatic developments have indeed surfaced within recent years to underscore the blindness of a policy that should have been modified before now.

A defeat such as we have suffered in the field of trade would have called for the scalps of directors and managers in any other line of endeavor. A conspiracy of concealment and silence has kept the unwelcome facts from the public.

This is a heavy indictment, all the more so because the concealment has been both unconscionable and stubborn, running over a period of years.

A few examples will illustrate the trade trends of the sixties:

Our exports to Japan from 1960-69 increased 141.1 percent; our imports 325.4 percent. Our exports to West Germany rose 66.4 percent, our imports 190.2 percent. Twenty percent of all our imports in 1969 came from these two countries. They took only 14.8 percent of our total exports.

We increased our exports to the Common Market countries by 75.7 percent

while our imports rose 156.3 percent, or double our exports.

With respect to Italy our exports rose 76.4 percent while we imported 206.8 percent more.

The United Kingdom increased her sales to us by 113.5 percent while our sales to the U. K. increased only 57 percent.

Our exports to all of Asia increased 97.4 percent while our imports swelled by 204.1 percent.

Our imports from the countries of the European Free Trade Association—England, Norway, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Switzerland and Portugal—increased twice as much as our exports to those countries: 127.2 percent compared with 63.4 percent. Our imports from Sweden rose more than twice as fast as our exports to her or 108.2 percent versus 43.4 percent.

The great exceptions were Canada and Latin America. In the case of Canada, largely because of the automotive agreement, both our exports and imports increased greatly. Exports rose 239.8 percent and imports 258.1 percent.

Latin America, with the exception of Argentina, Peru, and Mexico, showed a depressive result from the Latin American point of view. Our exports to Argentina rose only 5.3 percent while our imports increased 58 percent. Yet our exports still exceeded greatly our imports. In the case of Peru our exports grew only 13.6 percent while our imports went up by 71.6 percent. Our actual imports in this case were nearly twice as heavy as our exports. Mexican sales to this country rose by 132.3 percent while our exports to that country rose a more modest 74.1 percent. Yet we still had a favorable trade balance.

Our exports to Latin America as a whole, including the three countries mentioned, grew 36.1 percent while our imports rose only 19.4 percent. In a few instances our imports showed an actual decline during the decade, namely, from Chile and Venezuela.

In our total world trade our exports increased 84.6 percent while our imports went up 146.0 percent.

Our trade with all the world except Canada and Latin America showed a sharper disadvantage. Our exports grew 81.8 percent compared with an import increase of 160.8 percent. In other words, our imports from the rest of the world, outside of Canada and Latin America, grew twice as fast as our exports to that part of the world.

In the case of Latin America our imports consist principally of raw materials and crude foodstuffs. However, the great increase registered in our total imports in recent years from all the world has occurred in manufactured goods rather than in raw materials. Therefore imports from the industrialized countries accounted for much the greater part of the sharp rise in our imports during the past decade.

It may be asked why this great discrepancy between the growth of our imports of raw materials and manufactured goods should have occurred. The trend should really be no occasion for surprise. Imports of raw materials did indeed in-

crease, but they rose from an index of 100 in 1956-60 to 130 in 1968, compared with a rise from 100 to 402 for finished manufactures. In other words, imports of the latter grew 13 times as fast as imports of raw materials.

The sharply divergent trend is traceable to the relative labor content in the two forms of products. Raw materials incorporate only the first step or two of production. The amount of cheap labor expended is, therefore, the minimum. In the case of finished goods the full complement of labor is incorporated. This might be four or five stages of production. The savings on imports is, therefore, all the greater. Not only is there one stage of production at low labor cost but several stages. Therefore, it is of a much greater advantage to import finished products compared with raw products, because the former have more of the low-cost labor in them.

Today about two-thirds of our imports consist of manufactured goods. Not many years ago less than a third of all imports were of this variety.

If imports have grown so briskly compared with our exports, why do we not have a foreign trade deficit?

The answer is we do have a trade deficit. It merely does not so appear from the official trade statistics issued by the Department of Commerce. That Department elects to count as dollar exports not only the goods that we give away or sell abroad at cut prices but also those that we can export only because of our governmental subsidies. This practice swells our exports unjustifiably. If that practice were stopped our merchandise balance would show a deficit. Also we total up our imports on their foreign value rather than what they cost us landed at our ports of entry. This practice undervalues our imports by several billions of dollars a year. The upshot is that our trade deficit is in the magnitude of \$5 or \$6 billion in terms of commercial competitive trade instead of having a surplus as reported by the Department of Commerce.

These facts have been concealed too long. Their concealment has abetted the perpetuation of a trade policy that is against the national interest and has prevented the adoption of prudent restraints on imports that will prevent their running wild.

The great surge in imports has been explained by the "extraordinary increase in domestic demand." Yet the experience of Japan, West Germany and Italy thoroughly contradicts that explanation. Those countries, too, have experienced a great expansion at home. In spite of that they nevertheless also made great strides in their exports. Some other factor must explain our trade debacle. Only those who will not see will fail to perceive the real reason. This is simply that other countries, with their new productive technology and their lagging wages, can and do outcompete us both here and in foreign markets.

Unless something is done soon, not indeed, to reverse the trend, but to keep the imports within reasonable bounds of growth—not a cutback, but a moderation—a bitter reaction will set in, not

only among the manufacturers, growers and producers who are being injured, but by labor as well. The latter is already showing signs of unrest from this source. National unions that formerly supported the freer trade policy are shifting their position because they see in unregulated imports the evaporation not only of actual jobs but of potential jobs upon which the employment of their members depends in the future.

Such favorable trade balance as we do still enjoy in some sectors is confined to a very few products, most notably, and preponderantly, machinery, including automobiles, aircraft, and computers. In 1969 we exported \$6.6 billion more in this category than we imported. Chemical exports on a much smaller scale were also in a surplus position.

Machinery exports, both electrical and nonelectrical, have indeed continued at a high pace, thanks largely to our heavy investments in branch plants abroad, but imports have been gaining impressively. In 1960 we exported 4.7 times as much machinery and transport equipment as we imported. In 1969 the ratio was considerably less than 2 to 1. This is by far the heaviest single item in our exports. In 1969 it was 43 percent of our total exports. The 1960-69 trend has continued. Exports of machinery exclusive of transport equipment grew 46.2 percent since 1965 through 1969, but imports rose 154 percent, or more than three times as rapidly, in this 5-year period.

In other manufactured goods our exports rose from \$3.8 billion in 1960 to only \$7.0 billion in 1969. During the same period imports of other manufactured goods rose from \$4.5 billion in 1960 to \$12.0 billion in 1969. In other words, exports of this class of wide variety of products rose 83 percent; imports rose 163 percent. Among the products included in this broad class of products are iron and steel mill products, shoes, paper and manufactures, textiles, clothing, glass, glassware and pottery, clocks and watches, nails, screws, nuts and bolts, toys and athletic goods, rubber and plastic manufactures, bicycles, bicycle parts, motor scooters, hand tools, plywood, cameras, musical instruments, radio and TV sets, phonographs and records, musical instruments, sound recorders, optical goods, et cetera. In this group as a whole we suffered a deficit of \$5 billion in 1969, even when imports are tabulated on their foreign value rather than landed at our ports of entry.

In agricultural products we have import problems in strawberries, tomatoes, citrus fruits, canned olives and mushrooms, meat, lamb, potatoes, dairy products, honey, mink, fish, oysters, crabmeat, flowers, et cetera. In minerals we have a trade deficit in petroleum, copper, lead and zinc, bauxite and aluminum. Added to manufactured goods and agricultural products the total deficit far outstrips the surplus in machinery and chemicals.

Employment in the lines of products constituting these other manufactured goods exceeds employment in the limited lines in which our exports have been en-

joying a surplus, by some 2 million workers.

Our national policy is therefore in the posture of helping one broad industry—machinery and transport equipment, in which our lead is narrowing ominously in any event—at the expense of a wide spectrum of industries wherein imports are overrunning our market almost at will.

In view of the rapid narrowing of the export surplus in machinery and transport equipment, as noted previously, the exceedingly unstable foundation of our fictitious overall surplus provides little ground for confidence.

Moreover, since duties will be cut still further under the Kennedy Round, the outlook for improvement of our trade position must be regarded as bleak.

The reduction of our tariff has gone so far, and since its resurrection is hardly probable, we must look elsewhere for relief.

Imports of optical goods, which are your immediate concern, have followed a rather common pattern. You have been losing out in terms of the share of domestic consumption supplied by your companies. In the case of lenses you have seen imports come from some 7 or 8 percent of domestic consumption as recently as 1965 to some 18 percent in 1969.

Imports of frames which had already taken 22 percent of your market in 1965 rose to about 33 percent in 1969.

In each instance the invasion of imports has been relentless; and there is nothing now on the scene to suggest that the penetration will not proceed toward greater deprivation of our market.

The tariff would not, in any case, be of much help, unless it were raised to seemingly exorbitant levels, because of the low unit cost of foreign producers, especially the Japanese.

We, therefore, seek a different means of holding imports at a reasonable level.

Recently, legislation has been introduced in the Congress that would accomplish a moderation of imports. This legislation which was introduced in the Senate by the Chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator RUSSELL LONG, has been introduced in the House by some 65 Members, among them, four committee chairmen. It is called the Fair International Trade bill.

This bill would establish ceilings on imports for the purpose of preventing imports from running wild. It would generally accept levels of imports but would hold future penetration to a growth on a par with the increase in domestic consumption of the same product. This might be 10 percent, 15 percent, 30 percent, 40 percent, or more of our market, depending on the penetration already achieved.

Import quotas would be imposed only if imports should break through the ceiling for a period of 6 months.

If the ceiling principle is adopted, domestic industries would be assured of holding a fair share of the domestic market, no matter how low the foreign production costs. The notion that imports should be given priority over domestic production to the extent of bulldozing

the jobs of our workers out of the way and leaving it up to us to pick up the pieces and repair the wreckage by a system of adjustment assistance is wholly unjustifiable philosophy and represents an amazingly harsh attitude in point of public policy.

That foreign producers should be able to pay wages that would be illegal in this country and then build a destructive trade on that basis with the blessing of our Government, seems incredible. Yet, that is the basic philosophy of adjustment assistance. It proceeds on the wholly untenable assumption that if an American producer cannot compete with imports he is necessarily inefficient. He is guilty without trial, and must take the consequences. Yet on a relative efficiency basis, which is to say, output per man-hour or per man-year, American industry continues to lead the world. This lead is shrinking, however, and the low foreign wages combined with rising foreign technological productivity produces the foreign competitive advantage.

We cannot hope to hold our own industrially in this type of competitive climate. The fact of our competitive defeat from the persistence of lower foreign wages can no longer be concealed by sleight-of-hand trade statistics. The trend of rising imports will force a recasting of our obsolete trade policy.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to read a letter from Mr. Strackbein to the President of the United States:

APRIL 9, 1970.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is my impression that the Presidency is inadequately informed and therefore misinformed on the competitive state of our foreign trade.

Accordingly I send you herewith a copy of a speech I am scheduled to make before the Optical Manufacturers Association in a few days. It is entitled "A Decade of U.S. Trade Defeat." The speech is self-explanatory; but in view of the heavy demands on your time I shall present here a very brief account of its principal points:

1. Contrary to official foreign trade statistics the United States has for several years run a deficit in our merchandise import-export account. This deficit, in terms of private commercial competitive trade, is in the annual magnitude of some \$5 billion.

2. We do indeed enjoy a surplus in a limited category or two of goods. In 1969 this surplus was some \$8 billion, concentrated overwhelmingly in machinery and transport equipment and, to a much lesser extent, in chemicals. Imports, however, have been rising several times as rapidly as exports in the machinery sector during the past decade. This handsome surplus may therefore be expected to disappear in a few years.

3. With respect to nearly all "Other Manufactured Goods" we incurred a deficit of some \$5 billion in 1969. The products include steel, textiles, footwear, glass, pottery, radio and TV sets, plywood, bicycles, musical instruments, optical goods, toys and athletic goods, rubber and plastic manufactures, screws and bolts, hand tools, clocks and watches, etc.

4. If the deficit in certain agricultural products is included, such as tomatoes, strawberries, citrus fruit, mushrooms, fish, olives, meat, mink; as well as certain minerals, such as petroleum, lead and zinc, copper and bauxite, the surplus enjoyed in machinery exports is swamped.



5. Employment in the so-called "Other Manufactured Goods" mentioned above or "Miscellaneous Manufactured Articles," both as classified by the Census Bureau, exceeds employment in the narrow sector in which we enjoy the export surplus described above, by about 2 million workers. When the export surplus in machinery disappears we will be at bedrock of a foreign trade disaster.

6. Imports of manufactured goods now account for about 65% of our total imports, compared with only about 30% fifteen years ago.

7. Importation of manufactured goods offers our importers the most attractive bargain since these goods incorporate all the steps of the manufacturing process, which may be three to five. The cheap labor advantage is thus magnified compared with the importation of raw materials, which do not go beyond one or two of the steps of production. Little wonder that imports of finished goods have left the imports of raw materials far behind.

8. The incontestable competitive advantage enjoyed by foreign manufacturers in this market rests on nothing more mysterious than the lower level of wages they pay, coupled with the fast-rising productivity that has come from technological advancement and adoption of mass production methods abroad.

9. Looking to the tariff, which on the average is down 80% from its level of 35 years ago, as a defense is unrealistic. Also to rely on adjustment assistance is to vacate our productive facilities with their workers in favor of a form of competition that derives its advantage principally from the simple fact that foreign producers pay wages that would be illegal in this country. This fact should be weighed carefully in any assessment of inefficiency of our producers and manufacturers who in fact continue to lead the world in productivity. Fairness demands that the unequal burden be taken into account and that we do not penalize our industries and workers for complying with labor standards imposed by the Government in response to the wishes of the electorate.

10. As the tide of imports rises we need a ceiling over them in specific instances, designed to share our market on a reasonable basis, permitting imports to grow with our economy, but denying them the license to run wild while trampling over our established labor standards.

I shall be ready on request to substantiate more fully this outline of our trade position.

With assurances of my esteem,  
Sincerely,

O. R. STRACKBEIN,  
President.

**H. R. 17725—LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE THAT ALL FEDERALLY ASSISTED CHILD DAY-CARE PROGRAMS SHALL PROVIDE, AS A PART OF SUCH PROGRAM, NUTRITIONAL MEALS AND PREVENTIVE, DIAGNOSTIC, AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL CARE**

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced legislation, H.R. 17725, that would provide children attending federally assisted day-care centers with three balanced meals a day, if needed, and free, regular medical checkups, and medical care.

The sympathy of the whole Nation has been aroused by the so-called hunger

hearings. Studies showing that the lack of simple, wholesome food produces defects in children, the consequences of which influence their entire lives, have horrified many. I believe the time has come to do something about it.

The most precious single resource of our Nation is its youth. It is a resource that we dare not neglect or carelessly squander. I believe my bill will contribute substantially to the welfare of our Nation by helping to assure that children will not be prevented, by physical handicaps caused by hunger, from making their rightful contribution to our national life.

The text of H.R. 17725 follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no Federal funds shall be used, either directly or through grants or contracts, to meet or assist in meeting, the cost of a child day-care program, unless the program provides (1) a complete meal for each child present in the day-care center during mealtimes (unless provided such meal at his home), and (2) appropriate medical services for all children being cared for.*

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make such regulations as may be necessary for carrying out this Act which shall be observed by all Federal officers and agencies carrying on programs of assistance for child day-care programs. Such regulations shall (1) prescribe standards with respect to the type, quality, and amount of food which must be provided, and (2) the medical services which must be provided. The medical care so required shall be of a diagnostic, preventive, or emergency character only.

SEC. 3. If the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines that the funds available for any program of Federal assistance for day-care programs are insufficient to permit compliance with this Act, the Secretary shall, from funds appropriated to carry out this Act, make available to the Federal officer or agency concerned such sums as may be necessary to permit compliance with this Act.

#### ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able and constructive Members of Congress is the Honorable JOHN KYL, Congressman from the Fourth District of Iowa. Congressman KYL is now serving in his fifth term. During that time, he has been a cooperative, active, and effective member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of which I am chairman. He has also served most ably and effectively on the Public Land Law Review Commission of which I am chairman, which Commission will deliver its report to the President of the United States, to the President of the U.S. Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives during the last week of June this year.

Congressman KYL is one of those outstanding Members who does his own thinking and, in my opinion, he is almost always to be found in a knowledgeable and logical position. He is particularly interested in people and the conditions

under which people live, work, and play. His love for young people is exceptional. His desire to talk to them in an understanding manner is also exceptional.

Recently he made some addresses during Environmental Week of April 20 to 25 which have far more constructive thinking than most of the addresses given during that week. It has been my good fortune to read one of them and I wish to share it with my colleagues in Congress. Accordingly, I have obtained unanimous consent to have it placed in the body of the RECORD so that others who wish to share Mr. KYL's contribution may do so.

The address follows:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN KYL, FOURTH IOWA DISTRICT, ENVIRONMENTAL WEEK, APRIL 20-25, 1970

"To him who in the love of nature holds communion with her visible forms, she speaks a various language." Indeed, in our concern about our environment, there is a various language. Anyone can read anything into this great crusade. And it is, apparently, a various political issue, with benefit to and publicity for the practitioner varying directly with the magnitude of impending disaster prognosticated.

In our deliberations we will deal with the very elemental philosophic matters and we will deal with practical technology—from the poet to the computer. Some of the most elemental, seemingly simple matters, loom large in our considerations. We have to begin with appreciation that "the meanest flower that blows can give thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears," or that one can see "eternity in a grain of sand." We will view much that is bad, and much for which we can be thankful.

Our problems cannot be hidden. Hope will not cause them to go away. They will not be removed by protest or by blame-laying. This business will not be cheap, and it will not be quick. And in the end, our environment will be improved and sustained only when each of us does our own thing in our own place.

The job cannot be left to George. Our trouble started long before George.

Before man came to the world's stage, nature was a changing thing, and not all changes were environmentally perfect. There was a lack of hypocrisy. The frog ate a fly and a fish ate the frog. A bear devoured the fish and a fly, carrying disease, killed the bear. The fittest survived in an accepted, unchallenged pattern of natural selection. The earth was the Lord's, but it changed.

Time was when man was a part of nature and he was controlled by nature—sometimes overwhelmed by it. He was simply another species even though a special creation of the Almighty. He could think. In time, there came thoughts of altering nature.

When the white man came to this continent, some of our native brethren were engaged in changing nature—for instance, the Hohokams, with their amazing irrigation systems. But most were still nature's children. Their good gods were the helpful spirits of gentle breezes and spring rains and the buffalo maker; and the bad gods were elements they feared and hated. By and large, they lived with nature and their pattern of life was to use, but not to destroy.

The white man who came to this land was a step ahead. He soon sought to impose his will broadly. The tree was a barrier to agriculture and an enemy of westward movement. So woodlands were destroyed, sometimes in wanton fashion. In Jefferson's time, some in our government thought the three-centers an acre we paid for the Louisiana territory was exorbitant because that land was "nothing but a vast wasteland of trees."

We didn't know what other resources were there, and really didn't care. What we had wanted was a port of New Orleans. The rest was secondary.

Lewis and Clark, from their amazing Odyssey, recognized the vastness and the wonders of the new land. But they didn't understand the mysteries of oil and gas and countless other elements beyond their ken. Then as we learned what we had and how to use it, our resources seemed so inexhaustible that waste was not a problem. Tremendous rivers diluted and carried away the early wastes and there was no particular problem. There was a happy attitude which seemed to say that a fresh new world would be created with each rising sun. It was a familiar story, told over and over in the history books.

By the time of the homestead laws, we had turned around far enough to begin planting trees instead of burning them. Plant trees—get free land.

The industrial growth, and the technological revolution in turn, multiplied our problems, speeded our movement, our use, and our degradation of the environment. And finally comes the constructive concern.

This is important. What we did with our environment and our resources seemed to be the wisest thing at the given time. Today we are trying to make the adjustments and repairs which seem wisest at this time. We are probably as a nation more concerned with the future and policies for the future, mostly because we can see the end of the resources. But remember, please, that we are not the first with foresight. We are not the pioneers. All who have gone before us were not insensitive or stupid. Already much has been done to protect what is good, and to remedy what has been degraded by man through activity or neglect, and by nature itself.

As citizens of the U.S., you own 770 million acres of land, a third of the land in the fifty states. Most of this will be retained. You own 180 million acres of national forest, 23 million acres of parks and monuments in federal ownership, and a like area dedicated to fish and wildlife. You own ten million acres of Wilderness, large numbers of historic sites, seashore areas such as Cape Cod, Hatteras, Padre Island, and Pt. Reyes. We have started a system of trails, and of scenic and wild rivers. We are implementing standards for water and air, and controls on wastes and noise. We have a land and water conservation fund which has proved a useful tool for expanding open space. We have saved the redwoods and have moved to save and propagate endangered species of plant and animal life.

Without losing idealism, we must be practical. We cannot, like Leacock's hero, mount the steed and ride off madly in all directions. The emotionalism can spur concern, but the emotion must give way to logic and reason. There are practical illustrations of conflict.

Our Congressional mall from conservationists, preservationists, environmentalists and ecologists has become voluminous. Today we all fit those criteria. Many of these letters say flatly, "Don't let the Corps of Engineers build one more dam. Keep our rivers wild."

So far as I am concerned, this argument is about as bad as argument in favor of damming all rivers.

I lived on the Missouri River when it was really wild. It was destructive, muddy, and at its best was an unstable resource.

Now, it is controlled, and it is stable and it is useful. Many of the old meandering oxbows have been saved and improved to ecological purity. The river from St. Louis to its source is being developed as part of the Lewis and Clark Trail for conservation, recreation and historic memorialization. About 800 specific sites, ranging from half-acre picnic sites to a million, three hundred thou-

sand-acre wilderness area, have been designated. The entire river is the ribbon of continuity. Large reservoirs provide tremendous sources of pleasure and a healthy promotion of desirable environment. All alterations of nature are not bad.

Our own Des Moines River is another case in point. The river downstream from the dam is no longer wild, but it is natural and it is more beautiful. It is cleaner. The old-time fisherman proclaims that his pleasure is more productive now than in the halcyon days. We had 475,000 ducks on the lake one day last fall. In six months 2-inch "fry" became 24-inch Northern Pike. Water quality is excellent. But I have a continuing battle with allegations that the lake is a polluted cesspool. Some of the detractors have seemed disappointed with the wholesome state of affairs. The environmental crusade tests one's sincerity. A dedicated naturalist, who was testing water voluntarily in his area's streams, was asked how his work was coming. "Not so good," he responded, "so far all I have found is clean water."

But I don't want to stop this river-damming story there. If we had started spending this 100 million dollar reservoir outlay a hundred years ago on small watershed and soil conservation practices, we would have improved the upland where floodwaters originally fall, and would have saved bottomlands for agriculture—and perhaps, repeat, perhaps, would have obviated the need for the big dam. We didn't. Now we have to proceed with the watershed work anyhow if the reservoir is to be of permanent value.

Don't underestimate the unglamorous soil conservation effort. Silt is still the biggest water polluter. Further, the only way to keep natural nitrogen, phosphate and other chemicals from the water is to keep it on the land—through soil conservation practices.

We also get letters telling us that we must not cut one more tree in our national forests.

The motivation is fine. But the fact is that forests are not saved simply by leaving them natural and untouched. Forests get old. They die. They become diseased. They burn. I have debated with naturalists who say that forest fires are sometimes a good thing. The same persons argue against cutting any timber.

We can harvest trees, and plant, and fertilize, and otherwise manage them so that we have an improved, living resource for the multitude of values we ascribe to woodlands. The important thing is that we must not just cut and forget. We must manage.

The business of pesticides, fertilizers, and commercial fertilizers offers a different kind of situation. We must worry about the potential, long-range effects of persistent chemicals.

As of this time, we don't know the answers to these worries. They are real worries. But the argument doesn't all run in one direction.

Insecticides save millions of lives. That is a fact. Maybe we can find substitute controls with no possible hazards. We do not have them at this time. We search.

So far as I know, we have established human tolerance levels for only one pesticide of the entire broad spectrum. The Mark Commission, an eminent group, reported that there is no evidence of increased morbidity or mortality resulting from the use of pesticides. But it acknowledged concerns. We just don't know the answers yet. We are now starting to establish a monitoring system. We don't know if it will work, and if it does work, we cannot anticipate benefits. Other factors seem more clear.

It seems clear to me that a housewife does not want to buy wormy, blemished produce. It seems clear that we will need increased production of food and fiber.

We know that any element can be used

indiscriminately with harsh, even tragic results. But it is not simply an indulgence in rhetoric to plead for reason and for research when we cannot identify cause and effect.

In spite of all the pressures and hazards of modern life, we live longer. Nature flourishes in most places either in spite of, or because of, our efforts. Iowa uses immense quantities and infinite variety of agricultural chemicals. Yet, wildlife abounds. So far as we can presently determine, our greatest unnatural enemy of the large pheasant, deer, possum, raccoon and rabbit population is the automobile.

This does not belittle concern. I share the concern. I have seen the real problems and have tried to study the worries. But I plead for reason. We must learn from the past, but we gain no improvement by blaming the past. We need a compulsion, a zeal, a crusading spirit. But this is the necessary prelude to the hard work of improvement.

This is important business to which I give complete dedication. Because I have been involved for so long in environmental matters at the same time I have been involved in other national considerations day after day, I see many potential benefits beyond the obvious. For instance, I believe that in-depth study of our relationship to the universe will help us redirect our national priorities. I believe it can help us turn our attention from searching for what we do not believe, to thoughts and principles in which we do believe. I believe it can help gain a harmony for the individual life and for the national life.

History will also grade us on our effort in our time. History will judge us, not on our words, but on our deeds—not on our criticism, but on our work. Let us proceed with that work.

#### NEWSWEEK DETAILS FAILURES OF ECONOMY

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, Newsweek magazine has done a series of excellent pieces on the economy and they have been among the first to call attention to the signs of a major recession.

The latest in this series of economic analyses appears in the May 25 issue of Newsweek entitled "Hard Times 1970: Facts, Figures, and the Impact on People."

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of this excellent article:

HARD TIMES, 1970: FACTS, FIGURES, AND THE IMPACT ON PEOPLE

Already the seven-month-old economic slowdown had lifted unemployment back to the levels of five years ago, chewed into corporate profits and battered the securities markets into their worst slide since World War II. It was not yet officially baptized, but most consumers—and a sour consensus of businessmen, too—had no trouble finding a name. The name was recession.

This week's statistics made it plain enough that things were bad—and getting worse. Reversing an encouraging uptick, industrial production in April slid back, a pattern followed by housing starts. Yet inflation, which the slowdown is intended to halt, roared inexorably on. Eying the evidence, Wisconsin Sen. William Proxmire uneasily demanded: "Aren't we in the worst of all possible worlds?" The AFL-CIO Executive Council was quick to fix the blame. It put out a statement charging that "the Administra-

tion's campaign against inflation has been a complete failure."

Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns, a major architect of the campaign, repeated the litany of the Nixon Administration: "We are traveling a narrow path between inflation and recession, and we do not intend to divert." But many economists and a large part of the rest of the country concluded that Burns had already strayed off the path and in fact was whistling past the graveyard. For recession is also a frame of mind—and in dozens of interviews around the country last week, NEWSWEEK reporters found a troubled, uneasy sense of the deepening slump.

## SPECTER

Indeed, the slump has already hit vast numbers of Americans one way or another—in the form of layoffs, short work weeks, high interest rates, forced salary cuts, sagging stock prices or slow business—and countless more have seen the signs of trouble. Proxmire's question was rising to a good many lips last week, and people were almost casually invoking an even more dire specter. As a Michigan retailer put the issue, "We may be going into a really deep recession or even a depression, with awful unemployment but with a steep inflation at the same time . . . I just don't know what to think."

The tone of the stock market last week was in perfect accord with the eerie calm that had prevailed through the preceding three weeks of almost continuous slippage. Like Winnie-the-pooh dragged downstairs by Christopher Robin, share prices bumped limply for four straight days, falling to a new seven-year low of 685 on the Dow Jones industrial average before bouncing back in a sharp technical rally in the last days' trading. That left the Dow barely above 700, fully 29 per cent below the peak of 985 that was posted on Dec. 3, 1968.

Given the glum drop, drop, drop of Wall Street in recent weeks, few analysts even ventured to guess when or at what levels the market would hit bottom. There was increasing talk that a one- or two-day "selling climax"—a steep dive and abrupt turnaround on massive share volume—would be needed to shake the gloomy torpor and raise hopes for an eventual end to the slump. Not unnaturally, the extent of the slide was causing a few comparisons to be drawn with the events that followed 1929. But hardly anybody seriously believed that anything like the Great Depression of the 1930s could afflict the massive U.S. economy of the '70s. Even so, prices were so obviously unhinged from conventional reasoning that one respected analyst found it worth while to go through an elaborate calculation to prove, to his satisfaction at least, that a plunge of the Dow all the way to 500 "does not seem practical."

With the professionals that edgy, it was little wonder that less knowledgeable citizens were reassuring each other that even depressions can't be all bad. "Hard as things were back then, people helped each other; they loved each other," said a bus driver in Atlanta. "You don't have that any more today."

For the most part, the nation retained its characteristic buoyancy. "I do fear a depression," said a Detroit policeman, "but mostly for the other guy." And truth to tell, the recession so far has been for most a matter of options foregone rather than genuine hardships. A Boston executive has decided not to buy a summer home this year; a San Francisco housewife says, "You use the business about hem lengths as an excuse, but you're obviously not going to get a new wardrobe." Even for those more seriously affected, it isn't really time to worry. A truck driver laid off in Akron because of a wave of wildcat strikes used his unexpected leisure time to put his 27-foot cabin cruiser in shape for the summer.

## GALLUP POLL

For all these gentle ironies, however, the troubled mood was becoming pervasive. In its telephone poll for NEWSWEEK last week (page 30), The Gallup Organization found only 21 per cent of the sampling who felt they were better off economically than they had been in January 1969. Fully 28 per cent said their fortunes had worsened since then; nearly half of the sampling said there had been no change.

And this fretful mood plainly involved issued beyond the purely economic. In probing interviews that lasted as long as two hours, NEWSWEEK correspondents' subjects almost invariably linked their financial worries to a wider scene. "I'm not sure that it's the economy itself that is at fault," said a Los Angeles schoolteacher. "It gets back to a human kind of thing." Sure enough, the worriers cited such disparate crises as the war in Indochina, student rebellion and the declining quality of life. Many had the uneasy sense that the Administration had somehow lost control of events. A Dallas auto worker idled by the permanent closing of his plant made the point bluntly: "This idea that higher taxes and unemployment are gonna make things better just doesn't make sense."

What does make sense? In a special discussion, NEWSWEEK's three economic columnists debate the alternatives. Victims of the slump tell in their own words what recession means.

Ajay McKinstry and his wife, Gertrude ("But I'd rather be called Trudy"), saw the storm clouds gathering long before the rest of the country. But then, McKinstry had a special vantage point: he was an engineer at the environmental lab in North American Rockwell's Los Angeles Division, and Defense Secretary Melvin Laird was announcing massive cutbacks in the Defense budget as early as last summer. "With all those layoffs coming on—because we knew something was going to happen—we started cutting down. Oh, I'd say about eight, nine-months now," said Trudy, a tall, 36-year-old brunette, at her one-story bungalow in Inglewood last week.

"We were hoping for the F-15 (a fighter plane contract which North American lost to McDonnell Douglas). When that didn't go, then Mack figured, well, something's going to happen, so let's start counting our pennies. We paid off our bills, like clothing bills for the children and shoes, and we cleaned out all our charge accounts. While we had it, you know, pay off your bills. And I started sewing things rather than buying."

"On the food, now we're down to \$40 to \$45 a week. You just don't buy three kinds of cookies, you buy one kind. You don't have the onion dip with the treats. By luck, we both quit smoking, too, in September, just because we wanted to quit. And I stopped going to the beauty shop. I enjoy going. But I figured, well, if he can cut back, like not going to all his sports events—like he likes the Rams—I can cut something out on me."

"There's thousands of us doing it. I have friends in worse shape than I am. We help each other out. Now my girl friend, one month she'll call, the next month I'll call and we kind of split phone message units that way. And, we share rides. It's like, you know, somebody else in the same boat with you, you don't feel so bad."

When the storm broke, the McKinstry family was comparatively lucky. "Thousands of aerospace employees were being fired," said Trudy. "But when Mack got the word, they asked him to take a 10 per cent cut in his \$17,000 salary. That hurt too, you know. We sweated out the F-15, and now we're sweating out the B-1 [a contract competition for a new supersonic bomber]. After the B-1, where do we go? There's no severance pay. They gonna close the plant?"

"Mack doesn't talk much, he's not a bab-

bler like I am. But he said something: 'It hurts,' he says. You work. You struggle,' he says, 'you break your back,' he says, 'and they cut you down.'"

Others weren't as ready. "It was sort of like standing in a crowd and getting shot," said Joseph Rogatnick, 53, lately the head of mergers and acquisitions for Hayden, Stone, Inc., in New York. Of the thousands of salesmen and executives laid off on Wall Street in recent months, few held a job that was more sensitive to the stock price landslide and the credit squeeze than Rogatnick's. His business was smashed from all sides. "Two clients would be holding talks based on a swap of stocks, but then one or both of the securities would nosedive, and the deal was off. Other clients were trying to sell themselves on the basis of past earnings growth, but suddenly they'd report an earnings drop because of the squeeze, and those talks were off. The potential sellers in other deals wanted cash—but there was no cash. Everything just fell apart." As the business evaporated, so did Rogatnick's job. "It was simply circumstances, beyond all our control," he said.

"Am I suffering personally? Hell, no," said Fortney Stark. "I have an embarrassment of riches." Stark, the 38-year-old president of Security National Bank in northern California's Contra Costa County, plopped a 2-inch sirloin on the grill outside his lavish ranch house in the hills, drew the cork from a vintage red wine and told NEWSWEEK's Gerald C. Lubenow: "We have been hurt in terms of growth. We're a huge bedroom community, and housing is down 30 to 40 per cent. So large numbers of tradespeople are out of work. Little contractors who used to be looking for street jobs are looking for driveway jobs. Other contractors are selling their equipment. All their equity is wiped out. We're also having a lot of collection problems. We now own an airplane, a Caterpillar tractor, and a growing inventory of cars. Everyone is paying off loans more slowly, and more people are copping out. They declare bankruptcy or just take off. We have a doctor who just got into his Volkswagen bus and went to Mexico. People used to take things like divorce and bankruptcy very seriously. Now everybody does it."

"We've run out of money to lend; there's nothing we can do about it. Every day we have to turn down good loans with good customers because we just don't have the money. It's getting like a butchershop. People have to take a number and wait. We tell them that when we get some money we'll call them—and they very patiently stand in line."

Inflation, of course, is one problem everyone has felt. In five years, the salary of Thomas Moss, a college-educated patrolman with the Oak Park, Mich., police department, has risen from \$6,237 to more than \$13,000. Yet Moss hasn't felt that much difference. "I select and buy all the clothes for myself, my kids and even my wife," says Moss. "The previous year it cost \$350 to get the kids set for school. This year it took \$425."

"I can remember paying \$48 for a suit and leaving the store satisfied that it would last two or three years. Last week I paid \$110 and I don't look beyond six months. It used to be \$5 to see the doctor and now it's \$25. With the reduced buying power, all the raises we get seem hopeless."

And classically, inflation hits hardest at people with fixed incomes. "I knew when I married Phil he wasn't a rich man," said Sadye Eisenberg. That was 12 years ago, when Phil was 58 and Sadye 54 and both of them were starting to think about what some people call the golden years. But now it is \$243.40 a month in social security, \$38.40 a week for a part-time job at Goodwill Industries, about \$40 a month in profit from a small apartment building, and that's all. Phil has had a heart attack, and the

couple sit in their small home in Montgomery, Ala., and talk about it with the stark clarity of the old.

"Phil is 70 years old," Sadye told Newsweek's Stephan Leshner. "None of us lives much beyond 70. You're granted a reprieve for every year you live over 70. But what am I going to do if there's a long, long illness? Or if I have to go into a nursing home, or Phil has to go into a nursing home? Because it's outrageous what these nursing homes cost."

"The doctors don't say, 'I'll come to your home,' and they don't say, 'Come see me in the office,'" said Phil. "They say, 'I'll meet you at the hospital.' It's money in their pockets."

"The doctors have gone out of their minds because of medicare," said Sadye. "They figure we don't have to pay all of it, so why shouldn't they take advantage. But medicare won't pay for medicines. It won't pay for doctor bills unless they're over a certain amount. When Phil went in the hospital, the room was supposed to be \$23 a day, and medicare would pay \$18. All right. By the time he got out of there they had gone up from \$23 to \$27. In just three weeks' time. The doctor, who absolutely did not have to come every day, came twice a day—\$10 in the morning and \$10 at night."

"And do you know what he did?" said Phil. "He'd come in and if he'd see something on my plate, he'd eat it. Then he say 'Good-bye, see you tomorrow.' They take the bacon off your plate and charge you \$10. You think I'm joking?"

"Now, I have got a certain standard of living," said Sadye. "And all of a sudden because of what happened to Phil, I can't afford that. We've got to watch every penny. I'm left out of a lot of things because we can't belong to the country club any more. You never get resigned to these things. I got irritated with my fate. We went to Columbus, Ga., for Mother's Day, and I was out with all my children and everybody ran over to me—and I mean people of the highest quality—and made a big fuss over me. You think that happens here?"

To the hard-core unemployed, the threat of hard times has little meaning. Out of work for the past three years, 24-year-old Curtis Singleton of Oakland, Calif., figures he's down as far as he can go. "I shoot pool, gamble, hustle or somehow I might sell some dope. If I had a job I would have the type of financing I want. Like now, it's a day-to-day survival thing. I can't be hurt any worse than I'm hurt now."

But to the million workers who have joined the ranks of the idle as the jobless rate climbed from 3.5 per cent in December to 4.8 per cent in April, the financial loss can be rending. Burly R. T. Milner had been a union committeeman for fourteen years in the big Ford Motor plant at Dallas, Texas, and he recalled last week that "We all felt pretty secure." Milner himself was making \$10,000 to \$12,000 a year, and just last December he bought a new \$20,000 house in Mesquite. But then, said Milner, "I took sick in February, and then Ford closed down the plant." Milner isn't eligible for layoff benefits, and he won't be able to work until mid-July. "I'm getting \$90 a month from the insurance," he said softly. "But we're in a recession now and it won't be long before it's a real depression and it won't get over until Nixon gets out. I'm gonna try to hold onto the house as long as I can. You know, selling a place you live in can cost you about 14 per cent, and that would take nearly all you had in it. A job? I'll need \$7,000 a year. It's been a long time since I made that little, but I think I could make it on that."

Lucy Mae Dawson lives in an area of special depression all her own—the heart of the black section of Augusta, Ga., that was ravaged last week by rioting, firebombing and

looting. The 43-year-old woman supports her five children on \$4,464 yearly, which she earns as a community organizer for the local anti-poverty program. "About \$60 does the groceries over two weeks—ten years ago that would have done a month," said Mrs. Dawson. "I have to buy soul food to make it. Cabbage, turnips, collards, pig's feet, pig's ears, leg bones—stuff like that. Used to buy fatback, but that's too expensive, so I buy chicken. Then I got to pay \$5.55 a week for the school lunches. They ain't nothing left. I don't know what I'm going to do, by the way—my grocery store burned down during the riots, and I reckon it's going to cost me cab fare to shop for food from now on."

"If they would only think of the poor people. Think of the people with the low incomes. There's people in my neighborhood who can't even afford a twelve-cent box of grits, ain't got no bed to sleep in, six and seven children. They want to stop the shooting and the rioting and the looting—then they have to do something about all this."

Small-business men see recession in frightening close-up. "I would say definitely, we're in difficult times," said Patch Donaldson, idling in his small television sales and service shop in the Los Angeles suburb of El Segundo. Donaldson, a chunky man of 45, opened the shop a year ago and has lost \$18,000 on sales of \$112,000. The day before he talked to Newsweek's John Dotson he had taken in just \$31, about one-third of what he needed to break even. "We are definitely in a recession or a depression," Donaldson concluded. "Whatever you want to call it, it's here."

What that means to a small businessman is that money simply evaporates. "Don't get me wrong," said Donaldson, "there's a lot of people that have money. But they don't want to let go of it. Maybe they expect, with the stock market being down and all, maybe they just expect things to get worse instead of better."

"I go into homes every day now and they say, 'Well, we don't have the money today; we'll pay you Friday.' I got a drawer full of them there that are gonna pay me Friday. These are not strangers, man; these are customers that have paid you just like that. You're having to send out two or three, sometimes four duns before you start getting money back from these people."

Since he is forced to play banker to his customers, Donaldson tries to repeat the process with his own creditors. "I'm taking some of the bills that are due and payable, and that I know will wait a month or two months or three months, and I'm just not paying them," he said. "Some of them have been there four months. I'm talking about things like advertising and some of the other areas where people are not pressing for the money—notes owed to private individuals, who have more or less agreed to wait."

But the creditors, in turn, have problems of their own. "Even the big corporations like RCA are not letting anyone get over 30 days behind," Donaldson said. "Used to be they would send you a thing stating you owed them so much money. Now they get on this telephone and call you. You better believe it. My other supplier, you have to pay him every week. He comes by every week to pick up his check."

The ruthless result of economic pinches is that the big fish, who have readier access to life-giving credit, swallow up the small. Tom Gentry, a San Francisco-based home developer with sales running well over \$10 million, is hardly tiny. But last week, caught by the credit squeeze in the middle of several projects, Gentry conceded that he would "probably be acquired. We'll have to be . . . there doesn't seem to be any other way out. Several large firms are already baiting us with capital. Everybody," added Gentry with vehemence, "is so busy controlling

interest rates and everything else that they forget the little guy has problems too."

To most consumers, the economists' current worries over this growing lack of liquidity in the financial structure are pure abstraction. But to Frederick R. Kaimer, a labor-relations executive with General Electric Co. in Chicago, liquidity problems are as near as next fall, when his daughter is slated to begin college.

"Take the stock market," he said. "Many of us have taken such a beating that we can't get out. The market is so low, we'd be foolish to get out. And this means you don't have those dollars available to help send a child to college. You don't have the sort of freedom you've waited for, to do all the things you've wanted to do all your life."

"I received a \$10,000 check from Reader's Digest and after the government and state took its share, and after I bought a case of Scotch for a friend to show my largesse, I had about \$5,000 left," reports Buffalo author Paul Martin. The check was for a condensed version of his best-selling novel, "Heartsblood." "I was inundated with calls from my broker friends who said that then (last June) was the time to buy. They were only too happy to help me make my money grow. Now, I would say that I have almost enough left for a year's subscription to the Reader's Digest."

"The broker calls me and says he's buying a huge block of this for his mother and why didn't I come in on it," said a Boston public-relations executive too embarrassed to permit the use of his name. "So I did—100 shares of Four Seasons (Nursing Centers of America) at \$80.38. It's now under \$10 a share, and the Securities and Exchange Commission has stopped the trading. The broker himself is bleeding at both ears and won't call me. I call him to ask how it's doing, and he's so embarrassed to talk to me that he stutters. He was a brash, fast-talker before this happened. I'm through with tips. No more tips."

"No, I don't think Four Seasons is grounded," said Jack L. Clark, chairman of the company in Oklahoma City. "We've experienced some adversity due to tremendous changes in economic conditions—dramatic increases in labor cost and a very tight money market. But we're very stable . . . we're still growing. Our growth rate will depend on the availability of long-term financing."

"The stock market is just a superficial thing," said Birny Mason Jr., the soft-spoken chairman of giant Union Carbide Corp. "I don't think its behavior justifies all this gloom and doom. Why be pessimistic about stocks? This is the healthiest thing I've seen yet. I don't like to see the equities of strong companies go down, but if that's the price we have to pay to flush all this [speculative] stuff down the drain, then OK."

"Frankly, I would rather be thoughtful about the current scene than just yak about it . . . everybody seems to feel we have to engage in rhetoric."

"I guess I don't want a depression," said frizzy-haired college senior Ralph Dishowitz in New York, "because I wouldn't have time to be active against the war if I had to worry about eating."

Why do people's economic worries seem to involve so many peripheral issues these days—the discontent of the young, the war in Indochina, the threat of pollution? Sidney Rolfe, a consulting economist, author, teacher and investor, thinks the answer lies in a subtle shifting of economic thought. "Economists have calibrated their victories in terms of such things as per-capita growth in gross national product," he said. "Now we are changing what we are going to measure. Our resources are limited. We are discovering that we have to decide what we want most, and this is the guts of the argu-

ment in the United States. We can no longer say, "What's good for the GNP is good for the United States."

"What we're really arguing about is the quality of life. The cities are degenerating before our eyes. Our lakes and rivers are polluted; we can't breathe the air. We've never had a situation like this, where we have superimposed the quality of life onto economic concerns. There is a lot of soul-searching going on."

What can people do about hard times? For most, affluence is so well-founded that austerity is more novelty than hardship. "When I look at a dress that costs \$40 and I can make it for \$2.50, I sew," said Mrs. Kay Johnson, 35, of Marlboro, Mass., whose husband earns about \$15,000 a year. "I used to go into a supermarket with the feeling I was in control. Now the sales and specials dictate what I purchase." The Johnsons have cut back on entertaining and dine out far less frequently, and Mrs. Johnson says she is "not friends with my meat man any more. One thing I don't buy there is veal cutlets. I started to recently and they were \$2.49 a pound. I said to my meat man, 'This is ridiculous. What are you doing, marking them up 10 cents a week?' And sure enough, next week they were \$2.59 a pound. I've noticed he smiles a lot."

"The other day, when I was getting new tires for the station wagon," said Milton Horowitz, a 43-year-old New York psychiatrist, "I must have gone around to ten places to try to find the cheapest ones. It's ridiculous with our high income that we should be forced to little dodges like this. One really funny thing, I have found that suits made by my English tailor in London now cost less than suits hanging on the rack at Barney's. That incredible. So my wife bought her winter wardrobe in Florence last year and we're going to buy the kids' school clothes in London."

"I get so mad when I read about a man who makes \$15,000 a year and his wife has 22 pairs of shoes and they can't make ends meet," said Nancy Jacobs, an attractive housewife who lives in the most expensive section of Santa Monica, Calif., with her two small children and a husband who makes somewhat more than \$15,000 a year. But the Jacobses have made do-it-yourself a way of life. "If I can fix my plumbing, that's better than calling somebody," she said. "I believe they should get this pay, but on the other hand when it comes down to paying \$15 for that half hour of work, you think twice."

"The color TV really needs a readjustment, and I keep saying I'm going to take the back off some day. We've done pretty well with it. We put in our own earplugs. And I wanted an extra telephone outlet so I wired my own. It took me all day."

"Around here people will tend to cut back on household help a bit, and in their own personal expenses, before they get too obvious," said Mrs. Janet Baxter, a 42-year-old Marin County, Calif., housewife whose banker-husband obviously brings home a superior side of bacon. "People are shopping at the Co-op, having fewer big parties, not going to the city as often. Our church, the First Presbyterian in San Anselmo, is in awful straits. They shut off the heat the first day of spring and it was like going to a cathedral in Europe." The Baxters, influenced by the deprivations of the stock market, are drinking \$4-a-gallon California wine instead of their accustomed French wines, and have decided to forgo their planned purchase of a vacation home on the sea. "People are reminiscing," Mrs. Baxter added, "about what their fathers did in the Depression, discussing whether they think they could hold on."

"There's no way any of us can hold on more than a few years," said Bill Damisch, 40, who farms 314 acres of corn and soybeans

10 miles outside Elgin, Ill. In fact, Damisch is so pessimistic about farming that he is working on fifteen more hours of education credits so that he can teach history full-time when he is forced from the land. "Sure, every year the value of my land goes up on paper. The speculators want it," he said. "But the interest rate from the Production Credit Association is 9½ percent—just last year it was 8. Fertilizer, taxes, equipment—everything is up. Now look at the other side. Last year I averaged 97 cents a bushel on shelled corn, \$1.11 the year before and \$1.43 a bushel when I started out with my dad in 1952. Soybeans. Same thing." Damisch's net income from the farm in 1969 was just \$2,089, compared with \$6,347 five years earlier. "Christ, my kids can't be farmers, there's no way. I don't know if we're headed for a depression. But we've got just what Alexander Hamilton wanted—a government of the rich, by the rich and for the rich."

If Damisch loses his farm, he will walk away with training for a new profession and a sizable lump of cash in his jeans. Not so for Willie Walls, a strapping black man who quit his job and left his wife and four kids in Detroit last November to look for work in Chicago. Despite his Teamsters card, Walls has held only one job since then—but he is sure enough of his ultimate worth that he left it because of its long hours and low pay. "I'll take any temporary job now to keep from begging, but I'm not going to take a \$2- or \$2.50-an-hour job permanent any more," Walls said. "A truck driver—I love that kind of work. Four-fifty an hour—union scale—I could get by with a little less. But I want to live comfortable, that's what I want. I want to be respected as a man and treated as a man. I'm 41 years old now. I don't want to lay down and dream or can't sleep half the night thinking about how I'm going to get my next dollar. I want to be able to know I have a secure job, and lay down where I can get up in the morning and go out and fulfill my duties. A decent living, that's what I'm looking for. I hope things get better but I can't plan on things now."

Nobody can plan securely: indeed, sweeping and unwelcome change is the order of the day. "We're going to have chaos," said Albert McCoy, 44, a former University of Montana fullback who has been the \$16,000-a-year mayor of Aurora, Ill., since 1965. "We have 400 city employees—half of them police and firemen and the policemen have gone up from a \$5,200-a-year start when I took office, to \$9,000, and \$11,000 after five years. You keep increasing salaries and property taxes start going up."

"I can see the day coming when we'll have a real taxpayers' revolt. I can see the signs here in Aurora—and everywhere. The voters just turned us down flat on a \$12 million 'Decade of Progress' referendum—even though in the long run it would have saved us money. It used to be that this town always—and I mean always—supported school-bond or tax-rate referendums 100 percent. But in the last three years, they have been defeated time and time again."

"Our police and firemen . . . there is organizing being done by some of the biggest unions in the country. I personally don't feel that a city employee who takes an oath of office when he is hired should be able to strike, but I do believe they should have collective bargaining."

"I'm convinced that after the amount of college work that I've done, I should be worth as much to the community as a plumber is," said Los Angeles schoolteacher Tash Ruman Sogg, a 47-year-old divorcee who played an active role in a month-long strike by about half of the Los Angeles teaching force—a strike that ended with no new pay increase last week. "The main thing that personally worries me is a son who is turning 18 in June, and he does have long

hair and bare feet. I was concerned that he would not be a contributing member of society but rather a parasite. I've been rather lucky there—he's been willing to work."

"Ten years ago strikes up here were unheard of," said George Anderson, a village merchant in Northport in northern Michigan. But the construction trades here have shut down the school addition and construction in the marina. The worst, though, is the hospital. They couldn't find mortgage anywhere and finally located a broker in Florida. They paid his transportation, somehow gave him a finder's fee of \$60,000, and he skipped clear to South America. You read it happening in the cities, but not up here in the country where people have faith in each other."

"Who's to blame? The war," said California banker Fortney Stark, an antiwar activist who has taken strong positions on a number of social issues and raised hackles at the U.S. Treasury by advising customers that U.S. Savings Bonds were poor investments. "There are just so many dollars," he said, "and as long as the war is on we'll never be able to get at any of our real problems . . . There's a revolution brewing, and it's a revolution Agnew doesn't recognize. We've only got two choices: stop the war, or have more inflation, tremendous unemployment and some kind of crisis."

"Nixon has almost declared himself out," said William B. Johnson, chief executive of the huge conglomerate, Illinois Central Industries. "He said the economy would have to respond to his measures in its own way. Since then we've been in an Alice-in-Wonderland world, where it's patriotic to have point where some political leader will come along and say, 'Let's get this country moving again!'"

"Personally," said George Scharffenberger, president of City Investing Co. in New York, rendering one of the kinder views of Administration policy, "I feel that the steps taken by Mr. Nixon, while well-intended, are basically not working."

"To a considerable extent," said a high official in Washington, "the behavior of both the stock and bond markets reflect a tremendous uncertainty—the very uncertainty which [Federal Reserve Board chairman] Arthur Burns said last year we had to create if we were going to control inflation . . . We are passing through the toughest period right now, the cost-push, the 'winter of our discontent,' and it will take a couple more months until the cost pressures relent."

"Politically, we won't be seeing the results of this discontent until the period between July and the November election . . . What hurts the Republicans is not people out of jobs, but the related things—the stock-market decline and the squeeze on small business."

Perhaps the government's medicine was working; perhaps too it would exact no political toll next November. For the moment, people were perceiving that hard times are here, as a reality for some and a threat for all. Characteristically, however, the dominant note of apprehension was softened by optimism. "I voted for the Nixon Administration," conceded Anthony De Losa, an Italian immigrant and partner in his family-owned grocery store in the Boston suburb of Waltham. "I had faith in them, and I still have some. I think there'll be some improvements somewhere—somehow. I have hopes. I don't think this country's going to the dogs, even though it's already gone a lot farther than I thought it would go."

"I've about hit the bottom of the barrel, man; can't go any deeper," said TV store owner Patch Donaldson. But, for reasons curiously blending cynicism and plain faith, he looks for improvement. "Around election time, you know," he said. "I don't know if this is the thing to say, but I guess in all

Administrations it's the truth. It seems like when we get nearer to election time, things seem to improve for some reason or other.

"Me personally, I can survive indefinitely, one way or another. I can make a million as a TV technician . . . Man, where are you without faith? There's no way of keeping a country like this down, no way in the world. I say things are lousy right now, but they'll get better."

#### HOW THE SLUMP LOOKS TO THREE EXPERTS

Churning into the second half of 1970, the U.S. economy presents a confusing outlook of recession blended with inflation—plus assorted ominous signs of crash and panic. What's going wrong, how serious is the ailment and how can it be fixed? Newsweek put the questions to its three economic columnists—Milton Friedman, leader of the increasingly influential monetarist school of economics; Paul A. Samuelson, one of the foremost neo-Keynesians, and Henry Wallich, senior consultant to the U.S. Treasury. Their varying views:

1. How closely is the economy following the Administration's "game plan"?

Samuelson: The Nixon team underestimated both the rise in unemployment and the extent of price inflation so far in 1970. What else is new? However, as everyone had expected, the Federal Reserve Board has been easing money and credit since January, and the budget has become more expansionary. So the last half of 1970 should show a resumption of real growth—as both Washington and everyone else has expected.

Wallich: The economy is on track, but a little behind schedule; the slowdown has been mild, and growth seems about to resume. But getting control of inflation is taking longer than expected, and unemployment may go above the range of 4.5 per cent to 5 per cent. This is serious—much more needs to be done to extend and broaden unemployment benefits. The temporary loss of output resulting from unemployment is far less important.

Friedman: So far, the predictions have been largely borne out. But I believe that the "standard forecast" is somewhat too optimistic for the rest of this year. I doubt that an upturn will come before the third or fourth quarter at the earliest. Meanwhile, the best bet is that the recession will continue to be rather mild.

2. But John Kenneth Galbraith has said that we are reliving the dismal history of 1929. Do you think the stock market will keep falling? If it does, will there be another Great Depression?

Wallich: Professor Galbraith's statements always make good reading, but this one doesn't make good sense. After 1929, the Dow Jones industrial average dropped by about 90 per cent. I see nothing of the sort ahead. And even if the stock market suffered further reverses, the economy still would not be decisively affected.

Friedman: The stock crash in 1929 was a momentous event, but it did not produce the Great Depression and it was not a major factor in the Depression's severity. A sharp but not unprecedented contraction was converted into a catastrophe by bad monetary policy—one that permitted the quantity of money to decline by one-third from 1929 to 1933.

Whatever happens to the stock market, it cannot lead to a great depression unless it produces or is accompanied by a monetary collapse. And with present institutions and present understanding, that is well-nigh impossible.

Samuelson: Dr. Galbraith has been predicting a stock-market crash for fifteen years. I suppose, like Roger Babson in the 1920s, he's got to be right some day. But remember:

in our economy, the market is the tail—and the tail does not wag the dog, which is gross national product. The decline has cut a quarter of a trillion dollars from people's net worth and that will be a depressant, but not a major one, on consumption and investment spending.

3. Many economists are worried about the liquidity of the economy. What are the chances of a money panic?

Friedman: Next to none—in the strict historical meaning of the term. Past panics involved widespread bank failures, runs on banks and serious disturbances with the payments process. Under current circumstances, some securities firms and other companies could fail, but there is no way they could trigger widespread financial difficulties.

There is some danger that the Fed might react to this wave of apprehension by rapidly expanding the money supply, thus touching off a new wave of inflation many months later. But the Fed made precisely this mistake in 1967, and I do not believe it will be repeated.

Wallich: Aside from some unforeseeable wave of bankruptcies that could conceivably be triggered by past over speculation, there is no excuse for hysteria. A liquidity crisis is a scarier prospect for the market than for the Fed, since the Fed has its hand on the spigot. It is true, however, that any added liquidity gushing into the economy would be hard to mop up again.

Samuelson: The war in Indochina is creating a mental sickness in the whole American society, and this spreads into economic dreads—both on Wall Street and Main Street. Whatever they tell the Gallup poll, people fear viscerally that the President is not cutting our losses in Asia fast enough.

So don't laugh off panic as mere hysteria. To help ward off further disaster, the Fed should prudently let the money supply grow. To crusade against inflation at the risk of a general liquidity crisis is a notion that would only occur to an overage New York banker.

4. Is there any danger of a deep recession this year?

Samuelson: Not on present evidence. But economists are fallible, and Washington should not play with fire.

Friedman: It is not at all unlikely that the recession could become more severe, approaching the 1957-58 pattern. But it should be recalled that even that downturn was extremely mild compared with many of the earlier recessions, especially before World War II. Our standards and tolerances have become more exacting.

Wallich: One could imagine scenarios that could lead to a deep recession, but it seems very improbable. Inflation seems much the more likely threat.

5. If the economy turns up in the second half, does it make any sense to predict that the rate of inflation will fall back to 4 per cent or less?

Friedman: Yes, it does. Even after the upturn, there will still be a gap between the economy's potential output and its actual output, and this gap will put downward pressure on prices and wage increases. Then too, price movements have a great deal of inertia thanks to inflationary expectations. Just as it took a long time for the economic slowdown to begin to affect price increases, so the tapering off will continue after the economy starts to pick up.

Wallich: I agree. I might add that inflation last year was boosted by rising food prices, which now look like they are leveling off. And when the recovery comes, we are entitled to expect high productivity gains—something that was almost wholly lacking last year.

Samuelson: I don't think so. To conquer inflation without creating more than a mini-recession—as the Nixon economists claim they are doing—would involve more than the "hat trick." It would be a "rope trick"

that only the inexperienced and gullible will believe in.

6. Can the United States live with a long-term inflation rate of 4 per cent or more? If Brazil can adjust to permanent inflation, why can't we?

Friedman: I can live with one arm, but I would rather have two. The U.S. can live with any amount of inflation, provided it is permitted to be open and aboveboard and is not repressed by widespread wage and price controls. But the economy—and the social and political structure as well—will be far healthier if inflation is avoided. Brazil is hardly an impressive endorsement of inflation in these respects.

Wallich: Brazil hasn't adjusted; it has careened wildly from low inflation to high inflation and back again. Adjustment to inflation is always imperfect. As soon as you adjust the wage increases of 4 per cent, unions will ask for 7 per cent. Meanwhile, the uncertainty and the widespread fear of not keeping up with inflation will act as a continuing drag.

Samuelson: Willy-nilly, I think we will have to live with 4 per cent inflation for some time. We can do so without irreparable distortions and precipitous accelerations, provided (a) that the other mixed economies experience about the same rate of creeping prices, and (b) that we follow tax-and-money policies that will convince people that uncontrolled inflation is not in the cards.

7. What economic policies would you favor now?

Wallich: Present policies are about right, and will work if pursued long enough. We should give them the time they need. This may make the political people nervous, but it is already too late for any policy switches to have much effect before the elections.

Friedman: I would favor continuation of a moderately expansive monetary policy and restraint in government spending. I would eliminate legal ceilings on interest rates, the interest equalization tax and all restrictions on foreign lending and foreign investments. I would abandon quotas on imports and also attempts to get other countries to impose "voluntary" restrictions on their exports. In short, I recommend patience with present monetary and fiscal policies and greater freedom of trade.

Samuelson: Five years of war-induced inflation cannot be cured in one year, or even a few years. Congress should act to ensure that unemployment doesn't rise above the 5 per cent level. The Fed should let money grow enough to keep interest rates from rising several notches above the recent record levels. But the Fed should also be prepared to vary that growth rate in pursuit of economic stability.

8. Would you favor wage-price guideposts, or outright wage-price controls?

Friedman: I am strongly opposed to both guidelines and controls. They have been tried many times and have never yet worked. In failing, they have just distorted the economy and spread misinformation about the causes of inflation. Inflation is made in Washington, and nowhere else. But now the Johnson "new economists" are telling the Nixon Administration: "We failed with guidelines—why shouldn't you?"

Samuelson: A new Presidential price-wage program of guideposts, aiming at reducing the rate of inflation from, say, 4 to 3 per cent, could help reinforce fiscal and monetary policy. It's no substitute for those policies, however.

I'd save outright wage-price controls for a greater emergency—as, for example, if President Nixon's policies lead to a further escalation of the Asian debacle and to crisis in the domestic economy.

Wallich: I do not favor a return to the old guideposts, though I thought they had some merit in their day. At present rates of

inflation, it is almost impossible for government to determine fair guideposts, and it is quite impossible to administer them.

I do not favor outright controls under the conditions I expect. But in the unlikely event that present policies should fail over the next twelve months, or if they should be abandoned prematurely, the case would have to be reopened.

#### CYRUS EATON CALLS FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION TO CORRECT OUR ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern over the economy and the failure of the Nixon administration to act in the face of this crisis.

Many business leaders around the country share this deep concern over our deteriorating economy. Foremost among these is a well-known industrialist from Cleveland, Ohio—Cyrus Eaton. Mr. Eaton's long and highly-respected business career gives him an unusual and deep insight into the economy. Mr. Eaton sent me a telegram last week, following my letter to President Nixon concerning the economy.

Mr. Eaton has a number of important suggestions to make concerning our economy and I hope the Members of the House will look at them closely.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of the telegram from Mr. Eaton and a copy of my letter to President Nixon:

CLEVELAND, OHIO,  
May 22, 1970.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

You have done a great service in urging the President to meet with your committee on the economic crises facing the Nation. May I suggest the following steps be taken to avoid economic catastrophe: Reduce money rates, reduce margin requirements to 50 percent, end war in Vietnam forthwith, create immediately an organization the equivalent of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to have funds to loan to banks and corporations.

CYRUS EATON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,  
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1970.

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Many Members of the Banking and Currency Committee are deeply concerned by the apparent inaction on the part of the Federal Government in the face of a mounting economic crisis.

The continued lack of vigorous action is leading to a severe crisis of confidence in the ability of the Federal Government to deal with the dual problems of inflation and recession. This lack of confidence undoubtedly accounts for the downward plunge of the stock market. All of the economic indicators make it obvious that we cannot long endure a passive attitude by the Federal Government.

Last December, the Banking and Currency Committee originated legislation to provide you with standby authority to control all aspects of credit, including the level of interest rates, down payments, and the allocation of available loan funds. This eventually became Public Law 91-151, which was signed by

you on December 23, 1969. The credit control authority was given to you on a "standby" basis with the anticipation that you would trigger the authority immediately when economic conditions deteriorated.

We are deeply concerned that this authority has not been used despite rising unemployment, continued high interest rates, a falling stock market, and a totally-depressed housing industry. The Banking and Currency Committee, and the Congress, are in a position of having passed a law which the Executive Branch fails to carry out despite obvious need. Such a situation creates a serious crisis between the Executive and the Legislative branches, and raises basic questions on the scope and nature of future Congressional action to alleviate the current chaotic economic conditions.

In addition to Public Law 91-151, there have been other expressions of Congressional intent for the Administration to take vigorous action to lower interest rates and provide general economic stability. All appear to have fallen on deaf ears.

Mr. President, I think I speak for the overwhelming majority of the Banking and Currency Committee when I say that we are willing to give you any legislative tools which you feel are needed to bring the current economic situation under control. In light of your failure to carry out our earlier actions, however, many of us are puzzled as to your intentions and desires in this area. Many of us in the Congress feel an urgent need for action which will restore economic stability and renew confidence in our entire economic system.

But such action on the part of the Congress is difficult if the Executive Branch is determined not to carry forward the programs and not to use the weapons which are provided through legislation. It is important that areas of doubt about the Administration's intentions be cleared up before further legislative steps are attempted.

Therefore, I hereby urge and respectfully request that you permit the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives to meet with you concerning the economic crisis facing the nation. Such a meeting, I am convinced, would do much to clear the air and provide a solid background on which the Committee could take action in the remaining days of the 91st Congress. Such a meeting also, I am convinced, would aid in restoring confidence and making it plain that the legislative and executive branches are willing to act and not allow the U.S. economy to go down the drain.

Mr. President, I hope that you will act favorably on this request at your earliest possible convenience.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,  
Chairman.

CARLETON J. KING

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

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, once in a while it becomes possible for a Member of this body to spread upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his high regard for a colleague. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to remark the extraordinary devotion to this Nation and to its ideals of our colleague, the gentleman from New York, CARLETON J. KING. I have known him for many years during a distinguished career as a lawyer and district attorney. I am aware of the splendid reputation he enjoyed in the District Attorney's Association of the State of New York. His career in this House has been devoted to the enhance-

ment of American prestige abroad and its patriotic and spiritual sustenance at home. I, as past national commander of the American Legion, have always noted his keen interest and solicitude for veterans of our wars. His record displays a complete solidarity with veterans' programs and veteran legislation. I am aware that no tag belongs to any Congressman, least of all to the gentleman from New York, CARLETON J. KING. The problems of his district and the problems of this country are his problems whether they stem from America's leadership role in the world or from matters touching the laboring man or matters touching the veteran. However, if it were possible, I suppose the title that would be most fitting to CARLETON KING is that he is a soldier's Congressman and the veteran's friend.

I was more than delighted to read an editorial comment from the Greenville Sentinel, edited by McArthur Manchester, on our friend, which is laudatory of him but which deals deeply with subjects involving the Nation. The writer does so eloquently and intelligently. It must be made a matter of record so that all Members of the House can enjoy it, be educated by it and derive benefit for their constituents from it.

The editorial follows:

IS THIS CONSERVATISM?

It was but a matter of hours after Carleton J. King of Saratoga had been designated to succeed himself as a Member of Congress representing the 30th Congressional District before the opposition began whooping it up with all sorts of comment aimed at downgrading his political value to the nation and his constituents. High on the list of his critics is the "conservatism" which his opponents point out as not in tune with the times. For those who know the Congressman and his record this type of attack far outstrips the laughs ignited by Jackie Gleason's "Honeymooners." Yet, any candidate is fair game in an election year so we must expect to see and hear many wild tales and statements.

Now let's turn to Congressman King's so-called conservatism. Though he gives full support to American troops in Vietnam he wants them out of that country as soon as possible with honor. He has so informed Richard Nixon. He believes there is a limit to which this country can afford to kill off American youth in support of antiquated agreements and treaties. He believes Congress should take a new hard look at some of the foreign nations we supply, protect and practically bathe with dollars provided by the taxpayers of the United States. Is this being conservative?

The Congressman from Saratoga believes measures should be invoked restricting Federal interference with private enterprise. Over the years the tentacles of the national government have clawed the small and large businessman to the point where most agree life would be much more comfortable and satisfying as an employee of the government and not risking hard earned capital investment only to be badgered by the "men from Uncle." Is this conservatism?

Carleton King is recognized by veterans of military service as a real friend. He has consistently fought for their rights in the halls of Congress. On occasions it has been his pleasure and privilege to tip the Congressional scales in favor of the men and women who gambled their life on far off battlefields and today the resultant legislation and benefits are a tribute to him as the Congressman who cares. Is this conservatism?

His opponents say he should spend more time in his Congressional District. Mr. King believes he's being paid to represent his people in Washington and, unlike a lot of others in the Capitol, he has an enviable attendance record. He's not out playing golf on taxpayer time; he's not lapping up cocktails with the social set when the House roll call is sounded. He's always available and just a phone call or letter away. Best of all, people of his District get action on any reasonable request. Is this conservatism?

This newspaper just happens to know what Carleton King has done for many people who have no connections or personal influence to draw upon in time of need or desperation. Alerted to their situation he has acted with a rare dignity of understanding and utilized the power of his office to cut red tape, government and boondoggling despite the time and effort involved on his part. It just happens a number of these people are readers of this newspaper and you can bet your bottom dollar they favor his return to Washington! They know the man for what he is! Again we ask, is this conservatism?

As for us, if we thought Carleton King unworthy to represent his people in the Congress we'd gladly drive the political dagger in his back. As it stands we'll be number one in the voting booth to pull that lever to return him to Washington realizing his heart, ambitions and actions are tuned in to the welfare of America, its people and particularly his constituents of the 30th Congressional District. Is this conservatism? If so we'll sleep well realizing we're just damn conservative!

#### RESULTS OF ATTACKS ON ENEMY SANCTUARIES

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks ago Allied forces launched attacks to clean out major enemy sanctuaries on the Cambodia-Vietnam border. Our purpose was not to occupy the sanctuary areas, but to drive out enemy forces and destroy their bases and supplies.

Now, after 3 weeks, it is clear that the enemy has been struck a devastating blow.

We have captured nearly 8 million rounds of ammunition for machineguns, rifles, and small arms that will not be fired at our servicemen and our allies.

We have captured nearly 45,000 mortar and rocket rounds that cannot now go ripping into Saigon and into American and South Vietnamese bases.

We have captured more than 130,000 anti-aircraft rounds that cannot now be fired at our planes.

We have captured more than 9 million pounds of rice—enough to feed for 5 months the North Vietnamese forces estimated to be in Cambodia at the start of the operation.

We have destroyed more than 6,600 bunkers and military installations.

We have seized 11,000 individual weapons and more than 1,800 big, crew-served weapons—enough to equip 20 North Vietnamese infantry battalions.

In addition, the enemy has taken a disastrous loss in manpower. As of the latest report, 8,044 of the enemy had been killed and 1,773 captured, about one-fourth of the forces the enemy was estimated to have in the area.

We have disrupted the enemy's logistics network and lines of communication. We have struck a heavy blow at his offensive capability.

There can be no doubt now that the results of this operation will reinsure the President's announced withdrawal and Vietnamization programs and will hasten the day when all American forces can return home.

#### A PROPOSAL FOR EFFECTIVE ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, in the past several months there has been a proliferation of Federal programs designed to combat the pollution of our environment. The list of all Federal programs dealing with some aspect of environmental pollution now consumes 75 pages and includes activities of over 100 Federal agencies. It thus comes as no surprise that it has been difficult to evaluate the overall success of antipollution efforts.

The public has heard a constant stream of claims of merit for various antipollution projects, but like the Congress, the public finds it difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of those projects.

Because of the need for more effective tools to assist in evaluating the effectiveness of antipollution efforts, I have introduced a bill which expands the role of the Environmental Science Services Administration—ESSA—in this area.

My bill would require ESSA to make a daily determination at each Weather Bureau office as to the extent of air and water pollution in the area covered by that office. ESSA would be required to release this data to the public through the newspapers and radio and television stations in the area covered by each Weather Bureau office.

ESSA is also directed to establish an Environmental Quality Index. This Index will combine various indices used in monitoring the environment into one overall index which could become a powerful implement in developing priorities among the several programs affecting the environment.

The potential value of the Environmental Quality Index is great. Just as the management of our Nation's economic affairs are aided by a variety of indices which provide a picture of the Nation's economic health, the management of antipollution efforts will be enhanced by the use of the Environmental Quality Index.

My bill provides for the regular dissemination of the Environmental Quality Index to the public so that all citizens can judge for themselves the effectiveness of antipollution efforts going on in their areas.

Because of the vast number of agencies dealing with the environment, we must have one central depository to which anyone who is in need of environmental data can go. To meet this need, I have proposed that ESSA serve as a depository for all environmental data compiled anywhere within the Federal Government. In addition, when feasible,

ESSA will gather environmental data from the State and local governments. In order to aid both scholars and the average citizen interested in environmental data, ESSA will be required to make this information available on request and at no cost to the person desiring the information.

The programs contained in my bill will provide the mechanism needed by Congress, citizens and scholars, to make accurate assessments of the effectiveness of the various approaches available to combat pollution. The small expense created by the programs contained in this bill will be more than offset by savings which will come from optimum employment of antipollution resources.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE DECEPTION ON MIRV DEPLOYMENT

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon Administration's already serious credibility gap has been greatly aggravated by yesterday's discovery by CBS News that the administration has already begun to deploy MIRV warheads. That credibility gap is certain to extend to Vienna, where we are currently conducting crucial negotiations with the Soviet Union in an effort to reach a mutual agreement to limit strategic arms.

Since the SALT talks with the Russians became a serious possibility in 1968, the Congress has been concerned about the schedule for development, testing and deployment of the MIRV system given the serious implications of the system for the progress of the talks. The Congress has received consistent reports and assurances that MIRV weapons would not be deployed until testing was complete, and that the tests were scheduled to be completed in about July, 1970. Last March, Secretary of the Air Force Seamans announced in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee that deployment would begin at the end of June. His exact words, according to press reports:

"After a number of delays and stretch-outs we will start fielding the Minuteman III in June."

Now, in May, we learn that the military has not only already "started to field" the MIRVs, but that MIRV warheads are in place and ready to fire in at least one major missile site.

To justify this development, Pentagon officials, and even some of our own colleagues on the Armed Services Committees, are engaging in semantic games. They are claiming that references to June deployment, in Pentagonese, mean the time at which a full squadron of 50 or so Minuteman III's would be ready to fire in combat.

To me, and I daresay to the bulk of the American public, "start fielding" means exactly that—"start putting multiple warheads into place." It does not mean "have a full squadron ready to fire." If that is what the Pentagon meant, that is what it should have said. But it did not, and I regard that as a severe breach by the military and by this ad-



ministration of its pledge to communicate truthfully and openly with the Congress and the public, especially on matters of such momentous importance.

How can this administration hope or expect to obtain and hold the confidence of our young people, who are already distrustful of our entire system of government, when it continues to deceive the public so blatantly?

Senator EDWARD BROOKE, a member of the administration's party and an outspoken critic of MIRV deployment, is quoted as regarding this development as "not the end of the game, but an inching up to the threshold" with regard to the SALT talks.

The opportunity still exists—

an aide is quoted as saying on the Senator's behalf—  
for SALT to prevent a dangerous MIRV deployment.

I certainly hope that assessment is correct. But I regard this breach of faith as much more serious than that, not only for the future of the SALT negotiations, but also for its effect on national public opinion which is already so severely polarized on issues of war and peace. At best, it seems to me, this development is a clear indication of this administration's unwillingness or inability to clamp a lid on the military's burgeoning nuclear technology and blind determination to retain an unrealistically large margin of strategic superiority.

#### LAW OF THE LAND AND THE WAR POWER

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post, Mr. Merlo J. Pusey has written a column which clearly articulates the complex differences between the various proposals to limit the war in Indochina which are presently pending in the Senate.

In addition, Mr. Pusey addresses himself to the broader question of the power to make war under the Constitution in his comments on a resolution introduced by Senator PERCY of Illinois. The resolution expresses "the sense of the Senate that the President should not utilize the Armed Forces of the United States in intervention abroad for any combat activity without the express consent of the Congress except where the use of such force is necessary pending congressional approval, to respond to a clear and direct attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or upon forces of the United States that are lawfully deployed pursuant to a treaty or other specific congressional authorization."

Mr. Pusey goes on to ask why the Senator chose "to offer only a sense of the Senate resolution which the President could ignore? The policy he has stated is the law of the land, and Congress will have to find ways of getting it respected at the White House if our democracy is to be saved."

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, along with 15

colleagues, I introduced a bill which would make such a policy the law of the land. Because of widespread interest in the subject, I include Mr. Pusey's article and Senator PERCY's resolution and my bill at this point in the RECORD:

#### LAW OF THE LAND AND THE WAR POWER (By Merlo J. Pusey)

Much of the confusion over limiting funds for the war in Southeast Asia results from the fact that no consensus has yet emerged as to what Congress should do. There is strong sentiment behind the Cooper-Church amendment forbidding further incursions into Cambodia which comes to a vote today, but it does not fully satisfy the growing antiwar sentiment in Congress. Behind it are the McGovern-Hatfield amendment fixing a date for withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, the Mathias resolution repealing congressional approval of the war, the Percy resolution designed to forbid future use of troops abroad without the consent of Congress and a number of others.

It seems highly probable that the Cooper-Church amendment will be adopted in some form. With the modification in language so as to indicate that the policy it would write into the law is "in concert" with the President's announced aim of getting the troops out of Cambodia by July 1, no solid ground is left for White House opposition.

It is beside the point to say that passage of the amendment would indicate a lack of faith in the President's pledge. It would indicate only the determination of Congress to participate in the making of policies involving the lives of citizens. Equally far-fetched is the argument that the amendment might prevent the President from taking action necessary to protect American troops. The President has ample authority as Commander in Chief to repel any attack upon our armed forces, without waiting for Congress to act. The Cooper-Church amendment would say to him only that in acting to protect the troops he could not again invade Cambodia, without congressional approval.

If the White House is alert to the gathering storm signals, it may yet embrace this mild restraint in the hope that it might become a pattern for dealing with the more difficult problems ahead in regard to the war power. The Cooper-Church formula means that the Senate is not out to knife the President or take over direction of the war. It merely indicates that there should be no more upsetting escalations without the knowledge and consent of Congress.

The next challenge that the President will have to face in this area is more formidable. The amendment sponsored by Senators McGovern, Hatfield, Goodell, Hughes and Cranston would cut off funds for combat in Vietnam at the end of 1970, although funds could still be used for termination of U.S. military operations, withdrawal of U.S. troops, exchange of prisoners, aid to South Vietnam and so forth, with a proviso that all American military personnel be out by June 30, 1971. By this action Congress would impose on the administration a fixed withdrawal policy which could be altered only by a declaration of war or other congressional action.

Undoubtedly Congress has authority to take this drastic action, if it wishes, and if the war should continue indefinitely, against mounting internal protests, some last resort remedy of this sort might prove to be necessary. At present, however, it is difficult to imagine Congress taking upon itself the whole burden of liquidating the war.

Suppose that Congress should enact the December cut-off date for military combat in Vietnam and that Hanoi should launch a December offensive to strike a final crippling blow at the American forces preparing

to leave. Congress would be loath to declare war or order a resumption of limited hostilities. Suppose that the enforced withdrawal in accord with an inflexible timetable should lead to a Communist sweep throughout Indochina.

The country needs to be prepared for unpleasant consequences of its retreat from Southeast Asia. Under even the best of circumstances now foreseeable, the outcome of our ill-advised venture may prove to be a bitter pill, and the bitterness would be greatly intensified if a hasty retreat were forced on a Republican President by a Democratic Congress. Incidentally, the effect might be to strengthen the hold of the President or the power to make war if a congressional venture in overriding the President should lead to disaster.

The risks of the McGovern approach may drive the Senate back to the Mathias-Mansfield proposal which would, in its original form, withdraw the blank check that Congress issued in the Tonkin Gulf resolution and endorse the announced Nixon policy of withdrawing from Vietnam. Coupled with the Cooper-Church amendment, this would put Congress on record against reheating the war in either Vietnam or Cambodia. Ways may be found to stiffen the Mathias-Mansfield mandate for withdrawal without trying to force a rigid congressional timetable upon a complex international denouement.

The Percy resolution looks to the future and is not directly related to getting American forces out of Cambodia and Vietnam. It would express the sense of the Senate that the President should not utilize the Armed Forces of the United States in interventions abroad for any combat activity without the express consent of the Congress except where the use of such force is necessary pending congressional approval, to respond to a clear and direct attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or upon forces of the United States that are lawfully deployed pursuant to a treaty or other specific congressional authorization.

This is a fair restatement of the constitutional provisions which place the war power in Congress. Why, then, did Senator Percy choose to offer only a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which the President could ignore? The policy he has stated is the law of the land, and Congress will have to find ways of getting it respected at the White House if our democracy is to be saved.

H.R. 17773

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States shall not deploy Armed Forces of the United States outside the United States or any territory subject to its jurisdiction, for other than peaceful purposes, without the advice and consent of the Senate in connection with a treaty, or unless the Congress by law, specifically authorizes the deployment of such Armed Forces by the President; except that the President is authorized to deploy such Armed Forces at his sole discretion—*

(1) when he finds that the territory of the United States is under attack or imminent threat of attack; or

(2) when he finds that deployment of such Armed Forces fulfills a specific treaty obligation of the United States; or

(3) pursuant to a declaration of war by the Congress except that such Armed Forces may be deployed only in countries specifically authorized by such declaration of war unless the President finds that the safety of American or allied Armed Forces requires deployment of American Armed Forces in other countries.

The President shall notify the Congress within twenty-four hours after any such

finding of all action he has taken at his sole discretion pursuant to such finding. In the event the Congress is not in session, the President shall convene the Congress in an extraordinary session within twenty-four hours after such finding.

## S. RES. 409

Whereas the Senate has resolved that certain national commitments of the United States require affirmative action by both the Executive and Legislative branches of the United States Government; and

Whereas the use of the armed forces in combat in foreign countries necessarily has an important effect on international relations; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That in order that the Congress may properly exercise its constitutional powers regarding the use of the armed forces of the United States whenever the use thereof directly involves the foreign relations of the United States and the foreign policy of the United States generally, it is declared to be the sense of the Senate that the President should not utilize the armed forces of the United States in interventions abroad for any combat activity without the express consent of the Congress except where the use of such forces is necessary, pending Congressional approval, to respond to a clear and direct attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or upon forces of the United States that are lawfully deployed pursuant to a treaty or other specific Congressional authorization.

#### ADDRESS BEFORE WATERTOWN MARINE CORPS LEAGUE HONOR ROLL DEDICATION CEREMONY

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

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1970, it was my privilege and honor to speak at the honor roll dedication ceremony conducted by the outstanding Pvt. Charles J. Shutt Detachment of the Marine Corps League in Watertown, Mass.

Under unanimous consent, I include a summary of my remarks before the distinguished gathering and also the program for that occasion:

REMARKS, IN PART, OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN AT HONOR ROLL DEDICATION CEREMONY OF THE MARINE CORPS LEAGUE, WATERTOWN, MASS., APRIL 19, 1970

Commander, Officers, and members of this great Marine Corps League, distinguished guests, the sorrowing parents, relatives, and friends of the illustrious heroes we honor today, Ladies and Gentlemen—

I am highly honored to join in these very moving ceremonies when this great American organization, whose members have always so nobly served our country, adds to its impressive Honor Roll the names of these gallant, young men who have made the supreme sacrifice for the cause of freedom and country and pay fitting tribute to your own departed comrades.

Our hearts go out in deepest sympathy and compassion to the mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, relatives and friends of the brave boys who have offered their lives on the altar of American patriotism in one of the bloodiest and most frustrating wars of our history.

We prayerfully share with their dear ones the loss of intrepid heroes, like Corporal Daniel Duffy, Corporal Paul Gorman, Sergeant John Mareno, Corporal Richard Nashawaty, and Private First Class John Sullivan, and also the departed members of

the Post, John Carey, Edward Farragher, Harold McKenny and John Sullivan.

It seems as though only yesterday they were with us. Yet now they have joined the great company of immortals, who shall forever be enshrined in the hearts of this and many American generations as long as this great Nation shall endure.

They have given their all to insure that the lamps of freedom shall be kept lighted, and that tyranny shall not prevail over the free and the brave, and those intent upon building a better nation and a better world.

While this day is sad for all of us, it is also glorious beyond measure. For it shows to the whole world, including those who, if they could work their will, would enslave all of us and free peoples everywhere in communist tyranny, that this Nation will never surrender its precious birth-right of liberty.

Each and every one of these boys, and the brothers of the Marine Corps League, who have gone to their eternal reward, have given their all for every one of us, and it must never be said that they shall have died in vain.

One day very soon, let us pray, their cause shall be redeemed, their sacrifices for peace, security and human rights will prove once again, that "whether in chains or in laurels, liberty knows nothing but victory."

Our task is clear, our duty is plain. Our mandate is before us. It is for us to continue the struggle for peace and liberty which they have so greatly enriched with their invincible spirit of love, loyalty and patriotism which moved them so courageously to give up everything, even life itself, that liberty, justice, and equality before the law shall continue to reign in this Nation and in the world.

These boys will go down in the history of our Nation, and in our hearts, as American heroes whose memory will never dim, and whose luster will never fade, because they are among the immortals whom the American people and free men and women will cherish and honor to the end of time.

For in their own way, joining with all the others who have unselfishly given of themselves for the country and human freedom, they too will live forever in the hearts of a Nation that is eternally grateful to its hero sons and daughters who have left us a legacy more precious than life itself.

We live in a world of contrived tumult and danger, and we must never underestimate the intent and efforts of potential and actual enemies, at home and abroad, to destroy our liberties and our free society.

Until peace comes. Let us keep strong and prepared to meet every contingency and peril from any and every source.

It is only through strength of will, firmness, and strength of resources and power that we can hope to hold off and discourage those, both at home and abroad, who threaten our security and freedom.

As we work tirelessly for peace and brotherhood, until these ends are gained, we must guard our birthright, and protect our homes and our shores against all those, whoever they may be, who seek to weaken and destroy this great nation of ours, which in these troubled days is the best hope for freedom and peace in this country and the world.

Let us make sure that the bitter sacrifices of these boys, their loving families, and the many like them, shall not have been in vain.

So let Semper Fidelis be our fervent prayer and inspiration on this occasion which is at once so tearful, yet so glorious. Let us resolve to honor the precious memory of our honored dear ones, and move forward with resolution and determination toward the great goals these beloved, fallen heroes so courageously exemplified—for peace at the earliest possible time in this country and in the world, and for freedom and justice forever in this great land of liberty that we love, and propose to preserve.

## PROGRAM

Call to order, 1430 hours, Chairman Harold F. Welsh.

1. Invited Guests to Rostrum, Sgt. at Arms Arthur L. Sheppard.

2. Sgt. at Arms Escorts Commandant to Rostrum, Commandant Peter C. Dwyer.

3. Opening Prayer, Chaplain John P. McDevitt.

4. Pledge of Allegiance, Salute to the Colors, National Anthem, Commandant Peter C. Dwyer.

5. Remarks from the Commandant.

6. Reading of Memorial Roster and Presentation of Certificates, Chairman Harold F. Welsh.

7. Firing Squad Detail, Officer in Charge, Richard J. O'Neil.

8. Taps, Field Music, L/Cpl. John Snow, U.S.M.C.

9. Prayer for the Honored Dead (all rise), Chaplain John P. McDevitt.

10. Introduction of Honored Guests: Robert Maher, Official Representative, City of Somerville; Harold A. Osgood, Sr., Division Commandant, National Trustee, Marine Corps League; Daniel Beffa, Commandant, Department of Missouri, Marine Corps League; Lt. Col. E. F. Fitzgerald, Inspector-Instructor Staff, U.S.M.C.; Col. Ralph R. Bagley, Commanding Officer, 1st Bn., 25th Marines, U.S.M.C.; The Honorable Philip J. Philbin, Congressman, 3rd District, Massachusetts, Vice Chairman, House Armed Services Committee.

Closing ceremony—please stand. Marine Corps Hymn.

Harold F. Welsh, Chairman.

Peter C. Dwyer, Commandant.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. PATTEN of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on official business.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. HALPERN, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. POFF, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, today, for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. FENT, today, for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN, today, for 20 minutes.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. PHILBIN in five instances.

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

Mr. BUSH in two instances.

Mr. FOREMAN in two instances.  
 Mr. MIZE.  
 Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.  
 Mr. GROSS.  
 Mr. MINSHALL in two instances.  
 Mr. KLEPPE in two instances.  
 Mr. HALL.  
 Mr. ROUDEBUSH.  
 Mr. SCOTT.  
 Mr. WYMAN in two instances.  
 Mr. GUBSER.  
 Mr. HOSMER in two instances.  
 Mr. ESCH in two instances.  
 Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.  
 Mr. HUNT.  
 Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.  
 Mr. HARVEY.  
 Mr. SCHERLE.  
 Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.  
 Mr. KEITH.  
 Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.  
 Mr. HORTON in three instances.  
 Mr. GOLDWATER in two instances.  
 Mr. BRAY in three instances.  
 The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRAY) and to include extraneous matter:  
 Mr. CAREY.  
 Mr. MOLLOHAN in five instances.  
 Mr. PURCELL in two instances.  
 Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.  
 Mr. PODELL in three instances.  
 Mr. RARICK in two instances.  
 Mr. ALBERT.  
 Mr. EDWARDS of California.  
 Mr. FULTON of Tennessee in two instances.  
 Mr. MIKVA.  
 Mr. DOWNING in two instances.  
 Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.  
 Mr. MARSH in three instances.  
 Mr. HARRINGTON.  
 Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.  
 Mr. CABELL.  
 Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.  
 Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.  
 Mr. FOUNTAIN.  
 Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.  
 Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.  
 Mr. DORN in three instances.  
 Mr. GILBERT in two instances.  
 Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.  
 Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.  
 Mr. PEPPER in two instances.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3920. For the relief of Beverly Medlock and Ruth Lee Medlock; H. R. 5419. To provide relief for Comdr. Edwin J. Sabec, U.S. Navy; H.R. 6402. For the relief of the Sanborn Lumber Co., Inc.; H.R. 8694. For the relief of Capt. John T. Lawlor (retired); and H.R. 9910. For the relief of Hanibal B. Taylor.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 27, 1970, at 12 o'clock.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2086. A letter from the Secretary of the Army; transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 2, 1969, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Ludington Harbor, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 14, 1965 (H. Doc. No. 91-342); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2087. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice; transmitting the annual report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service for fiscal year 1969; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 15608. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948, as amended, relating to the acquisition of property for the Independence National Historical Park, with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: House Resolution 1045. Committee on Rules. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 15712. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend the authorizations for titles I through IV through fiscal year 1971 (Rept. No. 91-1124). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: House Resolution 1046. Committee on Rules. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 16542. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to regulate the mailing of unsolicited credit cards, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1125). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1033. Resolution on the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva, Switzerland with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1126). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on Judiciary. H.R. 13971. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park Compact with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1002. A bill to amend section 5701(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust the rates of tax on cigars with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 12807. A bill to amend the act of February 11, 1903, commonly known as the Expediting Act, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H.R. 17802. A bill to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 17803. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the duties on stainless steel sheets and on articles made from such sheets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 17804. A bill to amend the act fixing the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., and authorizing the acquisition of land therein, in order to increase the authorization for such acquisitions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 17805. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to prohibit the use in interstate commerce of certain nonreturnable containers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS (for herself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOSS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 17806. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 17807. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 17808. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish the authorized strength of the Naval Reserve in officers in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mr. WHITE, Mr. HAMILTON, and Mr. BRASCO):

H.R. 17809. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 17810. A bill to provide that compensation be paid to persons providing information which results in convictions being obtained for certain violations of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 17811. A bill to prohibit the use of funds appropriated by Congress to support the use in Southeast Asia of persons inducted under the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 17812. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 17813. A bill for the relief of certain farmers who sold CCC mortgaged grain to Lafayette Farm Services, Inc., Lafayette, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 17814. A bill to amend the tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to determining what articles fall within the additional import restrictions on dairy prod-

ucts set forth in part 3 of the appendix to such schedules; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 17815. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STANTON (for himself, Mr. McCLOY, and Mr. MORSE):

H. Con. Res. 647. A resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should establish a commission to examine the recent events at Kent State and other college campuses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REES:

H.J. Res. 1245. A resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 17816. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Bautista Tendero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 17817. A bill for the relief of Miguel Angel Ortiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 17818. A bill for the relief of John W. Shafer, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 17819. A bill for the relief of Francesco Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

393. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, relative to relocating the battleship U.S.S. *Missouri* in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Armed Services.

394. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the setting of national war policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

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

496. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Medical Association of Georgia, Atlanta, Ga., relative to decisionmaking in patient care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

497. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council, Youngstown, Ohio, relative to the sharing of Federal revenues with State and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE—Tuesday, May 26, 1970

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of Life and God of the Nation's destiny, in times of crisis when we are weak and unsure in our own strength, keep our faith strong in the efficacy of prayer. Spare us from mistaking our will for Thy will. Use our minds as the channels of Thy light and truth. Give us the will to obey the highest insight. Bless the dedication which rises above faction and party to serve the common good.

O Lord, in whom we trust, may the faith stamped on our coins be imprinted in our hearts and expressed in our lives. In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

#### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. RUSSELL).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. James B. Allen, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 25, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair now lays before the Senate the unfinished business which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 15628, to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would inform the Senate that the time between now and 2 p.m. will be equally divided between the majority leader and the minority leader.

Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be taken out of both sides equally.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as may be required.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

#### AMERICA'S FREEDOM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as we commit more blood and treasure in Southeast Asia for what advocates of our extended military efforts over the past

decade have called "freedom," we are frequently reminded that here at home our freedom may very well be in jeopardy.

An editorial in the New York Times of May 24 calls the problem, "freedom under fire." The writers of this timely commentary realize that America faces several crucial battles in the months ahead which may determine how much longer we can continue to enjoy "freedom," as we now know it in this country. There are the pressing needs to halt the increasing trends of Government repression, to reorder our national priorities in order to begin to cure the economic and social ills presently afflicting us, to resist anarchy on our university campuses by those who would immobilize these fountainheads of free inquiry and knowledge, and to end "the contagion of corruption and coercion" in all areas of our national life.

The internationally renowned columnist, James Reston, shows how one freedom—freedom of the press—is under fire. In a poignant article in the May 24 New York Times, he replies to the Vice President's annoyance with dissenters and critics of this administration's war policy. Mr. Reston asks:

What will have been achieved when all this senseless killing is over? How are the South Vietnamese going to keep the enemy out of the Cambodian sanctuaries when they can't keep them out of Saigon? A year from now, after 52 more weekly casualty lists, how will Indochina be more secure with 150,000 fewer American soldiers?

"These are the questions," Mr. Reston continues, that "Mr. Agnew does not answer" in his criticism of writing and talking journalists, "and they will not go away by blaming the press for asking them."

As many of us clearly remember, President Johnson was asked similar hard questions about the conduct of the war in Southeast Asia. "When he had no answer," Mr. Reston correctly points out, he was driven "out of office."

Mr. Reston goes on: