First. By sustaining last week's action, the Senate would be ending U.S. dependence on Communist Russia for a strategic and vital defense material, namely, chrome.

Second. Sustaining the Senate's position of last week would help save jobs in a period of high unemployment. As evidence, I point to the statement, inserted several times in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by the director, District 19, United Steel Workers of America, who says that unless the Congress takes such action, there will be no specialty steel industry in the United States. He expressed his deep concern for the jobs of the black workers and the white workers in that industry.

Third. The Fulbright proposal would give more power to the President and reduce the Senate's role in foreign policy. The Senate has made great progress in the last 2 or 3 years in reasserting itself and in facing up to its responsibilities. Senator FULBRIGHT'S proposal would reverse that trend and, as he states, give the option to the executive branch to proceed as it wishes. He would leave the determination in the hands of the President at the expense of the Senate.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest what I assume will be the final quorum call of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if no Senator desires recognition, I shall announce the program for tomorrow.

The Senate will convene at 10 a.m. tomorrow. Immediately following recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized, each for not to exceed 15 minutes, and in the order stated: Senators CRANSTON, MATHIAS, CHURCH, MONDALE, and BYRD of Virginia.

Immediately following the orders for recognition of Senators tomorrow, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

At the conclusion of the period for the transaction of routine morning business tomorrow the Senate will resume consideration of the pending question, the amendment by Mr. NELSON, amendment No. 441, the so-called Sanguine amendment, on which there is a 2-hour limitation of time. A rollcall vote has been ordered on that amendment.

Upon disposition of the amendment by Mr. NELSON on tomorrow the Senate will proceed to the consideration of amendment No. 435, the so-called F-14 amendment, which has been introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, with a time limitation thereon of 2 hours. Undoubtedly a yea and nay vote will occur thereon.

On disposing of the Proxmire amendment tomorrow, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the ABM amendment to be offered by Mr. HUGHES, amendment No. 443, with a time limitation of 1½ hours, and with a rollcall vote undoubtedly to occur thereon.

On disposition of the Hughes' amendment No. 443 tomorrow, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of amendment No. 444, to be called up by Mr. SAXBE—which is another so-called ABM amendment—on which there is a time limitation of 2 hours. A rollcall vote is expected to occur thereon.

Senators are alerted to the fact therefore, that there will be at least three or four rollcall votes tomorrow.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, first, I thank the Senator from West Virginia and others for working out these schedules and helping greatly in reaching agreements. Obviously, tomorrow will be a very busy day with two votes on the ABM. The first of those two amendments will be an amendment to strike the ABM from the bill and the second one, if that one fails, and I expect it will, would propose to put on the shelf or in escrow funds for the ABM.

On Thursday, as I understand the Senator has already announced, the agreement is for a limitation of time on the modern tank amendment.

Frankly, I was hoping there would be an agreement worked out with reference to taking up the Mansfield amendment, which is the same amendment we had with reference to the draft bill, also on Thursday. If that is possible it will make for another full day.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes; the Mansfield amendment will follow the battle tank amendment on Thursday. The majority leader expects to reach an agreement with respect to time on his amendment, and he will announce that tomorrow, I am sure.

Mr. STENNIS. I think if we get all of these matters finished and then have the session on Friday, the bill will not be finished but it will be a long way toward being finished.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. I am very much encouraged by what has happened.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 29, 1971, at 10 a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, September 28, 1971*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. Paul G. Behling, pastor, Grace Lutheran Church, Bronx, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Gracious Lord, You have granted us another day to love and serve You and our neighbor. We who represent the people of America come to You, for You have commanded us to pray and have promised to hear: Forgive our every failure as individuals, a Congress, and a nation. Turn us away from a love of money and a lust for power. Impart to us wisdom to know and do Your will. We pray especially for our enemies: Turn their hearts and grant that they with us may pursue peace. Give us confidence to believe that all things are possible with Your help, for without You we can do nothing.

Therefore, grant us this day Your blessing and benediction. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

S. RES. 174

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. John C. Watts, late a Representative from the State of Kentucky.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative.

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

S. 1733. An act to amend the act of September 26, 1970 (84 Stat. 884).

REV. PAUL G. BEHLING

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

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the opening prayer in the House today was offered by my dear friend, the Reverend Paul Behling, pastor of Grace Lutheran Church located in my district in the Bronx.

Rev. Paul G. Behling was born on September 13, 1933, in Manhattan. Attended public schools in Yonkers, N.Y.; college, Concordia in Bronxville; seminary, Concordia, at St. Louis, Mo.

Churches served: St. Philip's, St. Louis, Mo.; St. Paul's, Dolton, Ill.; Trinity, Walden, N.Y. Presently, Grace Lutheran Church, Bronx, N.Y. Married, two daughters: Ruth, age 7, Esther, age 5. Member of Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

I am particularly pleased that the pastor is here today because he represents the caliber of men needed to preach the new ministry. I say "new ministry" because our society has changed so drastically in the past several decades that our religious leaders have been forced to seek new ways to bring religion into the community.

Religion has served an important role in the development of mankind and certainly plays a paramount role in the development of the individual. In today's impersonal world, such a focal point is all the more essential. This is especially so for our youth who have found themselves lost in a period of great national change and personal questioning. Thus it is for the new breed of ministers to bring religion into the community and the hearts of its members.

Since arriving in the Bronx, Pastor Behling has dedicated himself to this effort. He revitalized the Young Youth League of his church to help foster a strong moral and spiritual commitment in the children and to show them that religion is not only relevant, but essential in today's world.

His previous years at a mission church in Walden, N.Y., prepared him for a new mission at Grace Lutheran Church. He has opened the doors of the church to Alcoholics Anonymous, providing them a place to meet. But more than that he has dedicated his spiritual community to serving this needy segment of the temporal community in the true sense of Christian giving.

Pastor Behling strongly believes that if a church or a religion is to serve its people well, it must be a vital part of the community in which it is located. This he has done not only in aiding alcoholics or working with youth, but in every project he takes on. His congregation and the whole community are far better persons for having him amongst them.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 10367

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have until midnight tonight, September 28, 1971, to file a report on H.R. 10367.

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

There was no objection.

OUR PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION NEED OUR HELP NOW

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

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, along with many of our colleagues this morning I talked with wives, mothers and fathers, brothers, and former comrades in combat of those missing in action, and prisoners of war.

What can you tell them? They ask questions that are very difficult to answer. They said, "Is the United States the most powerful Nation in the world? If so, why can we not find out the condition of our prisoners of war? Why can we not prevail on the other countries we have helped rebuild, and helped maintain their own strength, to join us in seeing that the Geneva Convention is lived up to so that those who are over there as prisoners are properly looked after?"

They asked me—and I cannot answer—can you? Why is our top priority in the United Nations now working for the admission of Red China? Why is it not on their agenda every day to see that the prisoners of war of the United States and of other nations and those missing in action are accounted for?

Mr. Speaker, these people are frustrated and I am frustrated with them. I join with them in asking the executive department why more is not being done in behalf of these men who are being held prisoners under conditions no one knows, and in utter contempt of the pleas of all decent people of this world.

The wives and parents, with some justification, are beginning to believe that these men are being forgotten. That they are being considered as expendable so to speak, and we must not let this happen.

I urge each and everyone of you to join me in calling upon the President and all branches of the executive to use the strength of this Nation; and by that I mean its economic strength, its diplomatic strength, and, if necessary, its military strength for the return of our prisoners and the accounting for those missing in action. We must not fail them.

COLLEGE FOOTBALL IS NO. 1 ENTERTAINMENT

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, out in the great heartland of America, when autumn rolls around, college football is the No. 1 entertainment, inspiring strong loyalties and strong emotions.

For those of us in Oklahoma, this past Saturday was a banner day. Virginia Tech's football team ventured into Oklahoma, and returned home after taking a 24–16 licking from Oklahoma State University. The University of Oklahoma Sooners came East and handily administered a 55–29 defeat to Pittsburgh.

The icing on the cake was Tulsa University's storybook upset of mighty Arkansas, coming from 20–0 behind to drop the Razorbacks 21 to 20 and out of the top 10 in the national rankings.

Oklahoma and Oklahoma State are members of the Big Eight Conference, and that conference has clearly become the premier football conference in the United States. Big Eight teams are 17 to 5 winners over nonconference opponents this year. When Colorado best heavily favored Ohio State Saturday, it marked the 17th consecutive victory of a Big Eight team over Big Ten opposition.

The national rankings published this morning add to the warmth of already excited Big Eight fans. Nebraska is ranked No. 1; Colorado is ranked No. 6, and Oklahoma is ranked No. 8 in both the AP and UPI versions of the poll. When an eight-member conference places three teams in the top 10, it should prove something about the quality of the conference.

Mr. Speaker, this digression from the weighty matters of the day is pardonable, I believe, because those of us who must depend on the newspapers of this area must read sports writers who still labor under the misapprehension that the real power in football lies elsewhere. The record, of course, clearly shows it is in the Big Eight.

GUN CONTROLS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARE FOR THE LAW ABIDING

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have noted from the local press that weapons dealers in the city of Washington report that sales of firearms are drying up. It is now virtually impossible to obtain a permit. The significance of this development is that the firearms generally available in sporting goods stores in Washington are weapons for hunting and offer home protection and are not for crime. Very few of the Saturday night specials, the cheap handguns, commonly employed by criminals are available in these establishments. Thus the fallacy of excessive gun control is again exposed. The only persons denied the right to own weapons are the law abiding citizens who want it for protection or for legitimate sport. Near the city of Washington within easy reach of the thugs or hoodlums are to be found the cheap handguns with which holdups are staged and policemen are killed. Is the District government blind to the real problem of gun controls or have they simply been taken in by the crowd that wants to take weapons away from all Americans?

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN C. WATTS

(Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute to revise, and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of my longtime friend and colleague, the Honorable John C. Watts.

John Watts was a powerful and highly effective Member of this body, and one who went about his duties in a quiet manner, without fanfare and the bright lights of publicity.

He worked long and hard for his country and for the people of his district in Kentucky. As a high ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, he brought his sound judgment and knowledge to bear on the complex and far-reaching legislation handled by that committee.

John Watt's career in public service was always characterized by a high sense of responsibility. That career included service as a county attorney, membership in the State legislature, a post in the Governor's cabinet, and, finally, membership in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Through it all, those whom he represented received the best that John Watts had to offer, and what he had to offer was considerable indeed.

I shall miss my truly kind friend, John Watts. I shall miss the calmness and commonsense that he exhibited in times of great stress in this body. But, most of all, I shall miss my association with this good man and fine Kentucky gentleman.

Kentucky and the Nation are considerably poorer with the passing of John Watts.

Mrs. Andrews joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his lovely wife and daughter.

SAIGON DICTATORSHIP

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering, in view of the events of the past few weeks in Saigon, if any Member of Congress or any member of the executive branch, would care to say he or she is willing from this day forward to give his or her life, limb, sanity or freedom—POW even for another day—further to prop up the Saigon dictatorship? Other Americans are being ordered to do so.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 2.

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

There was no objection.

DO NOT SCRATCH THE BIG FOUR FOREIGN MINISTERS MEETING ON THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I regretted reading in the newspapers this morning that Secretary Rogers had not come to New York for the projected meeting of the Big Four Foreign Ministers, and that the meeting had been canceled. I hope that this does not indicate any lessening of interest in the administration working to help bring about a negotiated solution of the difficulties in the Middle East. That important subject was to be on the agenda. It was expected that the ministers might be able to move the parties involved toward a settlement as a result of this effort. Certainly the time for settlement is gradually slipping away, and the long-term implications for the United States are grave and far reaching.

There was an opportunity, that is clear. I believe that the opportunity is still there, and I hope that the cancellation of this meeting will not mean that there will not be other meetings and further initiatives and I hope that Secretary Rogers and members of his department will move vigorously ahead to join with their counterparts in trying to bring about a settlement of this very difficult and dangerous situation.

BRIEFING ON SOUTH VIETNAMESE ELECTION

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have just come from a State Department briefing on the South Vietnamese presidential election. This briefing was called in answer to a resolution of inquiry which have requested the Department to disclose the full facts regarding the U.S. participation in the election.

Regrettably, this briefing, like the nonelection, was a sham. They told us less than we learn in our daily newspapers. The State Department has obviously misled the Congress, deliberately hiding the truth from the American people as regards the Vietnamese election.

I opposed the resolution of inquiry when it was considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee. However, I shall support it on the floor on Thursday because the State Department completely reneged on its promise to tell the Congress about the events leading up to the one man presidential voting in South Vietnam.

I deplore the absence of even the most basic democratic processes in South Vietnam. It has become all too clear that the State Department is either unwilling or unable to admit its role in the events which have produced the totalitarian framework in South Vietnam.

I am deeply afraid that history will reveal the events in Vietnam in the past year to be as sordid and full of deceit as the Pentagon papers disclosed the events in past years to be.

THE ROLE OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT IN THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE ELECTION

(Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the Members of the House that I will press for passage of my resolution of inquiry, House Resolution 595, when it is reported to the floor this Thursday. The resolution is directed to the Secretary of State and requests that he furnish the House within 7 days with the communications between the State Department and the Embassy in Saigon and between the Embassy in Saigon and the three principals in the election, Messrs. Thieu, Ky, and Minh.

It is the constitutional responsibility of the House to be informed as to the nature of this election and this Nation's involvement in it—particularly at a time when the majority of our constituents are asking that we withdraw from Vietnam immediately.

When the resolution of inquiry was introduced, it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which in turn referred it to the State Department. In a letter to the chairman of the committee, dated September 22, David Abshire, the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs, recommended against passage of the resolution and offered to brief interested Members of Congress as an alternative. Based upon the State Department's representation, the committee then voted against passage of the resolution.

A briefing was arranged. It was to be conducted by the desk officer who received all the communications from Saigon and saw all communications from the State Department to Saigon.

The briefing was held this morning for an hour and a half and attended by a dozen Members of Congress and staff representatives from about 75 other congressional offices. Unfortunately, the representatives of the State Department would not give us either the communications or their content. We received no more information than we have already received through the media, plus a few general observations and opinions of Vietnam desk officers.

Congress must no longer be left in the dark in this manner. We must demand that our right to know be respected, that our ability to perform our constitutional mandate be insured. I urge your support on Thursday for passage of the resolution of inquiry.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 10577, FOREIGN SALE OF U.S. PASSENGER VESSELS

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight tonight to file a re-

port on H.R. 10577, foreign sale of U.S. passenger vessels.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

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

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, 7 years and 186 days have passed since the first American became a prisoner of war. We cannot forget. We must not forget. Every effort must be made; every avenue must be explored to obtain the release of the brave men held captive by the Hanoi Government. Our commitment to this goal is absolute.

PROVIDING FOR DELETION IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 4713

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42), providing for a deletion in the enrollment of H.R. 4713.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McFALL. 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. 268]

Abbitt	Donohue	Murphy, N.Y.
Abernethy	Edwards, La.	Myers
Abourezk	Eshleman	Passman
Adams	Evins, Tenn.	Pepper
Alexander	Flynt	Perkins
Anderson, Calif.	Frelinghuysen	Pettis
	Frey	Poff
Anderson, Tenn.	Fulton, Tenn.	Reid, N.Y.
	Gallagher	Rodino
Ashley	Gaydos	Rooney, N.Y.
Badillo	Gibbons	Rosenthal
Betts	Gray	Rostenkowski
Boggs	Green, Pa.	Ruth
Brooks	Griffiths	Scheuer
Brotzman	Hansen, Wash.	Schneebeli
Burleson, Tex.	Harrington	Seiberling
Byrnes, Wis.	Hathaway	Snyder
Carey, N.Y.	Hays	Stanton, James V.
Carter	Hicks, Mass.	
Cederberg	Hillis	Steed
Celler	Howard	Stokes
Chappell	Hunt	Stubblefield
Chisholm	Ichord	Stuckey
Clark	Johnson, Pa.	Teague, Calif.
Clawson, Del	Keating	Teague, Tex.
Clay	Kluczynski	Thompson, N.J.
Collier	Landrum	Ullman
Conable	Long, La.	Van Deerlin
Conyers	Lujan	Waggonner
Corman	McMillan	Whalley
Cotter	Mathias, Calif.	Wyatt
Dent	Mazzoli	Wydler
Derwinski	Mills, Ark.	Yatron
Diggs	Murphy, Ill.	Young, Fla.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 332 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PROVIDING FOR DELETION IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 4713

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 42

Resolved by the Senate (House of Representatives concurring), That the enrollment of H.R. 4713, the Clerk of the House of Representatives be authorized to delete Senate amendment numbered 5, which inserts at page 3, after the second line following line 6, a new section 7.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am not constrained to object, but I do ask the gentleman from California if he is going to explain this matter to the Members of the House?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, this is an attempt to get the matter straightened out between the House and the Senate dealing with an amendment of the Reorganization Act of 1970. If the Members will recall, a short time ago we agreed to certain Senate amendments in connection with a bill which we had previously passed, simply restoring the use of counterpart funds for use of committees by statute, which inadvertently had been left out of the reorganization bill. There was no controversy, and the matter did pass by unanimous consent.

The Senate then adopted certain amendments. They sent those back to the House, we accepted those amendments, but one of the amendments added by the Senate dealt with strictly their housekeeping arrangements and dealt with the age limits of pages in the Senate. They adopted an amendment which would have caused their pages to be the same age or require the same age limit as the House pages.

After the bill went back to the Senate, a question was raised by one Member of the other body, and objection was raised to that amendment which they, themselves, had adopted. This concurrent resolution would remove that amendment, which is what the other body seeks to do. It is simply in line with what the Clerk has just read, and would instruct the Clerk of the House to drop that amendment. We have no objection because it deals strictly with a housekeeping matter for the other body.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object. Are we now engaged in stopping a fight in the Senate over an amendment? Is that what we would be doing here today with approval of this piece of legislation?

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this would simply permit the Senate to do what it wants to do apparently. This is a matter over which, of course, they have complete jurisdiction, having to do with the age limits of the Senate pages. We upon request of the Senate in this concurrent resolution simply will agree to what they now desire to do, which is to maintain their present age limits on Senate pages.

Mr. GROSS. Has the gentleman from California been assured that if we approve this legislation that we will have settled a fight between Members of the Senate?

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will yield further, we have great difficulty in determining any future action or course of the other body. As I say, we have been requested to concur with them in this amendment. It does deal exclusively with matters over which they have jurisdiction. I would hope, of course, this would end this particular matter and permit this bill to get to the President, so he might sign it into law, and correct an inadvertence on our part.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to my friend from California that it is most intriguing to be cast in the role of referee in a fight between Members of the other body.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the comment of my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10351, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1971

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules and on behalf of my colleague from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) I call up House Resolution 608 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 608

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10351) to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two

hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and all points or order against sections 11 and 15 of said substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI are hereby waived. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments there to to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 608 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 10351. Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1971. It shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and, due to a transfer of funds, all points of order are waived against sections 11 and 15 of the substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 4, rule XXI.

The main purpose of H.R. 10351 is to extend for 2 years the Act of 1964, as amended: $2,194,066,000 is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1972 and $2,750 million is authorized for fiscal year 1973, $350 milllion is reserved each year for the funding of local initiative programs.

The eligibility requirements for participation in Headstart are raised to an annual family-of-four income of $4,500.

The comprehensive health services program is amended to authorize the Director to require payment for health services to persons not in the low-income bracket.

The director of the drug rehabilitation program is authorized to undertake special programs to promote employment opportunities for rehabilitated addicts.

Four percent of the funds appropriated each year are reserved for community action programs in Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territories of the Pacific. This is increased from 2 percent.

A private, nonprofit corporation to be known as the National Legal Services Corporation is established, the incorporation and initiation of which shall occur within 6 months after enactment of the legislation. An incorporating trusteeship is established to be composed of the presidents or their designees of the American Bar Association, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, the Association of Law Schools, the American Trial Lawyers Association, and the National Bar Association. A 17-member Board of Directors for the Corporation will be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Corporation will take the place of the legal services program which has been operated by the OEO. In addition to funds reserved for the Corporation from appropriations for any fiscal year, such additional funds as may be necessary are authorized to be appropriated and shall remain available until expended.

The director of action for the foster grandparents program may approve assistance in excess of 90 percent of the cost of development and operation of such projects.

A new environmental action program is created to provide payment for low-income persons working on projects combating pollution and improving the environment and a new rural housing development and rehabilitation program is created to assist low-income families in rural areas.

The Director of OEO is forbidden to require non-Federal contributions of more than 20 percent of the cost of programs assisted and a 10-percent limitation is imposed on his authority to transfer funds earmarked for any program.

The 5-year national poverty action plan is required to be filed by December 31 of each year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule in order that the bill may be considered.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of House Resolution 608 which provides for 2 hours of general debate on H.R. 10351 under an open rule, and waives two points of order. This rule will make in order consideration of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1971 which extend for 2 years the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity at nearly $2.2 billion in fiscal 1972, and $2.75 billion in fiscal 1973. The bill also makes several significant changes in the programs carried out under the Economic Opportunity Act. These include the creation of a new environmental action program, a new rural housing development and rehabilitation program, and a new nonprofit, Independent Legal Services Corporation. In addition, the bill permits the Director of OEO to require payment for medical services provided under the comprehensive health services program, raises the general eligibility requirement for participation in Headstart to an annual family income of $4,500 for a family of four, and directs that priority be given to veterans and employers of veterans under the drug rehabilitation program while promoting employment opportunities for rehabilitated addicts. The bill also tightens certain restrictions and increases oversight and evaluation of OEO programs.

Mr. Speaker, when OEO Director Frank Carlucci testified in favor of this extension, he observed that his agency's programs are currently reaching nearly 50 percent of those Americans whose incomes place them below the poverty line, and he quoted President Nixon who has referred to the OEO as "the cutting edge by means of which government moves into unexplored areas." Mr. Carlucci went on to say that this extension will assure that there remains within the Federal Government "an agency serving as an active advocate of the poor, so that the thrust of the effort to eradicate poverty maintains its momentum." I fully agree with Mr. Carlucci that failure to extend this legislation would indeed undo much of the progress made to date and signal to the Nation that the Government was turning its back on those most in need of its assistance. We cannot and must not turn our backs on these people; we must continue our efforts to make it possible for our Nation's poor and low-income individuals to help themselves, and the OEO has been and should continue to be the "cutting edge" of this thrust.

Mr. Speaker, in the brief time remaining to me, I want to call special attention to title X of this bill which would transfer the legal services program of OEO to a new, independent nonprofit legal services corporation. As a cosponsor of a similar measure, I am extremely pleased that the committee has included this in this legislation. Such a reform has the backing of the administration and its Council on Executive Reorganization, the Legal Services National Advisory Committee, the ABA, and bar associations from across the country. This reform will assure that the legal services program for the poor is removed from political influence, thus enhancing the integrity of the lawyer-client relationship and the professionalism of legal services attorneys.

I think the committee is to be commended on arriving at a compromise between three separately sponsored legal services corporation bills—a bill which incorporates the best features of each proposal. The very fact that this bill was unanimously reported is an indication of the acceptability and advisability of this compromise approach. I have consequently joined with several of my colleagues in signing a letter urging adoption of title 10 without amendments. I am sure most of my colleagues will agree that the legal services program has given life to the concept of equal justice under law for millions of poor individuals who were previously denied full access to justice because of their financial condition. I am convinced that title 10 of this bill will further strengthen the legal services program and thereby enable the poor to obtain a meaningful resolution of their grievances and protection of their rights. I fully agree with the committee report which states that—

> It is in the public interest to encourage and promote the use of institutions * * * for the orderly redress of grievances and as a means of securing worthwhile reform * * * (and that) the Government must continue to play an important role to assist citizens to obtain legal representation regardless of the economic state.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule and passage of the 1971 Equal Opportunity Act amendments. Extension of this act will reaffirm our commitment to the policy declaration of the 1964 act that—

It is the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this Nation. * * *

Mr. SISK. 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.

AMENDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTION LAW

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10784) to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the District of Columbia Election Act (Act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 699) as amended, D.C. Code, sec. 1–1100 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (2) of section 2 is amended as follows:

(a) Clause (A) is amended by striking "one year period" and by inserting "six month period" instead.

(b) Clause (B) is amended by striking "twenty-one" and inserting "eighteen" instead.

(2) Paragraph (7)(A) of subsection (a) of section 10 is amended by striking out "on the twenty-first day following such election" and by inserting instead "on the twenty-eighth day following such election".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 7 through 10, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) Clause (A) is amended by striking out 'one-year period' and inserting in lieu thereof 'six-month period' and by inserting at the end thereof immediately before the semicolon ', except in the case of an election of electors of President and Vice President of the United States the period shall be thirty days'.

"(B) Clause (B) is amended by striking out 'twenty-one' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eighteen'."

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, this bill has three main points.

One is that in the District of Columbia election law it would change it as it now reads from 21 to 18 years of age. This is identical to the bill that passed the Senate.

The second point is that it would deal with the question of residency requirements in voting. Under the Voting Rights Act, the cases thereunder, to vote for President of the United States there is no right to require a residency requirement of more than 30 days. This would remain the same in the committee bill. There is a residency requirement, which is now 1 year in the District of Columbia.

This would be changed to shorten the period to 6 months. Only three States in the Union I believe have a shorter period of time and that is 3 months for residency.

This, too, would vary from the provisions as set up in the Senate bill which provides for a 30-day residency period. However, in the opinion of the committee, especially with reference to certain local elections such as electing a board of education, and after consultation with the District of Columbia Delegate regarding District of Columbia Delegate elections the 6 months residency period would better serve the public interest.

Then for runoff elections, the third change, there would be provided a period of 28 days for runoff elections. The Senate bill would give them from 2 weeks to 6 weeks and place the period to be established in the discretion of the Board of Elections.

Your committee thought that this represented an unnecessary discretion to be lodged in the Board of Elections and, possibly, as a result of political folderol they could either shorten or lengthen the time for such runoff elections. So, instead of that provision, we set a fixed period of 28 days for the time of the runoff. That extends the time from 21 days under the present law to 28 days. The Board of Elections has requested an extension.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that, generally, explains the provisions of this bill.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. What are the normal or average requirements for residency across the country?

Mr. HUNGATE. That is set forth in our committee report, I would state to the gentleman from Iowa. For instance, in the State of Iowa it would be 6 months. In the State of Missouri it is 1 year, although the courts have held it cannot be that long. The shortest one about which I know I believe is the State of New York: 3 months. The State of Pennsylvania has a period of 90 days and there are no States which have shorter periods of time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would state to the gentleman that I would have read the report had I known the bill was to be called up by unanimous consent today, but I had no notification of that fact until this morning.

Mr. HUNGATE. I apologize to the gentleman for this short notice. However, the bill was scheduled originally for consideration yesterday. I know how very thorough the gentleman from Iowa is in attending to his duties with reference to legislative matters and I can understand his position.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRASER OF MINNESOTA

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRASER: Page two is amended by adding after line 12 the following:

"(3) Subsection (a) of section 8 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In the case of a petition nominating a candidate for the office referred to in clause (2) of the first section of this Act, if the rules of the political party of the candidate for whom such petition is being circulated require a statement on such petition indicating which prospective presidential candidate such candidate supports, or a statement indicating that he supports no prospective candidate, the Board shall affix such statement to such petition.'

"(4) Subsection (c) of section 8 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'With respect to the ballot for any election for the office referred to in clause (2) of the first section of this Act, if the rules of a political party require the voters of such party to be informed on the ballot as to which prospective presidential candidate each candidate of such political party for such office supports, the Board shall indicate such commitment, or lack thereof, for each candidate on the ballot for such political party.'"

POINT OF ORDER RESERVED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all that I think the bill that is now pending before the House is a good bill. It is a very modest one that will reset certain requirements with reference to the elections process in the District of Columbia. I support the bill. There was not any controversy about it in the committee. However, I am offering this amendment because it was embodied in another bill which was under consideration by the subcommittee but one on which they have not been able to spend enough time in order to give it thorough consideration.

Mr. Speaker, what this amendment would do would be to enable any of the political parties in the District of Columbia to adopt a rule which would then provide that the delegates to the national convention who are running in connection with that party to state their presidential preference, if they have one, or state that they have none on the ballot for better information to the voters.

We reviewed this in the committee, and I have taken it up with the various Members, and I think there is no particular objection to it. All it does is give added flexibility to either of the parties that choose to require by rule that the delegates should have this opportunity to state a preference for a presidential candidate, if they have such a preference, or to state if they are uncommitted that they are uncommitted. If the party does not choose to adopt such a rule, then of course it has no effect on the existing machinery. It simply provides additional opportunity to the party in the selection process by which it selects its national delegates.

I think it is a good provision, and one that would give the parties flexibility, which they will find helpful in their work.

I would be glad to respond to any questions about it, if I may.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was one

of the Members on a point of order that was raised when we were in session when it was brought up, feeling that the bill itself was so important to the election process here in the District that it would be inadvisable to put anything in it that might be controversial, and I thought this might be controversial.

However, I must say that this is no different than the presidential primary approach that we take where there is a presidential primary, so I really do not have the feeling that I had in the committee because at that time I did not have the information that I thought I should have in order to make a sensible judgment on it.

So at this point I just want everybody in the House to understand what this does, so that we do not proceed blindly. It gives the election process here in the District a chance for either political party to have their delegates identified on a presidential basis, as I understand, so that the voters, when they vote, will know who they are voting for, and who the delegate is for in the presidential convention.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Is not the bill dedicated to the purpose of giving the right of franchise to 18-year-olds and above?

Mr. FRASER. I would yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE) to answer that question.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, there are three separate and basic points in the bill that came over from the Senate. We dealt with the same purposes. The gentleman from Iowa is correct as to the point of changing the voting age from 21 to 18 years in the statute.

The second point was as to the runoff provision which is currently 21 days. The Senate would grant discretion to go to 6 weeks. We thought that was too long, and we changed it to the 28th day.

The third feature of the bill dealt with the residency requirements. The Senate bill said that 30 days would be enough for the Board of Education. The House committee thought that perhaps a 6-month period would be more adequate. Whereas, for the presidential elections, which is the national law, to 30 days instead of a year.

Those were the three basic points when the bill came from the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the scope of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER). It seems to me that it goes beyond the provisions of this bill for amendments to the election laws in the District as to candidates. Am I correct or incorrect in that?

Mr. FRASER. I think the gentleman from Missouri made it clear that there are three sorts of unrelated matters in the bill.

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

(On request of Mr. GROSS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FRASER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman from Missouri made it clear that there are three sort of unrelated matters which have as their common thread—trying to fix up the election machinery in the District. In that sense, it seems to me that the commonality of the bill, as it attempts to improve and modernize election procedures here, is, I think, consistent with that. I do no really think that it is a great issue of any kind.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) desire to withdraw his point of order?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is withdrawn.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from further consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 2495), to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 2495

An Act to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the District of Columbia Election Act (Act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 699) as amended, D.C. Code 1–1100 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (2) of section 2 is amended as follows:

(a) Clause (A) is amended by striking "one-year period" and by inserting "thirty-day period" instead.

(b) Clause (B) is amended by striking "twenty-one" and inserting "eighteen" instead.

(2) Paragraph (7) (A) of subsection (a) of section 10 is amended by striking out "on the twenty-first day following such election" and by inserting instead "not less than two weeks nor more than six weeks after the date on which the Board has determined the results of the preceding general election. At the time of announcing such determination the Board shall establish and announce the date of the runoff election, if one is required."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HUNGATE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUNGATE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2495 and insert in leu thereof the provisions of H.R. 10784, as passed, as follows:

That the District of Columbia Election Act (Act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 699) as amended, D.C. Code, sec. 1–1100 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (2) of section 2 is amended as follows:

(A) Clause (A) is amended by striking out "one-year period" and inserting in lieu thereof "six-month period" and by inserting at the end thereof immediately before the semicolon ", except in the case of an election of electors of President and Vice President of the United States the period shall be thirty days".

(B) Clause (B) is amended by striking out "twenty-one" and inserting in lieu thereof "eighteen".

(2) Paragraph (7) (A) of subsection (a) of section 10 is amended by striking out "on the twenty-first day following such election" and by inserting instead "on the twenty-eighth day following such election".

(3) Subsection (a) of section 8 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of a petition nominating a candidate for the office referred to in clause (2) of the first section of this Act, if the rules of the political party of the candidate for whom such petition is being circulated require a statement on such petition indicating which prospective presidential candidate such candidate supports, or a statement indicating that he supports no prospective candidate, the Board shall affix such statement to such petition."

(4) Subsection (c) of section 8 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "With respect to the ballot for any election for the office referred to in clause (2) of the first section of this Act, if the rules of a political party require the voters of such party to be informed on the ballot as to which prospective presidential candidates each candidate of such political party for such office supports, the Board shall indicate such commitment, or lack thereof, for each candidate on the ballot for such political party."

The amendment was agreed too.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 10784) was laid on the table.

WEATHER MODIFICATION REPORTING

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 615 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 615

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6893) to provide for the reporting of weather modification activities to the Federal Government. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may

demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 615 provides for consideration of H.R. 6893, which, as reported by our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, would provide for the reporting of weather modification activities to the Federal Government. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, after which the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, now printed in H.R. 6893, as an original bill, for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this legislation arises from the fact that there is today no central source of complete and reliable information on weather modification activities in the United States.

The term weather modification is defined in the bill as any intentional, artificially produced change in the composition, behavior, or dynamics of the atmosphere. Anyone engaged in weather modification activities would be required under the proposed legislation to report such activities to the Secretary of Commerce. However, I have been assured by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. STAGGERS, that a person who tries to cause rainfall by chanting, dancing, rubbing of sticks or ti leaves together, would not be covered by this reporting requirement, even if actual rain follows such rainmaking ceremonies.

It should be pointed out that H.R. 6893 does not authorize, prohibit, or regulate any weather modification activities. The law of the State or jurisdiction where such activities are conducted would still govern. The legislation here proposed would merely require a reporting of any such activity to the Secretary of Commerce, who would keep a record of weather modification activities and make the information available to the public to the fullest practicable extent.

Any person who willfully violates any provisions of this act, however, may be fined up to $10,000 upon conviction.

To carry out its provisions, the bill authorizes the appropriation of $150,000 for fiscal year 1972 and $200,000 for the fiscal years 1973 and 1974.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 615 in order that H.R. 6893 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 615 makes in order for consideration of H.R. 6893. The purpose of the bill is to require that all persons who engage in attempts at weather modification within the United States must report their activities to the Secretary of Commerce.

At the present time, although more than half the States have laws regulating weather modification activities within their jurisdiction, there is no central authority to which such activity need is reported. Nor is there any central authority charged with the responsibility of collecting and disseminating reliable information on the subject.

The bill requires that all persons who engage in weather modification activities must report such activity to the Secretary of Commerce. The frequency of reporting and the information required to be contained therein shall be prescribed by the Secretary.

The Secretary of Commerce is further authorized to compile records of weather modification activities in the United States, to publish summaries from time to time, and to make such information available to the public.

Any violator is subject to a fine of up to $10,000. The bill authorizes $150,000 for fiscal 1972 and $200,000 for each of fiscal 1973 and 1974.

The bill was reported unanimously and it is supported by the Department of Commerce.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6893) to provide for the reporting of weather modification activities to the Federal Government, in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 6893

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

SECTION. 1. In order to provide for the acquisition and compilation of information concerning actual or attempted weather modification activities, each person, before engaging in and upon completion of any form of weather modification activity within the United States, including any possession or territory thereof and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, shall submit to the Secretary of Commerce a report at such time, in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may prescribe.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "person" includes any individual, corporation, company, association, firm, partnership, society, joint stock company, and any other organization, whether commercial or nonprofit, including State and local governments and agencies thereof, who is not performing weather modification activities as an employee, agent, or independent contractor of the Federal Government.

(b) The term "weather modification" means any intentional, artificially produced changes in the composition, behavior, or dynamics of the atmosphere.

(c) The term "territory" includes the insular possessions of the United States and also any territory of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Commerce shall maintain a continuous record of weather modification activities, including attempts, and shall disseminate summaries periodically.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Commerce may obtain from any person by regulation, subpena, or otherwise such information in the form of testimony, books, records, or other writings, may require the keeping and furnishing of such reports and records, and may make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings and premises or property of any person as may be deemed necessary or appropriate by him to carry out the provisions of this Act, but this authority shall not be exercised if adequate and authoritative data are available from any Federal agency. In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon any person referred to in this section, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Attorney General, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce documents, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

SEC. 5. Any person who knowingly and willfully performs any act prohibited or knowingly and willfully fails to perform any act required by the provisions of this Act or any regulation issued thereunder, shall upon conviction be fined not more than $10,000.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That, as used in this Act—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

(2) The term "person" means any individual, corporation, company, association, firm, partnership, society, joint stock company, any State or local government or any agency thereof, or any other organization, whether commercial or nonprofit, which is not performing weather modification activities as an employee, agent, or independent contractor of the Federal Government.

(3) The term "weather modification" means any intentional, artificially produced change in the composition, behavior, or dynamics of the atmosphere.

(4) The term "United States" includes the several states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or insular possession of the United States.

SEC. 2. No person may engage, or attempt to engage, in any weather modification activity in the United States unless he submits to the Secretary such reports with respect thereto, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may by rule prescribe. The Secretary may require that such reports be submitted to him before and after any such activity or attempt.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall maintain a record of weather modification activities, including attempts, which take place in the

United States and shall publish summaries thereof from time to time as he determines.

(b) All reports, documents, and other information received by the Secretary under the provisions of this Act shall be made available to the public to the fullest practicable extent.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary may obtain from any person by rule, subpena, or otherwise such information in the form of testimony, books, records, or other writings, may require the keeping and furnishing of such reports and records, and may make such inspection of books, records, and other writings and premises and property of any person as may be deemed necessary or appropriate by him to carry out the provisions of this Act, but this authority shall not be exercised to obtain any information with respect to which adequate and authoritative data are available from any Federal agency.

(b) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon any person pursuant to this section, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Attorney General, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce documents, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

SEC. 5. Any person who knowingly and willfully violates section 2 of this Act, or any rule issued hereunder, shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $10,000.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated $150,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and $200,000 each for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974, to carry out the provisions of this Act.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House today is by any standard a modest one. It would merely require that persons who engage in weather modification activities in the United States must file reports on those activities with the Secretary of Commerce, or more specifically, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency in the Commerce Department—NOAA. The Secretary would spell out this requirement in rules which he would issue under the legislation.

The Secretary would also maintain a record of weather modification activities in the United States and, from time to time, publish summaries thereof. Weather modification activities carried out by or for the Federal Government would not be subject to the legislation. Such information is available in environmental impact reports filed by Federal departments and agencies under section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

All data received by the Secretary under the legislation would be made available to the public to the fullest extent practicable. Deliberate violations of the act, or rules issued under it, would subject the offender to a fine of up to $10,000.

As originally requested by the administration, the legislation provided for open-end authorizations. During the hearing on the legislation, a witness for the administration estimated that once the legislation was implemented, they would be able to use up to $300,000 a year to carry out the legislation. After looking into the matter the committee amended the legislation to authorize the appropriation of $150,000 for fiscal year 1972 and $200,000 each for fiscal years 1973 and 1974.

Mr. Speaker, weather modification is no longer the province of medicine men and flimflam artists. Today it is a science. We know that under certain conditions precipitation can be increased or redistributed and that fog can be dissipated. There is, today, hope that hail can be suppressed and that lightning and severe storms and hurricanes can be modified. But we need information about the effects of weather modification activities and that is what this legislation is designed to provide.

Let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the bill does not authorize, prohibit, or regulate weather modification activities in any respect. Under the legislation that would remain a matter wholly within the control of the several States. At present, 29 States have various types of legislation relating to weather modification. But there is no place where information is available with regard to these activities. Yet, these activities can affect persons in adjacent States, and, for that matter nearby countries who are without effective recourse. They can distort the reliability of weather predictions and affect the reliability of other weather modification activities being carried out in nearby areas.

This is not an academic matter with me, Mr. Speaker. Some of my constituents, together with residents of adjacent Maryland and Pennsylvania, have formed the Tri-State Natural Weather Association. Many members of the association believe that secret cloud seeding was responsible for a recent period of drought in the Tri-State area. If this legislation had been in effect, it would have been an effective deterrent to any such cloud seeding activities which were not in conformity with State law.

For the information of Members of the House, I should also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that from 1958 until 1968, reports on weather modification activities were required to be filed with the National Science Foundation. In reassessing the role of the Foundation, we took away this function from it, but unfortunately did not assign it to any other agency of the Federal Government. The legislation now before the House would correct this oversight.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6893 is recommended by the administration. In hearings before the Subcommittee on Communications and Power, no witness appeared in opposition to the legislation. It was reported unanimously by the subcommittee and the full Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I urge its passage by the House.

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, weather modification can be a scare term in many areas and to many people. It conjures up visions of manufactured weather and rivalry for its benefits. Actually weather modification activities have been going on for many years and the possibility of positive results is not remote.

For some years after 1958 the National Science Foundation supported a program of study and research in this field. This was done pursuant to a Federal law which was changed by the 90th Congress. While the National Science Foundation had authority to require reports from persons experimenting with weather modification, the latter change removed that authority and did not place it elsewhere within the Federal Establishment. Since 1968 there has been no Federal agency with the power to keep track of the activities of the would-be weather modifiers.

Twenty-nine States have laws of one kind or another concerning the practices used to induce or divert rain and snow. Maryland plainly forbids it.

The bill before us today merely grants new authority, this time to the Department of Commerce, to require reports from anyone who intends to take a flier at weather modifications. Such reports can be obtained both before and after the particular incident and thus there will be a record of all attempts and the results obtained. On the basis of such information, proper public policy can be formed. National and international implications of weather modification can be properly evaluated and more intelligently handled in the future.

The bill provides that the Department of Commerce will create regulations for the reporting of weather modification activities by individuals, corporations and even State and local governments. Failure to comply will subject violators to criminal penalties. It also becomes the duty of the Secretary to make the information that is contained in the reports available to the public to the fullest extent practicable.

Authorizations to cover the activities described in the bill are $150,000 for the first fiscal year, fiscal year 1972, and $200,000 for each of the next 2 years.

The administration sponsored this legislation and based upon the hearings and consideration of the committee there appears to be no opposition to it from any quarter. I recommend that the House approve H.R. 6893.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the Committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the Committee amendment offered by Mr. Staggers: On page 5, line 20, strike out "hereunder" and insert in lieu thereof "thereunder".

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this is just to correct a typographical error.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND PROGRAMS RELATING TO PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1253) to amend section 6 of title 35, United States Code, "Patents," to authorize domestic and international studies and programs relating to patents and trademarks.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1253

An act to amend section 6 of title 35, United States Code, "Patents", to authorize domestic and international studies and programs relating to patents and trademarks

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 6. Duties of Commissioner

"(a) The Commissioner, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, shall superintend or perform all duties required by law respecting the granting and issuing of patents and the registration of trademarks; shall have the authority to carry on studies and programs regarding domestic and international patent and trademark law; and shall have charge of property belonging to the Patent Office. He may, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, establish regulations, not inconsistent with law, for the conduct of proceedings in the Patent Office.

"(b) The Commissioner, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, may, in coordination with the Department of State, carry on programs and studies cooperatively with foreign patent offices and international intergovernmental organizations, or may authorize such programs and studies to be carried on, in connection with the performance of duties stated in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) The Commissioner, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, transfer funds appropriated to the Patent Office, not to exceed $100,000 in any year, to the Department of State for the purpose of making special payments to international intergovernmental organizations for studies and programs for advancing international cooperation concerning patents, trademarks, and related matters. These special payments may be in addition to any other payments or contributions to the international organization and shall not be subject to any limitations imposed by law on the amounts of such other payments or contributions by the Government of the United States."

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, S. 1253 is an administration proposal. It was introduced at the request of the Department of Commerce. The bill passed the Senate on April 22, 1971, and was the subject of a hearing in May. The Judiciary Committee has approved it by voice vote.

The sole significant effect of S. 1253 is to authorize the Commissioner of Patents to spend not more than $100,000 annually, out of funds appropriated to the Patent Office, for payments to international intergovernmental organizations, for studies and programs for advancing international cooperation concerning patents, trademarks, and related matters.

Other provisions of the bill authorize the Commissioner to carry on studies and programs, himself or in cooperation with foreign patent offices and organizations, making explicit powers deemed already to be implied.

The funds would be transferred under direction of the Secretary of Commerce and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State.

The Department of Commerce advises that U.S. participation in cooperative international efforts in the patents and trademarks fields is vitally important to the business community. Heretofore the international role of the United States has been primarily that of membership in the Paris Convention of 1883.

The United States has now assumed a more active role. It was instrumental in establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization—WIPO—in the development of the Patent Cooperation Treaty of 1970, and in the establishment of the Committee for International Cooperation in Information Retrieval Among Patent Offices—ICIREPAT—among other international patent activities. The programs of the information retrieval group are important in coordinating the development of mechanized patent search systems.

NEED FOR AUTHORIZATION

The United States does not make voluntary contributions for the support of the programs of these agencies because it lacks statutory authority to do so.

The committee is advised that the inability of the United States to contribute to the support of these projects is a source of embarrassment, especially since the Soviet Union has recently paid its proportionate share, thus leaving the United States as the only major country which does not make money contributions. The major or class A countries, based on patent activity are the United States, United Kingdom, West Germany, the Soviet Union, and Japan. The purpose of the subject legislation is to correct this situation.

STAFF LOANS UNSATISFACTORY AND UNECONOMIC

In the past, we have contributed the services of personnel in lieu of cash, but this is unsatisfactory both to the international organizations and to other countries. Also it is expensive due to transportation expenses and other costs over and beyond salary incurred with respect to borrowed personnel. Thus, for calendar 1971, the suggested cash contribution of the United States for the Patent Cooperation Treaty and for the Information Retrieval Cooperation Committee—ICIREPAT—amounted to $51,289, but the actual cost of the two U.S. specialists detailed on loan exceeded $56,000 due to transportation, et cetera. We are advised that if this legislation is enacted the staff loans will be discontinued.

Mr. Speaker, the executive committee of the Paris Union has been meeting in Geneva to discuss budgetary needs and special contributions to various international projects. There is mounting objection to the contribution of funds in the absence of similar contributions by us.

WHY $100,000 MAXIMUM?

At the hearing on this measure the Commissioner of Patents was asked to justify the proposed maximum of $100,000 per year, in view of the fact that similar legislation introduced in the 91st Congress asked for only $50,000.

The Commissioner replied that the earlier legislation was drafted without the Patent Cooperation Treaty in mind, that treaty having been signed in June 1970. He also indicated that the amount to be requested of the United States in 1972 will be $42,000 for the Patent Cooperation Treaty and $19,000 for the information retrieval group—ICIREPAT. Conceding that these items, plus any unanticipated increases could be accommodated for less than $100,000, the Commissioner pointed out that even with this leeway, the Patent Office would have to justify its appropriations and its expenditures and, hopefully, would not be under the necessity of refreshing its authorization to appropriate within the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable action on the bill and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD immediately prior to passage of S. 1253.

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

There was no objection.

CIVIL LIBERTARIAN

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the national legislative director of the American Civil Liberties Union conveying to me the "vast sense of relief" experienced by his organization since I now look upon myself as a "civil libertarian."

It does give me a certain sense of satisfaction to realize that I must have reached Mr. Schardt with the fact that I argued for the libertarian position in the debate that took place on the floor of this House in regard to the Emergency Detention Act. As I pointed out in the debate, the choice was not between liberty and wartime security measures, but a choice between liberty with wartime security measures and total reliance upon the whims of the executive branch of Government during the hysteria and emotions of a wartime emergency without either. History does prove, and I hope the debate did prove, that it was people who, like Mr. Schardt, claiming to be civil libertarians who insisted on the needless, senseless incarceration of the Japanese-Americans without any regard to their loyalty. Mr. Schardt's arch enemy, J. Edgar Hoover, did complain about this dastardly deed but the voices of the self proclaimed "civil libertarians" were strangely silent at that time.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress simply took the easy way out and left the whole question of detaining potential saboteurs up to the President as it was in 1942 when the shameful mass detention of the Japanese-Americans took place. The emotional issue dealt with false symbolism. The real issue was simply a question of government by man or government by law. The true civil libertarian always chooses government by law.

Mr. Speaker, the spokesman for the ACLU further urged me to make my libertarian credentials official by becoming a member of his organization. First of all, let me make it unequivocally clear that I have established my libertarian credentials beyond any doubt in the 11 years that I have served as a Member of this House. Further, it strikes me as strange and arrogant that ACLU feels that the only way a person can officially establish his libertarian credentials is to become a member of that organization. It is my belief that the overwhelming majority of our Nation's more than 200 million citizens are civil libertarians while ACLU can boast of a membership of only 160,000.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to say that I have agreed in the past with some positions taken by the ACLU, and it is possible that I might agree with some of their positions in the future. However, I must say in candor that it has become progressively more difficult to find ACLU positions with which I agree since they repealed the so-called exclusion clause or loyalty requirement in 1968. The 1940 resolution of ACLU prohibiting Communists, Fascists, and others supporting totalitarian dictatorships from serving on governing committees and holding staff positions was in keeping with a commitment to civil libertarian principles. Certainly, those who support any form of totalitarian dictatorship could have no interest in civil liberties.

ACLU, in my opinion, altogether too often confuses the words "libertarian" and "libertine." The words may sound alike but they have completely different meanings. The retired longshoreman and down-to-earth philosopher, Eric Hoffer, has said:

> When liberty destroys order, the yearning for order will destroy liberty.

This must not happen! Liberty should not be destroyed in the name of liberty as has happened so often in the past. Even the classic libertarian, John Stuart Mill, would place the limits of individual liberty at the point when one would infringe upon the rights of others.

The ancient wisdom of the Roman historian, Livius, bears serious reflection today:

> Liberty, when regulated by prudence, is productive of happiness both to individuals and to states; but when pushed to excess, it becomes not only obnoxious to others, but precipitates the possessors of it themselves into dangerous rashness and extravagance.

Mr. Speaker, I must respectfully turn down the offer of membership in the ACLU—not because I do not consider myself to be a civil libertarian, but because I have serious doubts about their libertarian credentials. In my letter of response to Mr. Arlie Schardt I have strongly counseled him to direct his organization in the direction of true libertarianism and to avoid the extremes of becoming libertines or anarchists. If he heeds this advice, I am convinced that the vast majority of all Americans as well as Members of Congress will gladly join his organization. At this point I would like to submit for the RECORD the letter I received from ACLU along with my response:

COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY,
Washington, D.C., September 28, 1971.

Mr. ARLIE SCHARDT,
National Legislative Director,
American Civil Liberties Union,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHARDT: Thank you for your letter dated September 16, 1971, in which you express your sense of relief over my reference to myself as a civil libertarian and invite me to become a member of your organization.

Let me first express my profound hope that your letter indicates that you followed the debate on HR 234 and HR 820 and discovered that I was defending the civil libertarian position in this matter. As I pointed out the choice was not between liberty and war-time security but between liberty with war-time security and a reliance upon the whims of the executive branch in the hysteria that accompanies a war-time emergency. If the substitute bill, HR 820, which I offered on the floor would have been in effect prior to the start of World War II the massive detention of Japanese-Americans, advocated by such recognized libertarians as Earl Warren and Walter Lippman in the hysteria of war, could not have happened and the calmer opinion of such so-called authoritarians as J. Edgar Hoover would have prevailed. Certainly we all look back upon our treatment of the Japanese-Americans with shame.

I cannot determine if it is ignorance or arrogance that leads you to contend that the only way to obtain "official" status as a libertarian is to join your organization. Maybe you have overlooked the fact that there are over 200 million Americans in this country, the overwhelming majority of whom are civil libertarians, while your organization boasts of a membership of only 160,000.

Certainly, I have established my libertarian credentials beyond doubt in the eleven years I have served in the House of Representatives. In my opinion, your organization has often confused the libertarian position with the libertine position on a number of issues. It is for this reason that I must respectfully turn down your invitation to membership in ACLU. However, if you will redirect this organization in the direction of true libertarianism and avoid the extremes of libertinism and anarchism, I feel that the overwhelming majority of Americans would then feel free to join with you to work for this goal.

Sincerely,

RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Chairman.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
Washington, D.C., Sept. 16, 1971.

Hon. RICHARD H. ICHORD,
Chairman, Committee on Internal Security, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I was pleased to note that on page 19 of the Sept. 15 issue of *The New York Times*, you were quoted as describing yourself as a civil libertarian.

In view of the countless occasions in the past when our organization—which is dedicated solely to the protection of civil liberties of all persons—has found itself in a disagreement with positions advocated by you, I would like to convey the vast sense of relief which your statement has brought.

Heaven knows this nation urgently needs every civil libertarian it can muster in these days when so many Constitutional rights are in such constant danger from so many quarters.

I would therefore like not only to urge that bygones be bygones, I would also like to welcome you to the fold and urge that you make your status 'official' by becoming a member of the ACLU.

I am enclosing a flyer which doubles as an application envelope and a capsule summary of ACLU highlights through the past five decades. Also enclosed is a more complete booklet about ACLU accomplishments.

I sincerely hope you will decide to join the 160,000 Americans whose commitment has led them to actively support the ACLU. If I may be of further service, such as sending you a complimentary subscription to our monthly newspaper, I will be pleased to do so.

It would also be a pleasure to meet with you at anytime, at your convenience, or to offer the research facilities of our office to you on any civil liberties subjects where we might be of help.

Sincerely,

ARLIE SCHARDT,
National Legislative Director.

VICE ADM. MEANS JOHNSTON, JR.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday marked the last day of duty for Vice Adm. Means Johnston, Jr., as Chief of Legislative Affairs for the Navy Department. During the 20 months he held this most important position, he gave tirelessly of his capabilities and knowledge in serving the Members of Congress and thus by our constituents. Admiral Johnston and the men and women who served under him always performed in a most competent manner in fulfilling their responsibilities. I am particularly pleased to pay tribute to this career naval officer since he is a native of my home State of Mississippi. I am sure my colleagues will join with me in thanking Admiral Johnston for a job well

done and wishing him well when he begins his new duties as Inspector General of the Navy on November 1.

On January 20, 1969, Rear Adm. Means Johnston, Jr., came to the assignment as Chief of Legislative Affairs for the Navy Department from command of Cruiser-Destroyer Flotilla 10, then deployed with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean. Prior to that, he served a tour of duty as commander of the naval base in Newport, R.I. During that period, he simultaneously performed additional duty as commandant of the 1st Naval District with headquarters in Boston, Mass., for a period of 9 months.

Rear Adm. Johnston was recently nominated and approved for the rank of vice admiral. He will become the Inspector General of the Navy November 1.

Vice Admiral Johnston, a 1939 graduate of the Naval Academy, has enjoyed a distinguished career in the Navy, occupying positions of great responsibility. At sea, he has had 10 commands in the combatant forces. He saw action in both World War II and the Korean war. He was twice decorated in World War II for meritorious service while in command of the destroyer escort USS *Flaherty*. His ship participated in several successful actions against German submarines, including the famous engagement with and subsequent capture of the German U-boat 505 off the French west coast of Africa. This was the first man-of-war to be captured on the high seas since 1815. In the Korean war he was again decorated for service as commanding officer of the destroyer *Beatty*.

His assignments ashore have been uniformly important. He has served on the personal staffs of the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Naval Personnel, and the Commander in Chief, Pacific. On one occasion he served as military adviser to the President's citizen advisers on the mutual security program headed by the late Mr. Benjamin F. Fairless. In addition he headed the Navy branch of the Plans and Operations Division on the staff of the Commander in Chief Southern Forces, Europe, a NATO command. He also served on the Secretary of the Navy's task force on military retention, and on the staff of the Director, Navy Planning, Programing, and Budgeting.

Pursuing a natural interest in the law, which was kindled by his father, Vice Admiral Johnston graduated with honors from the Georgetown University Law School. In addition, he is a graduate of the National War College.

Vice Admiral Johnston is the son of Mrs. Means Johnston and the late Means Johnston, of Greenwood, Miss. He is married to the former Hope Manning Larkin, daughter of Mrs. Sylvester P. Larkin and the late Sylvester P. Larkin, Sr., of Greenwich, Conn. They have two children, a 22-year-old daughter, Hope Larkin, and a 16-year-old son, Means III.

DRUG PROBLEM

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Department of the Army is undermining the President's program to achieve greater international cooperation in the stopping of illegal narcotics traffic.

When I was in Iran last month as part of a worldwide tour of narcotics treatment facilities, I learned from Government officials there of the great problems Iran has had in policing its borders against narcotics smuggling.

Iran, which is slightly larger than the State of Alaska, shares borders with the U.S.S.R., Iraq, Turkey, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. Like the United States, Iran has historically been a nation victimized by narcotics smuggling. In the 1950's Iran outlawed the cultivation of the opium poppy, but the only effect of this action was to increase dramatically the amount of illicit opium smuggling into the country from Turkey, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. In Iran today there are an estimated 500,000 to 600,000 opium addicts and approximately 50,000 heroin addicts, figures which give Iran and the United States the dubious distinction of being the world's leaders in the consumption of opiates. The Iranian Government is trying gallantly to stem an ever-growing tide of narcotics smuggling and addiction, but the Iranian police are undermanned and underequipped to adequately patrol the large Iranian border.

To enable it to more effectively police its border areas the Government of Iran has requested that the United States sell to Iran five helicopters which have been declared surplus by the U.S. Army in Iran. The Iranian Government has offered a price of $100,000 per helicopter, but the U.S. Army is refusing to sell for less than $200,000 and has threatened to remove the helicopters from the country unless this price is met.

Our Ambassador to Iran, Douglas MacArthur II, and the Department of State have requested the Department of Defense to lower its price to enable the Iranian Government to purchase the helicopters. I have written to the Secretary of Defense to inform him of the importance of these helicopters to the Iranian Government's attempt to patrol its borders against narcotics smuggling. As I stated in that letter, we should recognize that the interests of the United States are directly affected by the ability of the Government of Iran to decrease narcotics smuggling. The hard lessons of history and of our current narcotics problem should have taught us that no nation is an island protected against the scourge of narcotics smuggling so long as this smuggling continues unabated in other areas of the world.

The President has shown recognition of the need to stop international smuggling in various statements, most notably in his message to Congress on drug abuse on July 14, 1969, and most recently in a speech on the drug problem in Rochester, N.Y., on June 18, 1971. In that speech President Nixon stated that the administration had put stopping the drug traffic as the top diplomatic priority in the various countries where this traffic is a problem. This message has obviously not reached the Department of Defense.

It is with bitter irony that those of us who have some familiarity with the terrible drug problem which affects our country view this refusal to sell at a reasonable price equipment which an ally has requested for the purpose of patrolling its borders against narcotics traffic. A country which has wasted 4,500 helicopters in the tragedy of Vietnam and which is daily turning over millions of dollars in equipment to a government which is making a sham of the democratic ideals for which we are supposedly fighting should certainly be able to permit the sale of but five helicopters to be used in the cause of international cooperation against narcotics smuggling.

STRATEGIC STORABLE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1971—STATEMENT OF EUGENE MOOS

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most knowledgeable and able spokesmen for agriculture in this country is Eugene Moos, of Edwall, Wash., who is an active wheat farmer, a former president of the Washington State Wheat Growers, and the current president of the National Association of Wheat Growers.

In a recent appearance before the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Moos pointed out the critical need for significant changes in the administration of the Nation's farm programs to avoid the disastrous impact from a dramatic increase in farm surpluses, especially in the key area of wheat and feed grains.

In his testimony, Mr. Moos not only spelled out the character of the surplus problem he foresees in the coming years, but detailed specific recommendations for corrective action.

Mr. Speaker, because the statement of Mr. Moos is of great importance and value, and because he is an acknowledged leader in American agriculture, I believe the full contents of his testimony deserve the widest possible consideration and dissemination. Accordingly, I include the text in this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF EUGENE MOOS

Chairman Purcell and Committee members: I am Gene Moos a wheat producer from Edwall, Washington and the current President of the National Association of Wheat Growers. I am accompanied today by Jerry Rees our Executive Vice President. Our association represents wheat producers in our member states of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Colorado, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas.

NAWG supports the establishment of a strategic reserve. By resolution of the membership we urge that a strategic reserve of wheat be maintained for purpose of national defense, an adequate food supply and emergency distribution; provided that the stocks will be isolated from the market at 100 percent of parity. The cost of such reserves should be charged to National Defense and other appropriate agencies serving the pub-

lic interest, and not alone to the cost of farm programs.

In the discussion of the need for a reserve, I feel it is important to review the first year performance of the set-aside farm program and its impact on production and prices. Perhaps the single most distinguishing feature of the set-aside program is its flexibility—the options it provides allow the individual producer to utilize his acreage in a variety of ways. As Secretary Hardin told the Senate Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee during hearings on USDA's 1972 budget: "We seek to make farm products more competitive and to help farmers reduce production costs through more efficient use of their total resources. Under the new programs, many farmers will have increased opportunities to make decisions on their own about what and how much they produce."

There can be little question that this guiding principle of the new programs has, in effect, given many producers the option of putting many more acres into production than previously—and, even more important, that many producers have exercised this option. Just how much additional acreage will be brought back into production as a result of this feature remains unknown, but the most recent crop reports strongly indicate a dramatic increase in production.

All wheat production in 1971 is forecast to be 18 per cent above 1970. The harvested acreage of all wheat was up approximately 9 per cent despite the fact that winter wheat which represents 60 per cent of all wheat produced actually showed a decline in harvested acreage. This clearly illustrates that Spring wheat and Durum which had a chance to respond to the flexibility of the set-aside program, responded with a 40 per cent increase in harvested acreage. Does this mean then that the U.S. will have a similar increase in winter wheat harvested in 1972? Let us hope not, even though a survey of member states of NAWG taken at a late August meeting of the Executive Committee in Denver shows a significant increase in planting intentions—something in excess of 20 per cent. This could mean 60 million acres of wheat harvested in 1972 even despite the increased set-aside requirement for the 1972 wheat crop. Multiplying 60 million acres by an average yield of 30 bushels an acre results in a potential wheat crop for 1972 of 1.8 billion bushels.

The case for feedgrains is quite similar with a significant increase in estimated production for 1971, partly due to increased acreage and partly due to higher than anticipated yields. As for estimating feedgrain production for 1972 there is little reason to believe there will be any less acreage planted in 1972 unless there is a significant increase in the set-aside requirement for 1972.

In terms of supply—carryover stocks of wheat at the end of the crop marketing year July 1, 1972 could be as high as a billion bushels. As for feedgrains, October 1, 1972 carryover stocks could be 50 million tons or higher. Although these carryover stocks of wheat and feedgrains will not set new national records, they could well set off a new generation of farm surpluses. Certainly they will be high enough to be a major market depressant, and there is little prospect that either wheat or feedgrain prices will be much above loan support levels during this marketing year. Set-aside exponents are on record indicating that guaranteed price supports are to be calculated at a level to support the cost of production. What this means then is that wheat and feedgrain producers would be condemned to total reliance on direct Government payments for their living costs.

These supply figures for 1971 are depressing enough but nothing like what they could be if production under the set-aside program in 1972 shows another significant increase. If the U.S. continues to build surplus stocks in 1972 under this program, it will take years of stringent acreage controls to absorb these excess stocks.

It is not hard to forecast the economic consequences to an industry already suffering from a severe cost-price squeeze.

A comparison of 1970 and 1971 wheat production in five major wheat exporting countries indicates the 1971 crop could be up about 575 bushels—18 per cent larger than a year earlier. The following comparisons are in millions of bushels with the 1971 estimates in parenthesis: Canada 332 (520) up 56.6 per cent; U.S. 1,378 (1,625) up 18 percent; Argentina 156 (180) up 15.4 per cent; Australia 293 (330) up 12.6 per cent, and the EEC 1,088 (1,170) up 7.5 per cent.

These production developments take on added significance when they are considered in conjunction with the "green revolution." Efforts to increase production in many underdeveloped countries through use of improved varieties and new cultural practices have been successful, and several nations now claim to have achieved self-sufficiency in grains. For example, India, who at one time imported nearly 200 million bushels a year from the U.S. expects to stop food grain imports by December of 1971 and does not plan to enter into any new PL-480 agreements after her current commitment expires next June.

Competition for available markets from our major competitors—Australia, Canada, Argentina and European Community—is certain to be intense during the current marketing year. The Foreign Agriculture Service indicates U.S. exports of wheat may decline by as much as 10 to 15 per cent.

Unfortunately, this bleak outlook for U.S. wheat exports comes at a time when our supplies are expected to increase substantially.

These then are the concerns of NAWG and all producers. Can the 1970 Agriculture Act be administered in such a way during the next two years as to reverse this accumulation of surplus stocks of wheat and feedgrains? NAWG believes this accumulation of stocks can be reversed but not unless the following things happen. One—the feedgrain set-aside requirement must be raised to at least 35 per cent with proportionate increases in the support payment while at the same time voluntary diversion payments must be made available for both wheat and feedgrains for 1972. The above recommendations will probably cost an additional billion dollars over and above anticipated farm program costs for 1972. We agree this is very expensive and difficult considering the present budget difficulties confronted by the Administration. However, we have to point out that in the absence of such an emergency effort to control the size of the 1972 crop, the U.S. will accumulate stocks of wheat and feedgrains to the point that economic disaster will threaten the farm community.

Two—The basic philosophy of the set-aside farm program must be changed from one of increased program flexibility designed to stimulate increased production to a policy that recognizes that the U.S. agricultural plant has the capacity to far over-produce domestic and export requirements for the foreseeable future. Adequate production controls continue to be a must, in fact with the increased use of both fertilizer and higher yielding varieties adequate production regulation of wheat becomes even more critical. In our opinion it was a major misjudgment to feel that management decisions can be reached individually by almost a million U.S. wheat producers to regulate production to demand. With this approach each producer must strive to produce a little more than his neighbor—more acres, better cultural practices, better varieties and more fertilizer.

Three—A major effort is needed to develop economical industrial uses for wheat and to promote these uses for industrial acceptance and utilization. This includes research, promotion teams and financial incentives.

Four—It is important that the U.S. present a more positive position in behalf of agriculture in negotiating trade rights with other countries and asserting these rights under current agreements.

Five—Positive action is needed to open West Coast ports for shipping and prevent a tie-up of Gulf and East Coast ports.

Six—Finally and certainly not the least in importance is the need for some type of reserve supply program for the regulated commodities. H.R. 1163 or some similar type of legislation must be enacted to protect both the consumer interest and the taxpayers' interest. The USDA experience this year in trying to anticipate the ups and downs of Mother Nature is the latest of a series of sorry experiences of this sort and pin-points the need for an adequate reserve program. Cost-wise a reserve program would be much less costly than the billion dollars NAWG believes is necessary to stabilize the production-supply situation in 1972. And of course that extra billion dollars would only buy production control for one year. Another point that must be considered is that an adequate reserve program would stabilize farm prices to the point where there would be some hope for producers being able to live off of what they receive in the market place rather than being dependent on the Federal treasury.

Mr. Purcell, I sincerely appreciate this opportunity to appear before your Subcommittee and to share with you the concerns and recommendations of the National Association of Wheat Growers with regard to the serious problems now facing agriculture. Mr. Rees and I will be pleased to respond to any questions you or other members of the Subcommittee might have at this time.

FORCED SCHOOL BUSING, A MAJOR POLITICAL ISSUE

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, forced busing to achieve a racial balance in public schools has become a major political issue in the United States. The Federal courts have extended the school desegregation and forced busing controversy far beyond the original Supreme Court ruling of May 1954. Now the conflict over forced busing has been extended to cities in the North, notably Pontiac, Mich., and Boston, Mass., which have lately been in the news. For the North the forced school busing ordeal is just beginning.

The forced school busing mess created by confusing and conflicting court decisions calls for congressional action, which might most effectively take the form of enactment of House Joint Resolution 651, of which I am a sponsor.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD an excellent news article which reviews the state of the court created, forced school busing mess at the beginning of this school year:

BUSING CRISIS HITS A PEAK

A revolt is spreading against federal demands for massive busing to get "racial balance" in schools. Reports from many cities show why there are fears that school opening may be stormy.

After years of mounting controversy, the battle over busing has hit a new peak that threatens trouble for the opening of the school term just ahead.

It's a battle that involves more than 300,000 children in scores of cities and counties throughout the South—and many in the North as well.

It also involves President Nixon and Alabama Governor George C. Wallace.

Its outcome could affect next year's presidential election.

As school opening draws near, this is the situation:

At least 300,000 youngsters face federal orders—either by courts or by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare—to leave their neighborhood schools and ride buses to more distant schools in other neighborhoods. The purpose is to get more integration. Often it becomes an attempt to achieve "racial balance" in every school.

President Nixon has declared anew his opposition to such busing and—while pledging to carry out federal-court decrees—he has told his appointed officials to hold busing to the minimum required by law. Those who violate this instruction, a White House spokesman has hinted, may find themselves off the federal payroll.

Governor Wallace leaped at the opportunity provided by Mr. Nixon. The Governor personally ordered three Alabama school districts to defy federal directives that call for busing as a means of integration. He prepared legislation to bar use of State funds for such busing.

Echoes of '63? To many, the Governor's actions recalled the time in 1963 when Mr. Wallace "stood in the schoolhouse door" in a vain attempt to bar Negroes from entering the University of Alabama.

U.S. District Judge Sam C. Pointer, Jr., was not impressed by this latest Wallace stand. The judge said the Governor's orders were legally meaningless—a mere "exercise of free speech"—and he told the school boards they should obey the courts, not the Governor.

Whatever the legal effect, Governor Wallace appeared to have accomplished these political effects: He put the President on something of a spot by challenging him to follow up his antibusing words with antibusing action. And Mr. Wallace dramatized an issue with strong emotional appeal that could provide campaign ammunition if he decides to run for President again in 1972.

Confusion. Adding fuel to the dissension over busing is confusion as to what the law really requires. The Supreme Court last April ruled that "dual" school systems must be eliminated and upheld busing for reasonable distances if necessary to do that. But the High Court still left wide discretion to lower courts to determine how much busing—and how much of a racial mix—would be demanded in each community.

A new round of Supreme Court tests may develop to clarify such questions. Several school districts already have appealed for modification of court orders in line with the stand taken by President Nixon.

Two other Southern Governors—John Bell Williams of Mississippi and John McKeithen of Louisiana—were quick to announce their support of Governor Wallace in his fight on busing.

Fears are growing that all these developments could lead to bitter confrontations—and possibly violence—in many communities when schools reopen.

Reports from various cities show the problems—and attitudes—involved.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.—This city, with the help of the U.S. Justice Department, won a Supreme Court delay of a district-court order that would require busing 15,000 of the public-school system's 46,000 pupils.

Corpus Christi has only 2,500 Negro pupils. But it has 20,700 Mexican Americans—and the lower court held they must also be mixed among other pupils. The Justice Department intervened to ask time for the appeals court to review this lower-court holding.

In granting the delay August 19, Supreme Court Justice Hugo L. Black said:

"It is apparent that this case is in an undesirable state of confusion and presents questions not heretofore passed on by the full [appeals] court, but which should be."

It was the Nixon Administration's own HEW—acting at the district court's request—which drew up the busing plan imposed on Corpus Christi.

A few weeks ago, the Nixon Administration disavowed another busing plan proposed by HEW for Austin, Tex.

Several other Texas cities, including Dallas, Houston and Fort Worth, also are scenes of dispute over busing.

It's a dispute of political significance in this big State with a key bloc of electoral votes. *Hundreds of thousands of Texans have signed petitions against busing.*

MOBILE, ALA.—*Integration of this city's schools brought disruptions and outbreaks of racial violence last year. Attendance fell. White students dropped out. Many entered private schools.*

This year, Mobile faces new problems. The city's integration plan was knocked out by the U.S. Supreme Court ruling of last April.

Mobile's new plan relies heavily on busing—*hauling thousands of black and white children out of their neighborhoods* in order to get as close as possible to a racial ratio of 65 whites to 35 blacks in individual schools. Despite all this busing there still will be many schools predominantly black and four all-black.

When the plan was ordered last July, a school-board statement said it would necessitate purchase of 83 buses at a cost of $516,000. But now Superintendent H. R. Collins says only "about one-third" of those buses will actually be required to carry out the new court order and others can be used to meet already-existing busing needs.

About 47,500 students within the city area will be affected by the new plan. Mr. Collins says he has no figures yet on how many will have to be bused as a result of the court order, but earlier he had given a rough estimate of "several thousand."

Superintendent Collins says of the new integration plan:

"It is not what everybody likes, and it represents concessions on the part of all—but it does bring about a unitary school system. And it is educationally sound."

Many parents—both black and white—are more critical. Students of both races also object to being bused away from their former community schools.

"We work all our life." Mrs. Millie Hobbs, a white member of an organization called Unified Concerned Citizens, tells of a niece who has been assigned to a school in the black ghetto, and says:

"We work all our life trying to get our children out of that, into a decent area. Then about the time we think we've got it made—wham!—they stick you right back into it."

H. C. Porter is spending $115 a month to send three children to private academies rather than let them be bused.

A white student, 16-year old Steve Mitchell, withdrew from Vigor High School, which was closed several days last year by racial disruptions. He says: "There was so much trouble it just wasn't safe to go there."

One Negro mother complained that "all the black kids are being bused out of their communities." J. T. Gaines, a black high-school principal, finds his school being closed, its 1,400 pupils assigned to five different schools.

A white teacher at Davidson High says the integration plan has completely disrupted the school, which is being put on a ratio of 60 whites to 40 blacks, with 700 blacks being bused in. Transfers took away many white pupils, including much of the band, 27 members of the football squad and the president of the student council.

"Blacks over barrel." Henry Rembert, director of an organization called ACT, has worked with black parents and teachers in an effort to smooth the transition. He says:

"They have the blacks over a barrel. *Last year there was so much trouble that neither white nor black children received any education.* The closing of black schools is definitely against us. But if we say, 'No, we won't go,' we'll just have another year of chaos."

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.—Local newspapers describe the Jacksonville school system as "the most bused in Dixie."

Here is why:

In the last school term 20 schools were "clustered" and "paired," with 5,200 pupils bused as a result.

In the school term soon to open, under a new court order, an additional 12,000 pupils will have to be bused, according to Francis Brown, a school transportation official.

Next year, in the 1972–73 term, "We expect to bus another 20,000 to 25,000," says Mr. Brown.

Jacksonville has the largest area—827 square miles—of any city in the United States. And most of this huge area is affected by the busing order. Even without busing for integration, thousands of youngsters must be transported simply because of the distances to be traveled. Last year, in all, 37,000 rode buses.

The average distance that pupils must ride on buses as a result of the court order is 10 miles, according to Mr. Brown—but some distances, he says, range up to 25 miles.

Needed: 250 buses. A shortage of buses is delaying full implementation of the new integration order, which would require 250 buses in addition to the 249 on hand. The city was able to obtain only 99 used buses in time for this school year.

Costs of transportation totaled 1.36 million dollars last year and are expected to rise to 2.2 million this year.

Double sessions will be required at all the elementary schools which will be receiving black pupils from seven schools being closed. *Some children in the same families will be going to school at different times.*

Most of those being transported in this year's phase of the stepped-up integration plan are black, since the phase which requires busing white pupils from outlying areas to center-city schools doesn't reach full effect until next year.

Negroes complain bitterly that their children are bearing the busing brunt.

Mrs. Eddie Steward, chairman of the education committee of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in Jacksonville, complains:

"Parents who work will have to make arrangements to get their children to afternoon school sessions. Many will have to pay nurseries or baby-sitters.

"It will be worth it if it means our children are going to get the same education as the whites. *But we do not feel that black schools need to be closed to accomplish this.*"

School Superintendent Cecil D. Hardesty gives this explanation:

"In order to make the plan work, we felt we had to close some all-black schools. People just are not going to send their kids into some of those high-crime areas."

NASHVILLE.—An appeals court refused on August 17 to delay a new integrated plan that will force Nashville to bus 51,000 schoolchildren this autumn—15,000 more than last year.

School authorities argued in vain that the plan ordered by a U.S. district court will require the purchase of 80 or more buses which

cannot be obtained by the time school opens, and pupils will have to go to schools in shifts.

Appellate Judge George C. Edwards Jr., told the school board: "You are asking us to fly in the face of a unanimous Supreme Court decision."

NORFOLK, VA.—To cope with the new busing required by a U.S. court order, Norfolk *plans to run schools in four different shifts*, with starting times staggered between 7:45 and 10:10 a.m.

About 24,000 pupils are affected by court-ordered transfers aimed at improving racial balance. Norfolk lost 2,100 white students from public schools last year in its first year of busing.

SAVANNAH, GA.—With 3,000 bus riders added this year, Savannah is staggering its school hours. If an appeals court orders a new plan, 5,000 more will have to be bused—and more staggering of hours will be required. *Nearly 30,000 Savannah residents have signed antibusing petitions.*

MACON, GA.—U.S. District Judge W. A. Bootle on August 16 ruled this city "legally desegregated" in that "all racial barriers have been removed." He rejected further reshuffling of enrollments which would require busing.

NEW ORLEANS.—Nearby Jefferson Parish has been ordered by a federal court to start busing about 3,000 children over distances averaging seven miles.

To do this, the parish will need 30 more buses. And Governor McKeithen said on August 13 he will use all the authority at his command to prevent the use of State funds for forced busing.

JACKSON, MISS.—This State capital is under orders to start a desegregation plan which requires the busing of about 9,000 pupils at a cost estimated between $300,000 and $400,000.

Mississippi Governor Williams, in approving Governor Wallace's actions, said on August 13:

"George Wallace has drawn a line in the dust and I stand fully with him."

VIRGINIA BEACH, VA.—School Board Chairman J. W. Buffington has asked the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to revoke this city's busing plan in accordance with the guidelines announced by Mr. Nixon.

SAN FRANCISCO.—It is not only in the South that busing is a hot issue.

The city of San Francisco and a big group of Chinese parents have appealed to the Supreme Court to block a desegregation order by a federal judge that would require massive busing to mix white, black and Chinese pupils in school throughout the city.

McCULLOCH BACK IN ACTION

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

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, before entering the hospital last December, I guided a bill through Congress to permit the historic riverboat *Delta Queen* to operate on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. Today, several weeks after leaving the hospital, I pick up where I left off—saving the *Delta Queen*.

It is great to be back in action. My doctors suggested that I take it easy for a few weeks and this time I am going to follow their suggestion. As a matter of fact, I might just go down to Cincinnati and take a ride on that old riverboat. Riding a riverboat can be a most relaxing experience, especially in the autumn. Mark Twain painted this picture:

One cannot see too many summer sunrises on the Mississippi. They are enchanting. First there is the eloquence of silence, for a deep hush broods everywhere. Next there is the haunting sense of loneliness, isolation, remoteness from the worry and hustle of the world.

And all this stretch of river is a mirror, and you have the shadowy reflections of the leafage and the curving shores and the receding capes pictured in it. Well, that is all beautiful; soft and rich and beautiful; and . . . you grant that you have seen something that is worth remembering.

The Fourth Congressional District which I represent does not border the Ohio River. However, my district is in the heart of the Great Miami Valley through which a tributary of the Ohio flows. This area has a background of history, song and story which go back to the creation of the Northwest Territory.

I have been serving Ohioans for over 30 years and I know that many people in and around my district have been enjoying this riverboat for nearly half a century. I am sure that many Ohioans as well as citizens from other river States across the Nation do not want to see the cessation of this great riverboat tradition. I might add that the legislation introduced today does not involve any expenditure of the taxpayers' money, but would only permit the *Delta Queen* to operate beyond 1973, subject, of course, to regular inspections by the U.S. Coast Guard.

I include a copy of the bill for the RECORD:

A bill to exempt from certain deep-draft safety statutes a passenger vessel operating solely on inland rivers

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the next to last sentence of subsection (b) of section 5 of the Act of May 27, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 369(b)) is amended to read as follows: "After November 1, 1970, no passenger vessel of the United States of one hundred gross tons or over, having berth or stateroom accommodations for fifty or more passengers, shall be granted a certificate of inspection by the Coast Guard, unless the vessel is constructed of fire-retardant material, except that this requirement shall not apply to a domestic passenger vessel which has berth or stateroom accommodations for less than two hundred passengers powered by steam and paddlewheel and operates solely on inland rivers.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. 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 has 25 percent more elementary and secondary schools per 100,000 population than the U.S.S.R. and more than twice as many colleges and universities. Americans enrolled in institutions of higher learning outnumber Soviet by 3½ to 1.

PRAYER AMENDMENT

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in the days past, I have taken the liberty of addressing the House on the question of the prayer amendment. The adoption of this amendment would result in an amendment to the Bill of Rights in the Constitution. It would break down the great principle of religious freedom that we have enjoyed for so long.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court decisions in Engel and Abington were correct when they held that the first amendment prohibited public schools from establishing religion and that the required saying of prayers constituted an establishment of religion within a constitutional sense. This decision is consistent with the Founding Fathers' intent when they composed the language of the establishment clause—to keep state and and church separate and independent.

The proponents of the school prayer amendment take issue with the Court's decisions primarily because they assume that the Court prohibited more than it actually did. The Supreme Court rulings bar only State-written, State-directed, or State-sponsored prayer. The right of the individual to pray independent of any State-sanctioned activity is not nullified by the Supreme Court decisions. Also, activities which do not constitute religious activities, such as the study of the modern history of religion, are unaffected by the rulings.

The language of the proposed amendments is inadequate to accomplish what the proponents want, and in general would create more problems than there are now. The Dirksen amendment of the 90th Congress, whose successors are Senate Joint Resolutions 32 and 40, and House Joint Resolutions 37 and 123 in the 92d Congress, permits nondenominational prayer. Who is to determine what is a nondenominational prayer? The divisive effect of religious groups lobbying at the State legislatures for their particular prayer version is exactly what the first amendment tried to avoid. And if the prayer is truly nondenominational, it would not be satisfactory to any religious group. The result might be a nondescript State religion developed in the public schools.

Leaders of 11 Protestant denominations—United Church of Christ, Evangelical United Brethren, African Methodist Episcopal, Disciples of Christ, Episcopal, Lutheran, Unitarian Universalist, Seventh Day Adventist, Methodist, and Southern and American Baptists—have indicated strong disapproval of permitting even voluntary prayers in the public schools. They argue that—

First, the first amendment to the Constitution should not be amended or "tampered with";

Second, already anyone can pray at anytime and anyplace;

Third, agents of the Government are not acting in their proper sphere when they provide for classroom religious exercises even if they do not dictate the content.

Fourth, it would be difficult to provide for prayer without some kind of compulsion either overtly or tacitly; and

Fifth, the 1963 Supreme Court decision has sanctioned teaching "about the Bible or religion in secular education."

Mr. Speaker, one of the best articles of the period so far in support of my position is in the Boston Sunday Globe of September 26 under the title of "Diminishing Religious Freedom." The editorial follows:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, September 26, 1971]

DIMINISHING RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

In 1963 the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in two companion cases that public school Bible readings and recitations of the Lord's Prayer were unconstitutional. Such activities, the court held, were in violation of the First Amendment's prohibition against the making of any laws "respecting an establishment of religion."

In some quarters the decisions were taken as violations of the right of free exercise of religion, a right supposedly protected by the very same First Amendment. The court was widely reviled as "Godless" and hostile to the cause of religion.

But careful analysis showed otherwise. Not only had the court been extremely solicitous of the right of free exercise of religion in other cases, but it had made it clear that the government had no business favoring one religion over others, thereby depriving adherents of the others of their own freedom of worship as they saw fit.

What the court struck down in the Bible-reading and Lord's Prayer cases was not anyone's right to engage in these particular forms of religious worship. Citizens and groups remained totally free to read from the Bible and say prayers in their churches, their homes, and other places where these activities did not impinge on the religious freedom of contrary-minded citizens.

But the public schools, the court said in effect, should be neutral ground. Supported by taxpayers of all sorts of religious (and non-religious) persuasions, these schools ought not to be used as forums for the advancement of any particular faith.

Indeed, supporters of the Supreme Court asked, what happens to the school child, taught to revere the Koran or the Torah, when the Bible is read or the Lord's Prayer is recited in his classroom? Is he not confronted with the Hobson's choice of joining in the ceremony or being stigmatized as "different" by his classmates? And in either case is he not compelled to suffer an infringement of his freedom of religion?

Moreover, would not Bible readings and prayer recitations in the public schools stir up all kinds of religious divisiveness in society, making parents angry wherever their children were put under pressure to subject themselves to religious exercises of a kind other than those of their own choice?

Nor, argued the high court's supporters, would a "non-sectarian" exercise be right. Propagation of such a faith, as one observer has said, would be "a regression to Constantinianism, if not to the emperor-cult of pagan Rome, where a single attenuated religion was the universal test of civic belonging."

Ever since the Bible-reading and prayer decisions of the court were handed down, the Congress has resisted efforts to have it approve a proposed constitutional amendment nullifying these decisions. But now proponents of such an amendment have secured enough signatures to force a vote on the issue on the House floor as early as next November 8.

The amendment would specifically authorize "nondenominational prayer" in publicly-supported buildings by persons lawfully assembled there. This is a pernicious measure. It would have the effect of diminishing, not enhancing, religious liberty in the nation. And even worse, it would represent a tempting precedent for similar diminishment of all the other Bill of Rights freedoms which serve collectively to distinguish our society from those where tyranny, whether of the left or of the right, holds sway.

EFFECTS OF UTU SELECTIVE RAIL STRIKE ON ORGANIZATIONS IN THE FOREST PRODUCTS INDUSTRY

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

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, in concluding my statements on the effects of the recent UTU selective rail strike, I would like to submit the statements of two organizations in the forest products industry—the American Plywood Association and the Western Wood Products Association.

Because the forest products industry is localized and in many instances isolated, it was greatly affected by the rail strike which seemed to concentrate on the western region of the country. Lumbermen in the forests of Oregon and Washington rarely have a choice of railroads, and as the American Plywood Association indicated, 44 percent of the plywood produced in the United States is served by only one railroad. Alternative transportation is impractical and expensive because of the weight and volume of the products, and thus, when the rail service halts, so does the forest products industry.

During the first 2 weeks of the recent UTU strike, the Western Wood Products Association estimated that the total revenue loss of forest product shipments in the Western States amounted to $28 million. Oregon alone lost $19.4 million, but these figures do not represent the total loss. For every dollar generated by the forest industry, the Western Wood Products Association claims an additional $3 to $4 is added to the economy through support services. If these figures are correct, then loss of rail service in the forest products industry alone amounted to an economic setback of almost $100 million.

Mr. Speaker, this dramatic illustration of the effects of the 19-day selective rail strike on the forest products industry speaks for itself. We, in the Congress, cannot stand by and permit the Nation's economy to take such drastic beatings every time there is a rail or an air strike. We must act now to establish permanent mechanisms for the settlement of rail and air disputes. Any delay would be abdicating our responsibilities as representatives of the American people.

The statement follows:

AMERICAN PLYWOOD ASSOCIATION,
Tacoma, Wash., September 13, 1971.

Hon. JAMES HARVEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARVEY: In answer to your letter of September 8, 1971, we have chosen to group your questionnaire together and treat our reply as a statement.

The American Plywood Association is a trade association and represents in excess of 80% of the plywood production in the United States. Our statements are based on replies received from our membership.

Approximately ⅓ of the total U.S. plywood production was stilled, due to the rail stoppage. This accounted for some 3,000 jobs, however, the effect is still being felt, due to severe boxcar shortages still affecting the same mills. The recovery period has been long, with no relief in sight.

Had the strike lasted two additional weeks, 79% of the total plywood, produced in the United States, would have come to a halt. To make more explicit our plight, the following is a quote by our Executive Vice President, Mr. Bronson Lewis, from our Management Report, dated July 30, 1971: "What we're really facing is an economic disaster which within a matter of days could paralyze the wood industry—the one remaining hope for recovery throughout the Pacific Northwest."

Our industry undoubtedly felt the raw, unmerciful affects of the strike, even more than the railroads or the union on strike!

The plywood industry, in the west, is for all practical purposes captive to rail transportation. Without rail transportation to move the product, production must stop. Curtailed production means a loss of jobs, a loss of jobs in an area where in many cases, the plywood mill is the major, if not the only employer.

Although several of our mills have a choice of railroad origin, many mills are captive to a single line. In fact 44% of the plywood produced in the United States, is captive to one railroad. This simply means that when that railroad stops, so does the production. The only alternative the mill has, is to shift to motor transportation, when available. As plywood must be loaded on flat bed equipment, due to size and weight restrictions, motor transportation is not always available or practical.

Throughout the plywood industry, inventory is normally maintained at 2½ weeks production. A seven day work stoppage, strangles the warehouse and production has to stop. Prior to the strike in question, the markets for plywood were not overly active, which has led to a continuing, near capacity inventory. When the strike hit, many mills found their warehouse jammed and were forced to stop production. Plywood is sold on a supply and demand basis, and when the supply is decreased, the demand will rise, forcing the price upward.

Wood chips, a by product of the wood industry, were hit hardest by the rail strike. Wood chip production is at a level, that the total is not consumed in the United States and therefore much of the production must be exported. There was and still is a longshore strike, which has all but stopped the movement of wood chips. Mills have stockpiled chips to their capacity, many mills (when the law permits) have had to burn chips.

The rail strike certainly had an impact on the plywood industry, an impact that will take time to overcome. We certainly hope that the congress of the United States can and will take remedial steps in this session, to put an end to the strike, as a means of collective bargaining within transportation companies. Strikes of this nature have a much bigger impact on third parties than they do on the two bargaining parties, which is unlike strikes within other industries.

We trust the information supplied was of some help to you. We fully support the position of the Forest Industries Council, as well as the position of the Transportation Association of America.

Very truly yours,
C. R. ELLENWOOD, Jr.,
Manager, Transportation Services.

WESTERN WOOD PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg., August 23, 1971.

Hon. JAMES HARVEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARVEY: I have prepared data in answer to your request on the impact of the recent rail strike on our industry.

Listed below are responses in numerical

order as shown on your *Railroad Strike Impact* questionnaire.

1. The enclosed statements on daily revenue loss and percentage of goods shipped by rail and truck are indicative of the effects of the rail stoppage.

2. Alternate means of transportation was not available in states such as Oregon where rail service was virtually paralyzed.

3. Not available.

4. Figures not available.

5. The heavy volume moving by rail would preclude alternate means of transportation in future selective strikes without Congress granting relief from present restrictions on water and truck transportation.

6. A choice of carriers is very limited in Western states.

7. Refer to the statement on daily revenue loss.

8. For every dollar generated by the forest products industry, an additional three or four dollars is added to the economy through support services.

9. As a producing industry, stockpiling has no advantage since available storage areas would be quickly filled.

10. The continuation of operations during a rail strike would depend on the individual mills' storage capacity. Generally, storage facilities would be filled within a couple of days.

Immediate relief from the Jones Act during periods of selective strikes would shift some of the coastal production to cargo shipment.

The present weight and width limitation on truck shipments over the interstate highway system should be revised to reflect present highway conditions and motor transport capabilities. WWPA supported Senate Bill 2658, introduced by Senator Magnuson, on which hearings were held in February 1968. The bill proposed to increase the present 96" width to 102" and gross weight would be increased to a new limit by application of a formula that allows greater weight at which length and number of axles are increased. A revision of the present motor carrier standards would be most beneficial in helping to promote shipments of forest products via this mode of transportation.

We certainly appreciate your interest in the transportation of lumber to the market area. Interstate Commerce Commission Service Order No. 1064 issued August 11 to return boxcars to Western railroads is evidence of the car supply situation with which our industry is confronted in the aftermath of the rail strike. The orderly shipment of forest products is essential to meet the vital housing needs of our nation.

Sincerely,

WENDELL B. BARNES,
Executive Vice President.

Percentage of lumber shipped from Western States by rail, truck, and water

[In percent]

From Arizona:	
Rail	28.8
Truck	71.2
From California:	
Rail	42.7
Truck	54.7
Water	2.6
From Idaho:	
Rail	81.9
Truck	18.1
From Oregon:	
Rail	71.4
Truck	13.7
Water	14.9
From New Mexico:	
Rail	15.0
Truck	85.0
From Washington:	
Rail	66.1
Truck	23.2
Water	10.7
From Wyoming:	
Rail	62.8
Truck	37.2

Source: Western Wood Products Association Statistical Supplement, August 20, 1971.

ESTIMATED DAILY REVENUE (CASH FLOW) LOSS OF PRODUCT SHIPMENTS IN WESTERN FOREST PRODUCTS INDUSTRY DUE TO STRIKE OF RAIL AND LONGSHORE UNIONS (BASED ON WORKING DAYS)

DAILY SHIPMENT LOSS

Product and State	Rail	Water	Total (both strikes)
Lumber:			
Arizona	$47,840		$47,840
California	931,068	$60,588	991,656
Idaho	339,767		339,767
Oregon	2,217,908	496,260	2,714,168
New Mexico	19,550		19,550
Washington	103,054	169,776	272,830
Wyoming	7,642		7,642
Total	3,666,829	726,624	4,393,453
Plywood:			
California	184,545	NA	184,545
Idaho	56,808	NA	56,808
Oregon	1,577,863	NA	1,577,863
Washington	40,090	NA	40,090
Total	1,859,306	NA	1,859,306
Chips:			
California	26,136	19,247	45,383
Montana, Idaho and Washington	12,151	62,152	74,303
Oregon	83,795	135,511	219,306
Total	122,082	216,910	338,992
Grand total	5,648,217	943,534	6,591,751
Cumulative loss to date (July 30, 1971):			
West	28,240,000	18,870,000	47,110,000
Oregon	19,400,000	12,640,000	32,040,000

Compiled by: Western Wood Products Association, Yeon Building, Portland, Oreg.

A TAX CREDIT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the foundation of all great republics is the quality of the people who inhabit that nation. America has always been a great nation because its leaders and people have been progressive, honest, and educated. In our rapidly changing world, the need for a highly educated populous is becoming more urgent and apparent. However, as this need is increasing so is the cost involved in providing higher education for our people.

One of the hallmarks of American culture is the reliance of the individual on providing for his own needs. In the past, American students have both worked and attended school at the same time. However, this era is quickly passing. Because of the academic community's increasing demand on the student's time and the skyrocketing cost of education, the burden of financing the higher education of our youth has fallen on the parents, the university, and the Government. I believe that when one spends such a large sum to provide oneself or one's children with a higher education, that person is spending money in the national interest and it is only fair that the Nation try to ease his burden through our tax laws.

I am well aware that many of our graduating high school seniors are not going to college but plan to attend postsecondary schools such as business, trade, technical, and other vocational institutions.

The bill I am introducing today is a tax credit for higher education. It will apply to all those who attend an institution of higher learning, be it college, vocational school, or business school.

The tax credit will be available to anyone who pays the specific expenses of an individual to obtain a higher education. It will be available to students trying to put themselves through school. It will be available to parents trying to help their children through college and it will be available to anyone who contributes additional financial aid. Thus, this measure would help to create individual scholarships where the donor would receive a tax credit. Colleges and universities could encourage their alumni to give scholarships to deserving students.

The basic provisions of my bill are a 100-percent tax credit on the first $200 spent on the cost of higher education; 75-percent tax credit on the next $300; 25 percent on the next $1,000. In order to help equalize the benefits among different tax brackets, I am providing for a 1-percent reduction from the tax credit for those earning an adjusted gross income in excess of $25,000. Thus, as an individual reaches a higher tax bracket, the tax credit will be smaller for him than for an individual in a lower tax bracket.

Mr. Speaker, the Members who are cosponsoring this bill with me represent a wide variety of political philosophies. I am heartened by this broad-based support and urge early consideration of my bill.

O'CONNELL WOULD BE OUTSTANDING JUSTICE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is now considering nominating two members of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Seldom in our Nation's history has the opportunity been given a Chief Executive to fill two positions on the Court at the same time. I know that he considers this to be an extremely important task and that his decisions will shape the future of American law.

It is with a high regard for the task he faces that I have written to the President with the highest recommendation possible for the consideration of Stephen C. O'Connell, president of the University of Florida, Gainesville, for one of these positions.

President O'Connell served with distinction as a member of the Florida Supreme Court and carved out a distinguished record in the judiciary in that position.

Our board of regents, seeking a man to fill the demanding post of president of this great university, turned to O'Connell and his record since that time more than justifies their decision.

Steve O'Connell would bring to the Court level judgment and a wealth of experience in the law, the judiciary, and the academic world. He would be a credit to the Court.

As I pointed out in my letter to the President, Steve O'Connell has the respect of the people of our great State, and I wanted to give him the strongest possible recommendation.

CORDELL HULL CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE RECALLS HIS ROLE AS FATHER OF UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the beautiful and historic Upper Cumberland Mountains of Tennessee the first tinges of autumn were reddening the maple trees clustered around a log cabin near Byrdstown, Tenn., when Cordell Hull drew his first infant breath on October 2, 1871.

During the recent recess of Congress I visited the Hull birthplace, and a century later the trees are again turning and the chill of autumn is in the air—but now the fame and works of this great man have transcended the endless cycle of seasons and have built a timeless monument to his accomplishments and achievements for world peace.

On the centennial anniversary of the birthday of Cordell Hull, my distinguished predecessor, other monuments to his memory and dedication are being announced. On October 2, the Cordell Hull Museum and Birthplace is being officially opened near Byrdstown. Many of his memoirs and memorabilia are on display at the museum, highlighting the career of this great Tennessean who served longer as Secretary of State than any other man.

In Nashville plans for the Cordell Hull Center for International Peace will be announced October 2. The building is to be constructed at Vanderbilt University.

At the Library of Congress in Washington a special exhibit has been arranged of many of Secretary Hull's official papers, documents, letters, speech drafts, memorandums, cables, and other fascinating mementos of his long and distinguished career of public service.

Cordell Hull came out of the Tennessee mountains to become one of the central figures in world history. He was described by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as "The Father of the United Nations." His Good Neighbor Policy in relations with South America will always bear his indelible imprint because by initiating this policy of good will he changed the attitude and relationship between the United States and our neighbors to the south.

In his first speech to the House on March 18, 1908, following his election, he articulated his basic policy of world trade and he later pursued this ideal with characteristic skill and determination. With patience and perseverance, his advocacy finally resulted in the enactment by Congress of the Reciprocal Trade Act and adoption of a policy of reciprocal trade with other nations.

Cordell Hull played a crucial role in strengthening the free nations prior to World War II and he negotiated patiently with the Japanese diplomats until the infamous attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. During World War II Secretary Hull worked tirelessly in the background to maintain cooperation between the Allies while at the same time laying the foundations for the United Nations.

He participated in many international conferences, including the Moscow Conference with Premier Stalin of Russia in World War II.

Perhaps the most satisfying moment of his career came when he received the Nobel Peace Prize.

On that occasion he said in his acceptance speech:

> Peace has become as essential to civilized existence as the air we breathe is to life itself.

Cordell Hull, following service in the Tennessee General Assembly and as a circuit judge, was elected to Congress in 1907 and served six succeeding terms. He was elected to the Senate in 1930 and resigned to become Secretary of State, serving in that capacity from March 4, 1933 to December 1, 1944—a period of almost 12 years.

In 1944 President Roosevelt went to Bethesda Hospital where Secretary Hull was confined in failing health to plead with him to continue as Secretary of State. But this great American who worked 7 days a week for many years had exhausted his energy and his body—his physical strength was gone.

His mind, however, never lost its keenness and he received daily reports from the San Francisco Conference on establishment of the United Nations from his longtime friend and assistant Col. Carlton Savage.

Recently, as Representative from the district which elected Cordell Hull to Congress, I had the pleasure of revisiting the Upper Cumberland District—the Cordell Hull country—with Colonel Savage.

We walked in the paths of Secretary Hull's career—Byrdstown and Pickett County, the place of his birth: Celina and Clay County, Carthage and Smith County, Livingston and Overton County, Gainesboro and Jackson County, Cookeville and Putnam County, and Lebanon and Wilson County.

Cordell Hull is a legendary figure now—16 years after his death in 1955. In the storied Upper Cumberland District—still the Cordell Hull country—he is recalled with respect and reverence.

He was a man from the hill country of Tennessee who did good, in the parlance of the mountains.

He never forgot the early lessons he learned from his proud but humble beginnings.

Once, when talking to Russian Foreign Minister Molotov, he warned him against a policy of isolation by Russia. He said he knew a bully in Tennessee who abused people. Concluded Hull:

> He wound up by not having a friend in the world.

Cordell Hull was a brilliant diplomat and statesman—a great American—a dedicated apostle of peace whose contributions to our country and the world have left their impact and imprint on history.

Certainly it is fitting and appropriate that on the centennial of his birth we should remember this man, this circuit judge from Tennessee, who brought to the international diplomatic scene a new sense of fairness, honesty and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, on this centennial occasion of Cordell Hull's birth, I place in the RECORD herewith articles from the Washington Star and the Nashville Tennessean concerning the career and monuments in history of this distinguished Tennessean:

[From the Nashville Tennessean magazine, Sept. 12, 1971]

THEY CHASED AND CAUGHT THEIR "GHOST"

(By Wendell Rawls, Jr.)

Into the midst of old men wearing bib overalls and straw hats and wire-rimmed glasses, a former diplomat who helped shape the United Nations chased a ghost.

A short, heavy man spat tobacco juice into the grass. He looked at the thin, silver-haired man approaching, then returned his attentions to a cedar stick and pocketknife peeling shavings beneath benches occupied by a dozen other Clay County Courthouse regulars.

"This is Carlton Savage," Congressman Joe Evins told the whittlers, lifting both arms towards the diplomat in introduction. Upon recognizing Evins the whittlers arose from the concrete benches and wicker bottom chairs. "He was a close friend and advisor to Cordell Hull and he's come all the way from Oregon to visit the land and the people of Cordell Hull."

For two days Carlton Savage had been chasing the ghost. The veteran statesman had served under six presidents from Calvin Coolidge to John Kennedy, and 10 secretaries of state from James Kellogg to Dean Rusk—but he thought Cordell Hull was the "greatest of them all."

Savage said he feels Hull looked on him "as the son he never had." Now, finally, Savage had come to the homeland of his adopted father to meander with another legendary politician through the humble environs of Middle Tennessee that traditionally have produced great men.

"What's Wayne Morse going to do?" one of the whittlers asked Savage, who was unable to suppress a look of surprise.

Savage mumbled something like "Well, I guess he'll have to do something different," obviously taken aback that the country fellow would so quickly relate former—and forgotten—U.S. Sen. Morse and Oregon, to which Savage's ancestors had traveled in covered wagons in the 1850s. Nevertheless, the 73-year-old State Department veteran joined the whittlers like a child jumps into a playground sandbox and the man in overalls handed him a cedar stick.

"I told you not to underestimate these folks," Evins reminded, pulling out his own pocketknife. "They know about things a long way from Clay County. You can't fool them. They keep up with what's going on." Now Evins had a stick and, like the man in bib overalls, he made long smooth strokes that left cedar ribbons curling off the end.

Evin's boyhood home in Smithville was three blocks from the DeKalb County Courthouse where he had spent endless hours listening to whittlers discuss politics while other boys played baseball. During his youth Evins made a trip to Washington with his father, a Tennessee State Senator, and they visited the office of Congressman Cordell

Hull. Evins set his course that day, in the tracks of Cordell Hull, toward a seat in the U.S. Congress, which he assumed in January, 1946, a little more than a year after Hull retired as Secretary of State.

Clay County Courthouse in tiny Celina was just one of the watering holes along the route Evins mapped out to stalk Hull's past through the hill country of the Upper Cumberland where Hull roamed before the center of his influence shifted to Washington. It was in Celina that Hull opened his first law office. He later served as Circuit Court Judge for Clay and a number of other counties before going to Congress.

But the four-day trek started for Savage in Lebanon, Wilson County seat and former site of Cumberland Law School which graduated such distinguished Americans as Sam Houston and Hull . . . and Joe Evins. The law school has since moved to Birmingham, Ala., and only a plaque planted in the ground in front of a new bank building reminds of the institution.

Evins bent before the plaque, removed a white handkerchief from a hip pocket and brushed away freshly cut grass to read the raised metal which tells that "the great Secretary of State Cordell Hull" was a graduate.

"It's like Daniel Webster said of Dartmouth," Evins said. "'Although small, there are those who love her none the less.' It was a school of statesmen . . . senators, ambassadors, governors, congressmen . . . great school . . . fine reputation . . . great deal of heritage . . . tradition."

Evins and Savage walked from the plaque to the dark blue Continental to continue their trip. After a few blocks Savage could not find his hat. "It must have fallen out of the car when we stopped back there," Savage said.

"That's alright, Carlton, we'll get you another one," said Evins, never one to be impeded. "Drive on, Charlie," he commanded to his aide, Church of Christ minister Charlie Gentry. Charlie drove on. Savage found his hat—crushed back into the back seat under the center arm rest.

"See, the land here is rocky and flat," Evins said, waving his hand toward the side window, oblivious to the condition of the hat. "As we move deeper in to my district (Tennessee's Fourth and with 21 counties the largest of the state's nine) it will become more hilly . . . lot of fine men came out of these hills and gullies."

"Mr. Hull told me he was born on a ridge between the Obey and Wolf rivers," Savage said. "I told him I was born in Oregon between Squirrel Hill and Sunnyside—that we should get along fine. And we did."

Savage, whose attitudes appear more of Eastern prep school origin than of Conestoga wagon, was assistant secretary of state under Hull for nine years. He had joined the State Department during the Coolidge administration and remained there in one capacity or another until his retirement during the Kennedy years.

Evidence of closeness between Hull and Savage was Hull's request that Savage arrange funerals for both the Secretary and his wife, Rose Frances Witz Hull. Savage telephoned daily from San Francisco to Hull at Bethesda Naval Hospital during the U.N. conference and when Hull compiled his two-volume memoirs, Savage was there to help.

"Although he was a generation older than I, we got along wonderfully," Savage said. "I think he looked on me as the son he never had. Tell me, Joe, are there many things named in honor of Cordell Hull?"

"Yes, Carlton," Evins intoned in his own inimitable oratorical fashion. "There is a dam named for Cordell, a building, a bridge, a hotel and 100 individuals in the upper Cumberland named for him. Matter of fact, I once had an opponent for Congress named Cordell Hull Sloan. He always emphasized the 'Cordell Hull' and minimized the 'Sloan.' Well, Carlton, tell us about Hull's relationship wtih F.D.R." Evins quickly diverted the subject away from himself as he is prone to do.

"They were not personal friends at all," Savage said. "But Roosevelt had great respect for Mr. Hull. Hull stood up to Roosevelt and you know that didn't endear anyone to the president. Roosevelt dominated everything around him, every meeting, every conversation."

Savage said he had a document, an article written in 1940, where Roosevelt said he would not run for a third term but would support Cordell Hull for President. Roosevelt later reneged and ran himself, of course.

"Hull would have been Roosevelt's successor rather than Truman," Savage said. "He was vastly more popular than Truman.

"I was with him at 4:30 a.m., Sept. 1, 1939, when Germany invaded Poland, and again moments after the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor. He was a great man. He was always composed, serene."

"Yes," Evins said. "Cordell Hull was the last of the log-cabin statesmen. I asked him once what he considered his greatest achievement and he told me he probably was proudest of being elected chairman of the Clay County Democratic Party when he was 18 years old—too young to vote. He may have been the first of the 18-year-old voters."

"You know, Joe, Mr. Hull had a reputation for being very profane," Savage said. "But the strongest thing I ever heard him say was in reference to those who opposed his programs or to the lunatic fringe. He called them the 'Polecat element.' Do you ever use that expression, Joe?"

"No," Evins said. "Everybody knows what that means—it smells. See that little tobacco patch up on that hill?" Evins changed the subject again. "The sun shines on that patch. This is Cumberland River country where Hull had his farm. Aren't these pretty hills? The pioneers floated down the Cumberland from these hills into Nashville. This is big tobacco country."

"Mr. Hull charmed Stalin by explaining how he made flat boats in Tennessee with oak strip bindings," Savage said. "Stalin told him about the Russian method of binding with vines.

"Joe, you were talking about tobacco a moment ago. One time Mr. Hull invited some staff members to his apartment for a meeting. While waiting to begin, he told them how he was addicted to cigars when he was in Congress. Had one when he awoke and always had to put one out before entering the House chamber because you can't smoke there. Then he said, 'One day I decided it was a dirty, filthy, stinking habit and I stopped.' With that Mr. Hull passed out cigars. Only one man had enough courage to accept one."

The dark blue car twisted along the road from Lebanon to Smithville and Evins pointed out where his father was born.

"He was born in a little ole house in the hollow," Evins said. "He got married and moved up on the hill. I was born on the hill. That's progress."

"Do they have a mayor in Smithville?" Savage asked.

"Oh, sure," Evins said. "We have everything. Clean air, clean water, industry."

The car drove up to the front of Evins' white-columned home "nearly 100 years old," and a welcoming party composed of the mayor (Evins' cousin), the county judge (Evins' cousin) and the county historian (another Evins relative).

The trail of Cordell Hull led Savage and Evins from Smithville to Carthage, where there is a bust of Hull in Smith County Courthouse. The Cordell Hull Dam and Lock (built with $40 million appropriated from one of Evins' subcommittees) is there as is Cordell Hull Bridge and Cordell Hull Motel. On to Gainesboro where the two main streets are Cordell Hull Avenue and Gore Street (for former Sen. Albert Gore, who owns a feed store in Carthage and considerable farm land nearby). To Celina, where Hull not only opened his first law office, but where his parents are buried. To Livingston, where Hull's longtime secretary Miss Will Harris, 94, lives with a relative, and from whence came America's first Vietnam casualty. To Byrdstown near Hull's birthplace, and finally to Nashville and Tootsie's Orchid Lounge, citadel of country music.

Evins calls the area "historic country."

"What is it about this country, this soil that produces such good men, Joe?" Savage said. "There's Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, Cordell Hull, Albert Gore, Joe Evins."

"Hard rock," Evins said, ignoring the compliment. "Hard rock produces good men and that's the main product of this country. Good men."

Both Savage and Evins are fascinated by heroes, "good men." Savage continually alludes to Sam Rayburn and Franklin Roosevelt and Cordell Hull. Apparently he idolized Hull. Sen. William Borah, of Idaho, "was the greatest orator I ever heard in the Senate." He praises John McCormack and former Texas Sen. Tom Connally. John Cash ("you can see in that face what he has been through") is his favorite singer.

Many of Evins' "heroes" are the same people, but, Savage said, "Joe is fascinated with heroes and he doesn't realize that to thousands of people he's one."

It was at Carthage that Savage was honored with a restaurant luncheon attended by about 30 old-timers who professed to have known Hull.

One, G. W. Allen, 93 years old, a former Smith County Judge and still a member of the Smith County Quarterly Court, confessed privately that he "didn't have much use for Judge Hull like some of these fellows I can't forget one of Hull's races for Congress. He was getting beat pretty bad, close to a thousand votes, but Morgan County returns were not in. And they got later and later gettin' in. When the Morgan County box finally came in, Hull carried it by a little more than a thousand votes. I never had much use for Judge Hull after the Morgan County box came in, but I felt I knew him very well, yes."

Ironically, on the restaurant wall there is an old newspaper political cartoon depicting Hull sitting on a stump and notching the butt of a smoking longrifle. Lying dead at Hull's feet are Sumner Wells, George Peek, Raymond Moley, Hank Wallace and "the Navy and War Departments' attempt to pass blame for Pearl Harbor."

The caption reads: "Feudin' with Cordell can be mighty unhealthful."

The 93-year-old man who recounted Hull's political affairs in Morgan County also recalled that feuding with Hull's father was equally "unhealthful."

"You know Judge Hull's daddy got into an awful fight with a man just over the line in Kentucky one time, and the man bushwhacked Judge Hull's daddy—shot him in the eye and put it out. Judge Hull's daddy came on back home and recovered, then he left one day, was gone a day or two and came back. Not long after that they found the Kentucky man dead."

In Gainesboro, where there is a 24-year-old mayor who was a former school teacher and pool room operator, and where the courthouse clock reads 11:30 on one side and 4:20 on the other, Savage was greeted by town fathers—and mothers—at Anderson and Haile Drug Co., at the corner of Gore and Main streets. The conversations centered on Joe Evins, who regularly carries the area 6–7–8 to 1, not on Cordell Hull who only convened court there 75 years ago. There was too much "Evins" in the conversation. Evins was ready to move on to the next stop.

On the curvy, roller coaster road from Gainesboro to Celina, Hull and Savage again reflected on Hull's folksy, log-cabin approach to matters.

"You know what a horseback opinion is, Carlton?" Evins asked. "Cordell Hull told me once in a typically simple answer, that a horseback opinion is talking before you get off your horse. Hull never did that. He was the hardest man in the world to get a direct yes-or-no answer from.

"When Hull was in the state legislature, a group of men tried. At exactly 12 noon by the house chamber clock, they asked Hull what time it was. Hull pulled out his pocketwatch, looked at it, looked at the clock on the wall, back at his watch, then turned to one of the men and asked:

"What time does your watch say?"

Then Evins told a "Hull" story that may have been told of every statesman since Thomas Jefferson.

"Another time he was traveling along one of the roads around here and there was a flock of sheep grazing in a pasture. The fellow driving commented that the sheep were 'freshly sheared, aren't they, Cordell?'

" 'They appear to be on one side,' Hull answered."

During breakfast in Celina, Savage began talking about Hull's efforts to bring about world peace.

"Mr. Hull began working on a world peace concept as soon as World War II broke out," he said. "He worked tirelessly for a peace organization which turned out to be the United Nations. He really dedicated his life to peace. And I dedicated my life to the same thing when I entered the State Department. I really have worked all my life for world peace."

A physician of Puerto Rican descent sat beside Savage. He shook his head slowly.

"You weren't very successful, were you?" he said.

Savage looked into his plate. The answer was long in coming.

"No, doctor, I haven't been." Then Savage brightened. "But I'm patient. Mr. Hull was patient. Now Joe is not patient. He likes to get things done."

By the time Evins and Savage had reached Byrdstown they had chased the ghost of Cordell Hull to its Oct. 2, 1871, origin—a log cabin truly on a ridge between the Obey and Wolf rivers.

"Just over the ridge there's a cave," said Glenn Sells, a Byrdstown lumber dealer who managed Evins' 1970 campaign in Pickett County, and who restored Hull's birthplace. "Hull's daddy made his whisky in that cave. Of course it was an honorable profession in those days. It was a product sold just like flax and corn."

"Still is," said one in the group following Evins and Savage.

At the birthplace a two-room cabin with an upstairs loft, Savage sifted through accumulated memorabilia ready to be exhibited at the museum nearby. Evins was surrounded by townspeople and supporters—as he had been surrounded at every stop for four days.

Savage fingered through three or four pictures and mused aloud:

"You know, I came to Tennessee to see Cordell Hull country. I've been just about everywhere he's been. But this is not Cordell Hull country. It's Joe Evins country, now."

Evins overheard the last sentence.

"You about ready to go, Carlton? We need to be in Cookeville before dark."

[From the Sunday Star, Sept. 19, 1971]

REVIEWING THE RECORD OF CORDELL HULL

(By Robert K. Walsh)

The Oct. 2 centennial of the birth of Cordell Hull is memorable for more reasons than his tenure as Secretary of State from 1933 to 1945, longest in that cabinet office's history.

Hull, who died in 1955, took part in one of the most dramatic and angry moments in diplomatic annals on Dec. 7, 1941, "a date which will live in infamy."

A member of Congress from 1907 to 1933, Democratic National Chairman from 1921 through 1924, and head of the Department of State for 11½ years, the old fashioned Southern Democrat from Tennessee suffered in silence a keen disappointment when his good chance—if not promise—for the presidential nomination was suddenly dashed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1940.

And despite a courtliness, dignity and patience that usually concealed anger, Hull accused Raymond Moley at the 1933 London Economic Conference of trying "secretly to undermine and destroy me."

The text of that sensational super-secret cable to President Roosevelt is available for the first time for the public to read. It and evidence of many other momentous or revealing episodes in Hull's remarkable public career, which won him the Nobel Peace Prize in 1945, stand out in a special exhibit in the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress.

The display of documents, letters, speech drafts, official and personal memoranda, cables and other matter—including a signed cartoon sent to Hull by The Evening Star's famed editorial artist, the late Clifford K. Berryman, after the 1924 marathon Democratic national convention in New York City—is a mere fraction of the contents of Hull's voluminous papers and memoirs.

Yet those few are extraordinary both in their present interest and their value as historical source materials. The collection occupies several cases at the Manuscript Division's Reading Room on the third floor of the Library Annex. It will be open to the public Monday through Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. until the end of October.

Although not all of the papers originated with Hull, the entire exhibit centers on him and the main segments of his long career in public service.

Hull's official memo of his Dec. 7, 1941, confrontation with Japanese Ambassador Kichisaburo Nomura and Special Envoy Saburo Kurusu while Pearl Harbor was actually under attack has been described so many times that his castigation of his visitors came to be practically household words during World War II.

They still sound as scathing and startling when read today as they must have when Hull uttered them on that fateful Sunday afternoon 30 years ago in his office in the old State Department Building. The single page typewritten memo does not substantiate—but neither does it disprove—stories at the time that Hull also hurled at the two Japanese diplomats considerably less diplomatic language that would have stunned even the outspoken Tennessee back-country folk he knew when he was a boy.

"I must say that in all my conversations with you during the last nine months I have never uttered one word of untruth. This is borne out absolutely by the record," he told the Japanese envoys after reading their government's reply to his Nov. 26 note outlining a possible basis of negotiations for averting war.

"In all my 50 years of public service I have never seen a document that was more crowded with infamous falsehoods and distortions—infamous falsehoods and distortions on a scale so huge that I never imagined until today that any government on this planet was capable of uttering them."

NO COMMENT

Hull's memo grimly concluded: "The Ambassador and Mr. Kurusu then took their leave without making any comment."

While hardly on the same scale of world history, the exhibit's decoded cable that Hull sent to Roosevelt in 1933 concerning Moley will be news to many people today. A feud between Hull and Moley at the London Economic Conference was generally known and widely reported in the spring of 1933. But its intensity and the grave charges that Hull leveled against Moley apparently have never before been published.

The four-page message was classified "Strictly confidential to the President. No distribution to any person." It was accompanied by Hull's orders for decoding by only one designated official in the State Department.

Hull asserted that Moley professed friendship and loyalty to him as Secretary of State and as head of the American delegation to the London Conference but nevertheless bypassed him, assigned a woman employe to spy on him, questioned his official competence and otherwise attempted to end his usefulness.

Moley, who had been a Columbia University professor and became chief of Roosevelt's "Brains Trust" in the early years of the New Deal, was not a member of the United States delegation to the meeting on economic and monetary problems. He showed up in London in what has been described as "the vague role of President Roosevelt's liaison officers." He reportedly went about negotiating a currency stabilization agreement which Roosevelt later repudiated. Blame for the subsequent failure of the conference was placed on various persons by contemporaries as well as historians.

Whether or not Hull's version is accepted by Moley's supporters, Hull's cable left no doubt that he was completely convinced and deeply angered that Moley tried to do him in:

"It is most painful to have to report an attitude and course of conduct on the part of Professor Moley which has been utterly dumbfounding to me. . . .

"He sent along at least one woman from his office, who, according to reliable information, has consistently attempted to spy on my movements and make secret reports back to Moley. . . ."

Complaining that the press in London, Paris and elsewhere began to "dramatize Moley as coming to speak and act for you" (Roosevelt), Hull related how Moley went on "to negotiate directly" with British Prime Ministe- Ramsay MacDonald and others.

Finding that Roosevelt was being "personally charged with wrecking the conference," Hull informed the President: ". . . (I) was lucky enough, if I may say so, to be the chief single factor in preserving the conference and saving you from the outrage of being branded a destroyer. . . . Moley was secretly sending code messages to you about my incapacity to function here. He was at the same time pretending absolute loyalty of friendship and of official attitude to me. He does not know that I am aware of this fact and I only discovered it after he sailed (for the United States).

AMAZEMENT

"My regret only equals my amazement to discover the deliberate attempt of one I have implicitly trusted thus secretly to undermine and destroy me in my situation while openly professing friendship and loyalty."

In any event the record thereafter indicates no lack of mutual confidence between Roosevelt and Hull. Their personal friendship began as far back as the 1920 Democratic convention, where Roosevelt was nominated for the vice presidency. It grew stronger while Hull was Democratic national chairman and at the 1924 convention, with its fantastic and frustrating 103 ballots. It was solidified at the 1932 convention that put Roosevelt in the White House.

On July 3, 1940, the President invited Hull to lunch at the White House. There, accord-

ing to Hull's handwritten recollection of the conversation, Roosevelt more than hinted for the first time that he would go for a then unprecedented third term.

In human interest and political significance Hull's memo of that White House luncheon is on a par with the memo on the Moley incident. It is even more significant from a what-might-have-been standpoint. It will surprise many readers today, if only because of Roosevelt's unflattering and unfair opinion of Wendell L. Willkie, the 1940 Republican presidential nominee.

It also indicates that Hull himself perhaps protested too much in telling Roosevelt that he really did not want to run for President even if Roosevelt retired after the third term.

"After I had talked of several departmental matters," Hull recalled in his memo, "The President suddenly said: "Well, let us talk some politics."

" 'You know, there are many people saying to me 'you can't afford to let us down.' I interjected that it was probably an avalanche. The President in saying this had a sort of impatient, incredulous tone, a tone deprecating the idea of running. . . .

"He said he did not believe Willkie was honest, that he represented a species of fascism or collectivism. (I just can't recall just how he technically phrased it.) He then got on to my strong and weak qualities as a candidate. He was extremely guarded compared to his former conversations."

Hull wrote that he interrupted the President to say that in any event "I was not to be considered; for many months my wife and I had agreed that I should go out of public service." According to the Hull memo, the President "proceeded to speculate on how he would run in November, with the conclusion that he could win unless the war should stop and in that event Willkie might defeat him and that he would not care except for the country's sake."

The exhibit contains communications to or from Woodrow Wilson, Col. Edward House, William Allen White, former Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels, Ambassador William E. Dodd on the 1934 Hitler "blood purges" in Nazi Germany, British Prime Minister Anthony Eden, Soviet Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov, British Ambassador Lord Lothian on the exchange of American destroyers for British bases before United States entry into World War II, and documents relating to the organization of the United Nations in 1945 in San Francisco following the Dumbarton Oaks discussions here, the lend-lease program and the "good neighbor" policy with Latin American nations.

TAX LAW

Hull's maiden speech in the House on Mar. 18, 1908, epitomized his basic philosophy as a "free trader." He entitled it "Freer Trade Among Nations Through Reduction in Tariffs." In view of 1971 excursions with floating dollars and trade restrictions, the text of that speech makes for something more than musty historical reading, despite such oratorical flourishes as "The trusts are entrenched behind the walls of the protective tariff system. The flag of monopoly has always floated above the ramparts of protection."

His stand on that issue and his ability and versatility in so many other areas attracted the attention of F.D.R. more than 50 years ago and of President Wilson even earlier. So did his achievements and comparative popularity as Democratic national chairman during the years when his party's political and financial fortunes were at an especially low ebb.

There is, for instance, a letter from Wilson in 1922 after he left the White House. It shows considerable personal warmth as well as brimming measure of idealism on the need to obtain high caliber Democratic candidates for public office.

"We must fill our seats with gentlemen and men of honour and let the politicians get used to good company," Wilson wrote to National Chairman Hull. "I do not think that these considerations can be too earnestly and too imperatively pressed upon our party men everywhere. I know you will indulge me in these reflections."

Characteristically perhaps, the scholarly Wilson underlined in ink the word "imperatively" and used the spelling "honour."

Those who remember having met Cordell Hull can safely indulge in a reflection on his 100th birthday anniversary that he particularly treasured that Wilson letter.

Still more of a memorial to Hull is the copy of his Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech, in which he declared for all time: "Peace has become as essential to civilized existence as the air we breathe is to life itself."

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Sept. 19, 1971]

CORDELL HULL PEACE CENTER PLANNED HERE

(By Wendell Rawls, Jr.)

Plans will soon be announced for a $4 million Cordell Hull Center for International Peace, to be constructed near Vanderbilt University for use by all sectors of the Nashville community, it was learned yesterday.

Formal announcement of the plans is tentatively scheduled for Oct. 2, the 100th anniversary of the birth of Cordell Hull, famed secretary of state who devoted his life to world peace and who is credited with fathering the United Nations.

The project is designed to make Nashville an international center by bringing together the financial, business, academic, cultural and religious communities in a common purpose, with a physical facility for common identification.

The center concept was conceived by two Vanderbilt professors, Werner Baer and William O. Thweatt, and two officials of Commerce Union Bank's international banking department, Jerre Haskew, director of the department, and John Mousourakis, head of the department's Latin American and Mediterranean divisions.

More recently, several interested Nashvillians, such as Mrs. John T. McCall and Mrs. Warren Riegle, have joined in efforts to secure community support needed for the foundings of such a venture, Thewatt said.

The group envisions a facility which could provide:

Space for international trade shows, with rooms where foreign manufacturers could display wares for businessmen from the central South and other regions.

Space for private groups and foreign governments to arrange cultural exhibits.

Space for seminar rooms and a small auditorium where lecture series could be presented by major political and economic figures.

A library to house all aspects of world trade, including periodicals, trade journals, information on licensing, sales, joint ventures, plant locations, distribution of products and import-export data.

Office space for a customs house broker, a freight forwarding agent and perhaps a foreign exchange branch bank.

Facilities for a resident international law firm.

Lounges and possibly a small international restaurant catering both to students and to visitors.

Facilities for foreign language instruction, including English for foreign students and foreign languages for Nashville residents.

Office space for a physician to serve foreign students and their families.

Administrative headquarters for Cordell Hull scholarships in international affairs. The idea being to provide scholarships and Cordell Hull research professorships with money from endowments, as well as space for other students doing research in international affairs.

Headquarters for a new publication on world problems which would be competitive with the journal "Foreign Affairs," which usually represents the views of the "Eastern establishment" on international relations.

The housing of several international graduate programs presently sponsored by Nashville universities.

Space for guest rooms for visiting professors, businessmen and government officials.

"It is our belief that this plan for an International Peace Center in Nashville is both feasible and desirable," Baer said. "With the cooperation of interested community and university groups it can become a reality. Such an undertaking would be in keeping with the dynamic growth-oriented emphasis of Nashville's civic leadership."

"The business community needs to understand what the academic community has to offer and vice-versa," Haskew said. "There are more than 1,000 foreign students in Nashville, ready to exchange ideas on cultures and religions."

The originators of the idea hope to finance the venture with grants from national foundations and corporations, then depend on a "broad base of the local regional business community" for continued support.

The concept had been endorsed by the International Affairs Committee of the Nashville Area Chamber of Commerce and by numerous business leaders and prominent citizens, Haskew said.

"Economically speaking, the idea is particularly appealing when you realize that more than $600 million worth of goods was shipped out of Tennessee last year," Haskew said. "That is up from about $470 million five years ago. A like amount probably is imported each year, and both exports and imports create jobs.

"Most of Nashville's major industries engage in international trade and the three major banks are extending credit to finance international trade."

Nashville's churches have commitments all over the world, Thweatt said, and Nashville's universities have numerous programs operating in such countries as France, Germany, Spain, Brazil, Egypt, and Paraguay.

"There is a tremendous amount of international activity in Nashville," Baer said, "but there is nothing in Nashville to bring them together. No other city or university center in the region provides anything like it, either, and Nashville can do it first."

"The feeling of the group was that it was only fitting to name the center after Cordell Hull, a Tennessee native who devoted his lifelong energies to promoting international trade and understanding for world peace," Thweatt said, adding:

"We were delighted when Mrs. Kathleen Hull Ethridge, Hull's niece who cared for him during the final years of his life, enthusiastically endorsed this idea when we recently visited with her in Celina.

"We would like for the center to reflect the international spirit which Cordell Hull tried to promote throughout his lifetime. With sufficient financial support Nashville has the other necessary resources to bring this goal to reality."

PROPOSED SELECT COMMITTEE ON PENAL REFORM

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the tragic events at Attica Prison earlier this month dramatically illustrate that our so-called corrections system is in urgent need of reform. Today I am introducing

for appropriate reference a resolution to create a House Select Committee on Penal Reform that would be authorized to conduct a complete investigation of current conditions at Federal, State, and local penal institutions.

The carnage at Attica highlights the fact that we build and condone a system of despair and degradation in the name of "correction" and "rehabilitation." As horrifying as was the death of 42 civilians and inmates at Attica, it is more alarming to realize that Attica will happen again—perhaps at another place and another time—but it will happen again. It will happen again unless the American people face the fact that a major overhaul of our prison system is the only way to overcome its failure.

It is all too clear that for most offenders the term "correctional facility" is a gruesome euphemism. Prisons in the United States are usually little more than universities of crime, "graduating" growing legions of bitter and hateful individuals who have spent their time in jail polishing and refining their criminal techniques and who emerge from behind the concrete walls more motivated to commit crime than they were when they entered.

Two-thirds of the 200,000 inmates currently incarcerated in our Federal and State prisons are "alumni" of other institutions. Most startling, 80 percent of all felonies are committed by repeaters, those who have had prior contact with the criminal justice system. Indeed, according to the FBI's most recent Uniform Crime Reports, nearly 70 percent of all crimes committed in this country last year were committed by people with previous convictions. Moreover, of the 100,000 persons released from confinement each year and returned to society, 75 percent again commit serious crimes and return to confinement.

The principal reason for this extraordinarily high rate of recidivism—repetition of crime by individuals—is that penitentiaries in the United States are usually little more than warehouses of human degradation, stripping prisoners of their dignity, providing few useful skills that will enable convicts to find gainful employment in the outside world and offering woefully inadequate psychiatric and educational programs and facilities.

Richard W. Velde, Associate Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Department of Justice, recently gave a chilling description of the American prison system:

> Jails are festering sores in the criminal justice system. There are no model jails anywhere; we know, we tried to find them. Almost nowhere are there rehabilitative programs operated in conjunction with jails . . . The result is what you would expect, only worse. Jails are, without question, brutal, filthy cesspools of crime—institutions which serve to brutalize and embitter men, to prevent them from returning to a useful role in society.

Dr. Karl Menninger, a prominent psychiatrist, stated in his book, "The Crime of Punishment":

> I suspect that all the crimes committed by all the jailed criminals do not equal in total social damage that of the crimes committed against them.

It would be difficult to devise a better method of draining the last drop of humanity from an individual than confinement in most prisons as they exist today. Many prisons have large dormitory rooms with 100 beds or more where guards do not venture at night. Beatings, deaths, and suicides are frequent in the dormitories. Rape, robbery, and homosexuality are rampant, as marauding gangs and individuals pillage the dormitories and terrorize their fellow inmates.

Many prisoners would deeply understand the vivid description of penal life provided by the Russian novelist Dostoevsky, whose book "The House of the Dead," describes his devastating ordeal while imprisoned in Siberia.

If he died and awoke in hell, Dostoevsky reasoned, he would expect it to be no worse than life in prison. On his last night in jail, walking beside the fence that that had confined him for 4 years, Dostoevsky concluded that on the whole the men there were no better and no worse than people generally. Among them were exceptionally strong and gifted people. The waste of their lives was an intolerable cruelty. From his experience in prison he defined man as "a creature that can become accustomed to anything."

We in America spend more than $1 billion a year maintaining our archaic prison system. Ninety-five percent of all expenditures in the entire field of corrections in the United States goes for custody—iron bars, stone walls and guards—while only 5 percent goes for hope—health services, education, and developing employment skills.

As a consequence of the high rate of recidivism, the American taxpayer is grossly shortchanged in the investment of his tax dollar aimed at achieving criminal rehabilitation. In fact, if a private business had as poor a percentage of success and as high a level of cost as does our prison system, it would have difficulty surviving its first shareholders' meeting.

The American Correctional Association has estimated that it takes $11,000 a year to keep a married man in prison. This figure is based on the inmate's loss of earnings, the cost of keeping him in prison—$10.24 a day in Federal prisons and $5.24 a day in State prisons—the cost to the taxpayer if his family has to go on relief and the loss of taxes he would pay.

Medical and dental facilities are sadly lacking in prisons. The result is that many prisoners lose their sense of dignity by being forced to live with debilitating physical problems. For example, many prisoners are badly in need of dental work, but few receive adequate attention in prison. Personalities are shaped by such factors as the loss of teeth. The lack of the most fundamental medical services is a significant part of the dehumanizing daily existence of prison life that results in brutalization.

Our prison system also suffers from a staggering need for increased psychiatric and educational personnel. There are only 50 full-time psychiatrists for all American prisons, 15 of them in Federal institutions which hold only 4 percent of all prisoners. In adult penal institutions, there is only one teacher available for every 150 inmates, although fewer than 5 percent of the inmates of Federal institutions function at a 12th-grade level, and one psychologist for every 1,200 prisoners.

The acute lack of psychiatric and psychological personnel is particularly deplorable as studies have shown that most prisoners suffer from mental disturbances at the time they committed their crime.

Many ex-convicts revert to a life of crime because they have not received job training that would assist them in obtaining employment in the outside world. License plate and mop bucket manufacturing are two examples of prison vocations that bear little relation to potential jobs in private industry. Eighty-five percent of the inmates of Federal penal institutions lack any marketable skill when they leave prison.

Although much attention has been focused on the condition of our Federal and State prisons, a recent census of 4,037 local and county jails, conducted by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, revealed many problems that plague these institutions. Eighty-six percent of the county institutions or jails located in cities of 25,000 or greater population had no facilities whatsoever for exercise or recreation. Eighty percent lacked educational programs, while 26 percent were without visiting facilities. About 50 percent had no medical services. About 1.5 percent lacked toilets. In addition, 19,000 of the 98,000 cells in those jails were between 51 and 100 years old, and 5,416 of the cells were more than a century old.

The same survey also revealed that 52 percent of all inmates in city and county jails were held for reasons other than conviction of a crime. Almost all the inmates in this category were awaiting trial, many of them unable to raise the bail necessary for their release. The result is that prisoners who have not come to trial must sit idly, waiting months on end with no constructive activity available to them. During this purgatorial period of enforced idleness, they mingle with convicted criminals, often assimilating their views and lifestyles.

We have drawn an iron curtain in our minds, shutting out from our awareness the daily tragedy of life in America's prisons. Except when there are prison riots such as occurred at Attica, jail breaks or scandals, little thought, attention or concern is given to our correctional institutions and their inmates. It is time to recognize that repression is an inadequate substitute for rehabilitation. It is time the American people realized that punishment alone does not bring correction. We must awaken to the fact that the present system of criminal justice, in the words of the President's Violence Commission, "does not deter, does not detect, does not convict, does not correct."

It is not for humanitarian reasons alone that we must reform our corrections system. It is for our own safety. We have never faced up to the facts that most convicts will some day be released from the hellholes we call correctional institutions. They come out, as we have

seen, more bitter, more disturbed, more antisocial, and more skilled in crime than when they went in.

Accordingly, if we are to break the vicious circle of recidivism, we will need to revolutionize our corrections program.

Twenty-five hundred years ago, the ancient Chinese Philosopher Confucius wrote:

A journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step.

An important initial step toward improving our detention centers would be the creation of a House Select Committee on Penal Reform. It is my earnest hope that Members of the House will give swift attention to this vitally needed measure and will join with me in calling for the establishment of such a Select Committee.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress worry too much about the role of Congress in foreign affairs, and not enough about its competence. When that competence is achieved, the present imbalance between the executive and legislative branches will be improved, if not corrected.

One important way the competence of the Congress in foreign affairs can be improved is through the creation of a Joint Committee on National Security.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 10899, to create such a committee. The same legislation has been introduced in the Senate by Senator HUMPHREY.

This joint committee would function in the national security field in a manner comparable to the operation of the Joint Economic Committee in the field of economics. Just as the Joint Economic Committee examines the annual economic report of the President, the Joint Committee on National Security could study and analyze the annual foreign policy messages of the President and the Secretary of State.

The Joint Economic Committee has become a respected forum for examining economic issues, and its recommendations have a substantial impact on the development of economic policy. The joint committee I propose could have the same impact on our national security policy.

Just as the Joint Economic Committee unifies the otherwise fragmented voice of Congress on economic policy, the Joint Committee on National Security would channel congressional opinion on foreign policy. It has been estimated that more than half of the 38 standing committees on Congress are involved in some aspect of our foreign policy. As a result, there is no way of knowing what the Congress thinks about a particular international issue. This joint committee will offer a centralized voice.

Its main responsibilities would be these:

First, to study and make recommendations on all issues concerning national security.

Second, to review, study and evaluate the Pentagon Papers and other documents covering U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

Third, to study and make recommendations on Government practices of classification and declassification of documents.

Fourth, to conduct a continuing review of the operations of the agencies intimately involved with our foreign policy, including the CIA and the Departments of Defense and State.

The committee's membership of 25 would include the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority leaders of both Houses, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committees on Appropriations, Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs, Armed Services, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, plus three members of each House, two from the majority party and one from the minority, chosen by the Speaker and the President of the Senate.

There will be unavoidable problems in working out the relationships between such a new committee and the standing committees, but unless the Congress can overcome its own inadequacies and upgrade its mechanisms for handling national security issues, all hope fades of dealing with the executive branch on an equal basis.

The joint committee, by addressing itself to the broad issues that overlap the jurisdictions of the separate committees, would assist Congress in its participation in the decisionmaking process. It would provide a source of information independent of the executive which is absolutely necessary if the House and Senate are to fulfill their constitutional responsibility of acting as a "check and balance" to the President. Without a competence of its own, the Congress cannot make discriminating judgments between alternative programs and proposals.

It is not enough for the Congress to insist upon its prerogatives if it is not prepared to cope with its responsibilities. A Joint Committee on National Security will help it to cope. It will provide the expertise that is needed if Congress is to act more as a partner and less as an adversary in the development of national security policy. It can offer a mechanism to assure adequate consultation, rather than frequent confrontation, between the President and the legislature in the formulation of this policy.

HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS MEMORIALIZED

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I have received from the executive secretary of the Third Marina Islands District Legislature a copy of that body's resolution No. 21-1971.

This resolution, expressing "sincere gratitude and appreciation" for our Foreign Affairs Subcommittee's work on the Micronesian Claims Act of 1971, mentions me by name as the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements. But it also expresses appreciation for the role played by the other members of the subcommittee and I would like to add my voice to this expression of gratitude.

In addition, the House as a whole should be commended for the dispatch with which this long-delayed matter was acted upon in the 92d Congress.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 21-1971 OF THE THIRD MARIANA ISLANDS DISTRICT LEGISLATURE, SIXTH REGULAR SESSION

A resolution relative to expressing sincere gratitude and appreciation to Honorable Donald M. Fraser and members of the House Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Foreign Affairs Committee for the favorable support of the "Micronesian Claims Act of 1971"

Whereas, by virtue of the speedy action by the House Subcommittee on International Organizational and Movements of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the "Micronesian Claims Act of 1971" passed the Congress of the United States in record time; and

Whereas, the signing of Public Law 92-39 by President Nixon on July 11, 1971, will at long last set into motion the machinery to begin resolving a problem that has existed for too long; and

Whereas, a great deal of work by many people has gone into the introduction and passage of the "Micronesian Claims Act of 1971", and we on behalf of the people of the Mariana Islands District, wish to express our sincere gratitude and appreciation to the members of the House Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Foreign Affairs Committee for their very valuable assistance and speedy action;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the 3rd. Mariana Islands District Legislature that its sincere gratitude and appreciation be and is hereby expressed to Honorable Donald M. Fraser and members of the House Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Foreign Affairs Committee for their favorable support of the "Micronesian Claims Act of 1971".

Be it further resolved that the President certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption hereof and thereafter transmit copies of the same to the members of the House Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Passed by the 3rd. Mariana Islands District Legislature, August 18, 1971.

VICENTE N. SANTOS,
President.

DANIEL T. MUNA,
Legislative Secretary.

TRYING TO KEEP UP WITH SECRETARY MORTON'S FLIP-FLOPPING

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the difficulties in keeping up with fast breaking events and keeping

our public statements timely and relevant. That is never an easy task.

We are also aware that public officials, including Congressmen, occasionally change their positions on issues. This is certainly a public official's privilege and, probably, there ought to be more instances of such changes.

Just yesterday, however, my staff and I were victims of a switch of opinion by a public official, which to us was exasperating and went well beyond the bounds of openmindedness which the public has a right to expect from its officials.

On Monday morning, an article appeared on the front page of the Washington Post with the headline: "Alaska Oil May Flow Via Canada." That article quoted an interview with Secretary of Interior Rogers C. B. Morton which appears in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report. According to the AP story, the Secretary had "hinted strongly yesterday—Sunday—that all oil from Alaska's North Slope may ultimately go to market through Canada." The article also said that Morton "implied that it may be months before the decision" on whether the proposed Alaska pipeline would be built, is made.

Since I have been concerned with the Alaska oil issue, immediately after seeing the AP report in the Post, I prepared a statement praising Mr. Morton for his latest statements, which appeared to represent a significant shift in the Interior Department's position on the Alaska pipeline.

In that statement, I said that the Secretary's most recent statements "could have required considerable courage." I also said that Mr. Morton's statements could either be viewed as a very significant switch in Interior's approach to studying the Canadian alternative—

Or it could also be viewed as the latest in a series of flip-flops Secretary Morton has gone through on whether the Interior Department will independently and thoroughly study a Canadian pipeline alternative. At the very least, the latest flip is on the right side, but I am hopeful that the Secretary's comments mean a lot more than that—

I said in my undelivered statement.

Unfortunately, before I could praise Mr. Morton for his latest flip, he had already flopped again. That afternoon, another AP report which appeared in the Washington Star under the headline: "Changes Clear Way for Alaska Pipeline," stated in its lead that—

"The Interior Department may be able to make a favorable environmental report on the trans-Alaska pipeline because of changes agreed to by the proposed builders," Interior Secretary Rogers Morton said.

My news release praising Mr. Morton for his original statements as reported in the Post that morning, was in the process of being stapled by my staff for distribution. It had to be stopped, of course.

In following the Alaska pipeline issue since last January, I thought I had become accustomed to Mr. Morton's inconsistent and contradictory statements, of which there have been several. Nonetheless, I was still unprepared for this latest and most glaring inconsistency in a long line of glaring, inconsistent statements. Indeed, Secretary Morton's complete reversal in such a short span of time was a remarkable achievement, even for him. To use an analogy that should be understandable to all members of this Administration: Mr. Morton managed to lose 6 yards on a play on which he seemed to be falling forward for a first down. I can only hope that Mr. Morton's time record in overruling himself had no relation to the fact that both he and the President were in Alaska at the time the original AP story was published.

This is not the first time that Mr. Morton has flipped or flopped on the question of whether and how a Canadian pipeline alternative would be studied. Back in May, the Interior Secretary first said that Interior would undertake a comprehensive and independent study of the Canadian alternative. But, later he said that this would not be done. Instead, he said that he would ask the oil companies to talk with the Canadian government.

Once again, it appears clear that whatever studies are being done on the Canadian pipeline, the decision to go ahead with the approval of the Alaska route has essentially been made, which is what virtually everyone—both the oil companies and the Alaska pipeline's opponents—has believed all along.

The glimmer of hope that the decision on whether to construct the trans-Alaska pipeline had not been made in fact, as well as in theory, was quashed by Mr. Morton's reversal of himself—even before we could acknowledge that glimmer. Ever optimistic though, I have sent the following letter to Mr. Morton asking him to clarify his contradictory statements and to further detail how Interior intends to study the Canadian pipeline alternative. I send this letter to the Secretary with some trepidation, however, because I fear that his response, rather than clarifying things, will only serve to confuse them even more. Politics, however, is a risky business.

The letter to Secretary Morton follows:

SEPTEMBER 27, 1971.

Mr. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Interior Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was greatly confused by the apparent inconsistencies in the September 27 articles "Alaska Oil May Flow Via Canada" in the Washington Post and "Changes Clear Way for Alaska Pipeline" in the Washington Star. Some clarification on your part, especially concerning the study of a Canadian pipeline alternative would, I believe, be quite helpful.

First, do you plan to wait for research to be completed on the Mackenzie Valley pipeline before any decision is made on the Alaska pipeline? As I understand it, the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Limited expects to have completed its research by the end of this year. Will the Interior Department evaluate the results of its research and, if so, how will that evaluation be done? Will the Interior Department independently evaluate the ecological aspects of the Canadian pipeline or will it rely primarily or wholly on the studies of the Mackenzie Valley Company and the recent Arco comparison of the Canadian and Alaskan pipelines?

Second, how do you plan to have the economics of the Canadian pipeline studied? Will an independent study be done? Specifically, how will the economics of the Canadian pipeline in relation to the Alaskan pipeline be studied and evaluated?

Third, will the Interior Department, the State Department, or both together, enter into negotiations with the Canadian government concerning the construction and operation of a Canadian pipeline? If so, approximately when do you expect these negotiations to take place?

I do not, of course, expect completely definitive answers to these questions at this time. However, I feel that some further details on how the Interior Department intends to proceed in the studying of a Canadian pipeline alternative would help greatly to clarify to the public and to Congress the Administration's approach to the whole Alaska oil issue.

Thank you very much for your attention. I look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Sincerely,

LES ASPIN,
Member of Congress.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S MINORITY BANK DEPOSIT PROGRAM IS A DISAPPOINTMENT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last October 2—a year ago—the Departments of Treasury and Commerce and the Office of Management and Budget announced a 1-year program to increase deposits in minority-owned banks by the very modest amount of $100 million. The Department of the Treasury was to raise $35 million in deposits from Federal agencies. The Department of Commerce was to be responsible for an increase of $65 million in deposits from private sector groups such as labor unions, foundations, and corporations.

October 1 is approaching. Yet in terms of actual deposits, the minority bank deposit program is only a little more than half way toward its goal of $100 million for the Nation's 36 minority-owned banks. This short-fall in performance is disappointing. It is particularly disappointing on the part of the Treasury, which is only some $22 million toward its quota of $35 million.

If the administration—from the President on down—had really gotten behind this program, the goal of $100 million could have been reached in less than a year. Instead, the program was allowed to drift for many months. As a result, only $5 to $7 million in Government deposits and $20 to $25 million from the private sector had been realized by midsummer this year, according to estimates of Dr. Edward Irons who until recently was executive director of the National Bankers Association.

Belatedly, and under public prodding by minority bank officials, the administration is now trying to make up for months of inaction. The Office of Minority Business Enterprises—OMBE—in the Department of Commerce currently estimates the increase in deposits under the program at some $53 million. By October 10, OMBE hopes to report $100 million in commitments. However, it estimates only $56 milion in actual deposits

by that date. Under the most optimistic assumptions, the Treasury will still be some $10 million short of its $35 million deposit quota.

I would be inclined to say "better late than never" if the administration, and particularly the Treasury, acting vigorously on other fronts to aid minority banks and otherwise to encourage socially useful bank lending.

But here also, the record is disappointing. The Treasury, for example, despite prodding by 15 Democratic members of the House Banking and Currency Committee, stubbornly refuses to consider managing its $5 to $10 billion in tax and loan balances so that commercial banks benefiting from these interest-free balances will be induced to increase their lending in support of minority business, low and moderate income housing, student loans, and other public-interest enterprises.

The administration's minority bank deposit program has been a timid step in the right direction. Full performance on the promises of this program is overdue. Even more overdue is Treasury leadership to marshal the resources of the private banking community on the scale required to bring real relief to the capital-starved social programs and impoverished areas of this country.

FREE CHINA'S OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, current developments in the United Nations concerning the so-called China issue are being watched very closely by our citizens and officials alike. By all poll indicators, our citizenry fully supports official policy in retaining the fine representation of the Republic of China in the United Nations. On record, the Republic of China has observed its obligations in the U.N. scrupulously and with exemplary dedication. There can be no doubt about this. Her own achievements in economic progress, land reform, and economic aid, especially to numerous African states, are the envy of many a government in the free world, not to speak of most in the Red Empire.

A most interesting and striking article on this issue has been written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University and also president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee. Titled "Free China's Opportunity," the article appears in the autumn issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly, a world-renowned periodical on Eurasian affairs which is frequently referred to by institutes both in the free world and the Red empire.

The article appears at a most opportune moment in showing the legal bases for the Republic of China's retention in the U.N. It also stresses the absurdity of paralleling the China issue with the Byelorussian and Ukrainian representation in the U.N., albeit it of puppet character.

At this moment I strongly recommend the article to the studied reading of our Members and our interested citizens:

FREE CHINA'S OPPORTUNITY

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

President Nixon's plan to visit Red China had long been in the making. When the Peiping trip of Dr. Henry Kissinger, the President's advisor on national security matters, was revealed, it was undoubtedly a news spectacular. But for those who have these past ten years followed the thinking, pressures and literary output dealing with a "Two China" policy, some of which will be referred to here, the news clout of the Kissinger expedition scarcely carried any element of basic surprise. It was only the timing and secretive circumstances that produced the superficial surprise.

Looked at from one angle, the move after all is in conformity with the Administration's oft-repeated theme of "negotiation, not confrontation." It has almost Khrushchevian overtones of "peace and friendship," which the then Vice President Nixon was endlessly exposed to over ten years ago. The style is also of like character. Yet, still from another angle and in a more fundamental sense, this gesture represents a confrontation of negotiation, which in this make-believe period of confetti diplomacy is nothing more than the diplomatic dimension of the Cold War as practiced by the Russian totalitarians and the Red Chinese, and accepted in challenge by us. As Hungarian and other "satellite" sources put it, the clout of the revealed Presidential visit elevated the stage from "ping-pong diplomacy" to "baseball diplomacy." The next higher stage will be one of "football diplomacy," calling for intricate, calculated plays on both sides.

The immediate effects of the White House announcement regarding the Peiping trip were mixed, both here and abroad. In the course of my trip in Asia in mid-summer it was patently evident that doubt, uncertainty and even chagrin marked the reactions of both official and unofficial Free Asia, varying in degree from capital to capital, country to country. From Seoul down to Manila the prime complaint was the lack of prior consultation on the matter with America's Free Asian allies. On Taiwan, of course, a quiet bitterness was sensed and if the government of the Republic of China hadn't exercised a restraining hand, several outbursts of anti-Americanism would surely have occurred. They would have been understandable, too, in view of Free China's strong and unwavering loyalty to U.S. policy and interests in Asia. No matter where the writer went or with whom he consulted, the subject of prime interest was the President's decision to visit mainland China and the question, naturally, was "Why?" This was the sole question asked of the writer in a TV interview over the China Broadcasting System.

MULTIDIMENSIONAL ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM

In attempting to answer this pressing question in the most rational and objective way possible, the writer obviously could not assign the weights given to the several considerations that doubtlessly led the White House to its decision at this time. Despite this, however, the major causal reasons for this action have been discussed, debated and examined for some time. In short, the problem has multidimensional aspects which the writer endeavored to explain in terms of the Sino-Russian conflict, the Vietnam War, the emerging power of Japan, the need for communication, and domestic political considerations.

Regardless of overlaying public utterances, the objective global context providing for this action is the intensive Sino-Russian conflict and its ramifications in both the Red Empire and the Free World. More than anything else, this objective context is the determining factor underlying the present move toward Red China. It was not without reason that the President visited first Bucharest and then Belgrade, and now is planning his trip to Peiping. For it has been no mystery that the intra-Red Empire conflict has extended into the Balkans with political orientations toward Peiping in Rumania, Yugoslavia and Albania. These Red states are under the shadow of the Brezhnev doctrine and its ruthless application as is Red China. A careful reading of the President's second foreign policy report to Congress unmistakably pointed in this direction with its repeated emphases on the growing tensions within the Red Empire. For example, "The Stalinist bloc has fragmented into competing centers of doctrine and power. One of the deepest conflicts in the world today is between Communist China and the Soviet Union."[1]

This fundamental context on the global level encompasses several other important factors. While all the diplomatic maneuvers are underway, steadily the Russian armed build-up on the borders of Red China continues. Some thirty to forty divisions are concentrated on this 4,000 plus mile border. The military pressure for a pre-emptive strike against Red China's nuclear installations is ever-present, preceded in fact by quite a number of Russian generals having been relieved or declared dead for reasons unknown. The deductive known reason was their desire to have the task done now rather than later. Red China is known to possess a stock of short-range IRBM's, but these are not as yet deliverable for distances covering Moscow and Leningrad. Needless to say, it won't be long before Peiping will possess these and a stock of ICBM's. Then, finally, the political factor of competition for leadership in the world communist movement enters into this deep conflict. As its new constitution and other points of evidence show, Peiping has no intention of renouncing the Maoist revolutionary animus. In the meantime, Moscow's policy of isolating Red China both geographically and ideologically is being exploded by the Nixon overture to Red China.

In addition to this basic reason for the President's new approach to China, there are secondary and tertiary reasons. Of secondary import is the Vietnam war, which from the military viewpoint is to all intents and purposes over. Recently, in Saigon, the writer received several briefings delivered by the South Vietnamese high command, and the confident manner by which his pointed criticisms were fielded represented a sharp contrast to the situation he experienced in Vietnam three years ago. The dominant problem today in that war-torn country is political. By all evidence, North Vietnam is militarily tired, new recruitments are slow, and the recent floods have shaken its economic structure badly. The danger in the whole situation rests in the possibility of Hanoi gaining its objectives at the political table, where it was not able to on the field of battle. In substance, it may seek the repetition of the '54 Geneva Conference when, despite the spectacular feat at Dienbienphou, its forces were generally prostrate.

Talk about a deal with Red China for a conference on Southeast Asia and an agreed-upon neutralization of the area has surfaced in the wake of the President's planned trip to Peiping. At the same time, the Red Chinese totalitarians have reiterated their stand that Hanoi pursue "protracted war" to final victory in Indochina. An August 13 Peiping radio broadcast beamed the promise of "full support to the Vietnamese people and the Indochinese peoples to carry on the war against U.S. aggression and for national salvation until complete victory. . . ."[2] These and similar statements may well be propa-

---

Footnotes at end of article.

ganda plays to gain a conference and neutralization eventually, which paradoxically enough would provide a wide field for protracted warfare of a psycho-political type. Yet, considering the general weakness of both Red China and North Vietnam, there is no rational justification for such a deal. South Vietnam could well develop strongly in the path of South Korea, and between a formidable South Vietnam and Thailand stability and peaceful development can be assured in southeast Asia.

Another important reason affecting U.S.-Red Chinese relations is Peiping's fear of resurgent Japan. On the national scale, Japan today is the world's second economic power, and it is first among the Asian nations. Under the guise of Home Defense units, its military power is steadily developing, and certainly should Japanese confidence in the stability of U.S. policies wane, it won't take Tokyo long to convert itself into a major nuclear power. Moreover, a point oftentimes overlooked is the importance of a free Republic of China on Taiwan to the security of Japan. In light of these paramount facts and possibilities it is evident why Peiping fears a powerful Japan. However, at this stage this fear cannot be equated to that of Russia in the Soviet Union. In any case, it provides enormous bargaining leverage for the U.S.

Khrushchev is reported as having said "Mao Tse-tung has played politics with Asiatic cunning, following his own rules of cajolery, treachery, savage vengeance and deceit." [3] The course set by the President is, to say the least, one inviting considerable treachery from the Red Chinese. Nonetheless, given the other more essential aspects, it is a necessary confrontation for negotiation, to open up lines of communication, to allow for a variety of cultural and trade contacts, hopefully to deflate the revolutionary fervor of Peiping, and to challenge the Chinese totalitarians to display some observance of the rules of international conduct and behavior. This period in Sino-American relations as concern the mainland is not unlike that preceding U.S. recognition of the Soviet Union forty years ago, though certain substantial differences exist between the two. Put simply, an offer to talk is by itself no stamp of approval of the so-called People's Republic of China nor a slight to the valid legitimacy of the Republic of China.

A point stressed by the writer in his appearances on Taiwan is that President Nixon is no Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower, Truman or Roosevelt. His solid background of anti-communism distinguishes him from his predecessors. He is acutely alert to the political wiles and machinations of Red cold warriors, and in the circumstances of our domestic climate and moods is pursuing an admittedly treacherous course with superb confidence in his own ability to manage both the variables and imponderables of the global scene for America's own basic security. Four years ago, in an article published in *Foreign Affairs*, private citizen Nixon wrote: "The primary restraint on China's Asian ambitions should be exercised by the Asian nations in the path of those ambitions, backed by the ultimate power of the United States. . . . Only as the nations of non-Communist Asia become so strong—economically, politically and militarily—that they no longer furnish tempting targets for Chinese aggression, will the leaders in Peking be persuaded to turn their energies inward rather than outward. And that will be the time when the dialogue with mainland China can begin." [4] In essence, the Nixon doctrine appears in germinal form here.

Undoubtedly, other influences worked on the President in the direction of the general course he has set for himself as concerns Red China. A memorandum dated November 6, 1968, was submitted by several academicians to "President-Elect Nixon" on the subject of relations with China. The memorandum is studded with typical absurdities about "no-win" wars, the effects of the ABM system on more favorable relations with Peiping, the surrender of Matsu and Quemoy and about some sub-surface political forces in Taiwan. However, it charts a course for accepting "Peking's membership in the General Assembly and the Security Council while seeking simultaneously to preserve a General Assembly seat for Taiwan, whether as the Republic of China, an independent nation, or an autonomous region of China." [5] The last part of this recommendation sufficiently indicates the naive or sinister motivation of these academics. The President's and Secretary of State Rogers's declarations on abiding with our present commitments toward the Republic of China adequately dispose of these and other absurdities.

Finally, from the viewpoint of domestic politics, the disclosure of the President's intended trip decisively took the wind out of his opponents' sails. As many an editorialist pointed out last summer, had the presidential elections taken place then, Nixon would probably be reelected with ease. Each of his potential opponents couldn't help but praise the President's stride for "peace in our generation," a slogan that will resound more and more in the 1972 campaign. Plainly, it cannot be said, as some are prone to do, that the move toward talks with Peiping has been motivated by the President's desire for reelection regardless of its effects upon our national security. To entertain such an insular notion is to ignore the chief considerations as portrayed in the broader picture here. That several objectives can be realized by a single action, albeit directed in an area of global significance for both the United States and the Free World, is a most commendable feat in the art of political statesmanship. Especially is this so when the higher ends are not really endangered by the residual satisfaction of lower ends.

If this analysis is correct, the increasing amount of evidence flowing from Eastern Europe and the tensions growing there certainly fits into our interpretative pattern and assumes grave significance for imperialist Moscow. The expanded reception of the Red Chinese in Rumania, Yugoslavia and Albania has already been cited. The circulation of ideas in official circles for a Balkan alignment involving these three and Turkey and Greece to boot shows the extent to which the threat of the Brezhnev doctrine, or in other words, applied Russian domination has stimulated the fears of most Balkan capitals. The Rumanian Communist Party is well on record denying Moscow's right to lead the Communist movement and rejects the Brezhnev doctrine of limited sovereignty in these words: "It is the primordial international duty of each party to encourage no faction fights in another country." [6] On the other hand, Moscow's lackeys seek to dampen the impact of the President's invitation to visit Peiping. For example, the East German Communist Party newspaper *Neues Deutschland* accuses Red China of world ambitions in these words: "The demagogic cloak of Maoist propaganda has fallen, and the policy of Mao Tse-tung and his followers comes to light uncovered." [7] Out of Moscow characteristic drivel of this type flows: "The ultimate aim of Chinese foreign policy is to provoke a military conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States . . . and then build on the ruins." [8] Doubtlessly, the period ahead will abound with such comments.

THE "REALITY" OF RED CHINA

Before we consider the opportunity that all this has provided the Republic of China for a strong legal stand in the United Nations, a few observations are necessary in connection with the so-called imposing reality of Red China and the Byelorussian/Ukrainian analogy to the two China policy. In the drive to gain a seat for Peiping in the U.N., there has been a grossly unwholesome tendency to paint Red China as a great power, indeed as a super-power. As the writer states it elsewhere, "if reference can be made again to the issue of recognizing Peiping in whatever form, it is striking, indeed, how old illusions on 'reality,' 'prospective trade' and 'peace' nurtured forty years ago with regard to the USSR are muddling minds today in relation to mainland China." [9] For propaganda reasons the inflated myth of Red Chinese reality is understandable; from a factual point of view it represents the grossest misrepresentation of what is in essence a geographic expression. A huge population and geographical expanse clearly do not add up, in themselves, to a big power reality. On the contrary, lacking other essential factors, they attest to massive weakness.

Just as in the case of the Soviet Union the human cost of mythological communism in mainland China has long been known to be ghastly. What the Select House Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression assembled in data seventeen years ago, Robert Conquest has summarized recently as concerns the Soviet Union. Innumerable works have covered the genocide, murders and assassinations perpetrated by the Red Chinese totalitarians, and Richard Walker has presented a similar summary recently.[10] However, the latter's economic perspectives on Red China leave much to be desired. Both perform a valuable service in alerting or re-alerting free people as to the political types we are dealing with, and though in the case of Peiping the estimates of decimated lives may differ from a minimum of 34 million lives to 63 million in the last fifty years (and in the case of Moscow, from 40 to 80 million) the lesson of organized barbarity remains the same. The assassin background of Chou En-Lai—Murderer—should have tempering effects.[11] But whatever the effects, they will scarcely alter the drift of accommodation which must be shaped by a vivid realism toward this geographical expression.

On the scale of power ingredients, the so-called People's Republic of China is clearly not in the club of super-powers. The two successive convulsions of the past decade—the Great Leap Backward and the Uncultural Revolution—cost the PRC a whole decade of economic regression. One of the worst underdeveloped countries, the PRC can only show for itself an estimated gross product of $70 to $80 billion, or about 2/5 of Japan's GNP, and its per capita output ranges from $90 to $100, about only ⅓ of the Republic of China. Its food-population problem is a long-standing one, with an approximate output in grain production totaling 190 million tons for a population ranging from 680 to 775 million. As a pointed indicator, PRC's crude steel output approximates 15 million tons, as compared with 130 million for the U.S. and 116 million for the USSR. Its foreign trade turnover amounts to about $5 billion per annum, which is closely rivaled by the Republic of China and its population of about 14.8 million on Taiwan.

A recital of the normal aspects of the standard of living on the mainland—off the guided tourist tracks—is one of economic abomination, well exceeding those in other underdeveloped Asian areas. To be sure, progress has been made in nuclear and satellite development, but here, too, perspective should be shown toward this powerbadging stroke of technologic concentration. At this stage Red China possesses IRBM's, but not powered enough to reach Moscow or Leningrad. It's on the way for ICBM's, but to develop a complete delivery system will take years yet. Inroads in this area still are quite underdeveloped, as is, indeed, the entire economy.

* Footnotes at end of article.

THE BYELORUSSIAN/UKRAINIAN ANALOGY

Negotiations and dealings with Red China require a perspective attuned to the essentials given above. Basic weakness, not strength, is the hallmark of the PRC, and no inordinate concessions are necessary in the name of peace. Proper and accurate perspective in the argumentation of the China issue is also necessary with regard to the oft-repeated Byelorussian/Ukrainian analogy. About a year ago Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts argued that Red China should be admitted into the United Nations on the same basis as that enjoyed by Byelorussia and Ukraine. The latter are parts of the USSR, have separate representation in the U.N. as does the USSR as a whole, and are separately recognized by all other members in the world body. Therefore, each of the two parts of China as a whole should also be in the U.N. Recently, this has been raised by a noted columnist in this vein: "One argument is that the Soviet Union, for example, has two of its 'provinces' in the international organization." [12]

In truth, this argument is baseless and misleading. First, it ignores the fact that the United Nations *is* nominally the United Nations, constituted of nations which bear some form of statehood, ranging from the vacuous to the substantial. Second, notwithstanding rampant misconceptions concerning them, both Byelorussia and Ukraine are nations distinct from the Russian which is really represented in the form of the USSR. In sharp contrast, the Chinese on the island of Taiwan are a part of the same Chinese nation that embraces the Chinese on the mainland. Briefly, then, there is no national parallel here between the relations of Ukraine and Byelorussia and federated Russia and that of the Chinese in the province of Taiwan and those on the mainland.

Thus this argument has no valid application to the two China problem. There is no such thing as a two Russia arrangement in the U.N. The matter of legitimacy is also not pertinent to the drawn analogy. In all three cases—Russia, Ukraine and Byelorussia—fundamental illegitimacy rules. The admission of Red China would, however, militate against the legitimacy of the Republic of China as the sole representative of the Chinese nation in the U.N. It would neutralize it in the world body, but the legitimacy factor can be sustained by the United States and others by continued direct diplomatic relations with Taipei. Rationally pursuing this further, if direct relations were also extended to Peiping without any automatic severance of relations incurred by Taipei, the legitimacy of the latter still would be sustained. Aside from geographical and governmental differences, a more logical analogy here would be U.S. diplomatic relations with the USSR and also the Baltic legations. A change to this extent should presuppose some hard bargaining in the interests of both the U.S. and its free Asian allies.

THE U.N. AND FREE CHINA'S OPPORTUNITY

If one synthetically relates all the elements presented so far, it becomes evident that a splendid opportunity exists for the Republic of China to strongly defend its position in the U.N., to reinforce the principles of that world body, and to do all this without in any way embarrassing the U.S. or undermining its own legitimate status. First, the Lodge report, statements by the President, and Secretary Roger's declaration of August 2 underscore our opposition to the expulsion of Nationalist China in the event of Red China's admission. As the last put it, "the United States will oppose any action to expel the Republic of China or otherwise deprive it of representation in the United Nations." [13] The salient question is whether, without any economic, political or military recriminations, we would allow the Republic of China to defend its seats in both the Security Council and the General Assembly on the basis of the U.N. Charter itself.

The Fifth World Anti-Communist Conference, which was held last July in Manila, passed a significant resolution emphasizing certain provisions in the U.N. Charter which provide the legal basis for Nationalist China's defense. Some maintain that only this legal basis should be used in the defense, foregoing any political fight in view of the numbers stacked up against ROC. There is merit in this argument, but there is no reason why, for the record and as a tempering introduction to the strictly legal battle, ROC's ambassador should not recite objectively and dispassionately before the entire General Assembly and to the world the long record of Peiping's aggressions, genocide and barbarities, and then concluding with the question "I ask each and every one of the distinguished representatives present here whether in your moral conscience and in dedication to the declared principles of this world body you honestly feel Communist China is qualified and is eligible to become at this time a member of this organization?"

At this writing, when both Japan and Great Britain have indicated their intention to vote for Red China's admission regardless of ROC's expulsion, the need for an unfettered defense by Taipei is greater than ever, perhaps even for the U.S. to save face. A careful reading of the pertinent U.N. Charter provisions shows that ROC's case is air-tight and impregnable. Beginning with the matter of expelling a member, Article 6 expressly states: "A Member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendations of the Security Council." [15] Immediately two chief points emerge here: (1) persistent violation of principles and (2) Security Council recommendation.

Without doubt, any opponent of ROC would be hard pressed to offer even an iota of evidence substantiating the first point on the part of ROC. To the very contrary, the record of ROC in the U.N. and in the world is almost impeccable and steadily progressive. As one liberal columnist stresses, "There are 97 'countries' in the U.N. with smaller populations than Taiwan's, and it makes no sense, either in terms of these people's rights or the long-range effectiveness of the U.N., to throw Taiwan out." [16] His other powerful points on this exclusion as "a foolish step" away from universal membership, "Taiwan's extraordinary social and economic progress," its assistance to other nations, "especially the poorer nations of Africa," and Japan's world power qualification for a permanent seat on the Security Council deserve the most serious consideration. Furthermore, the present occasion is ripe for the public to recognize some essential facts concerning ROC, as, for example, its annual economic growth rate of over 10%, inflation of only 3% a year, foreign trade turnover of close to $4 billion, its model land-reform program and food production self-sufficiency, a well-balanced industrialization growth, a per capita income of $292, and impressive donorship of foreign economic aid.

Concerning the second point on Security Council recommendation, the repeated so-called Albanian proposal to seat Red China and oust ROC has been a repeated illegal attempt since no such recommendation has founded it. If any such recommendation were proposed in the Security Council, the Republic of China, as a permanent member, would veto it, a right guaranteed by Article 27. In short, then, since ROC has never violated the principles of the Charter, there is therefore no factual or legal ground for its expulsion.

On this matter of permanent membership, Article 23 specifically provides: "The Republic of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America shall be permanent members of the Security Council." [17] The only legal process by which the permanent member title "The Republic of China" can be replaced by "The People's Republic of China" is by amending the Charter, as provided in Article 108. The article clearly states: "Amendments to the present Charter shall come into force for all Members of the United Nations when they have been adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two-thirds of the Members of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council." [18] Obviously, the key word here is "all," meaning that if ROC or the U.S. or both as "permanent members" refuse to ratify the proposed, necessary amendment, the above change couldn't legally take place. Thus, by the provisions of the Charter itself, ROC cannot be removed from the Security Council. Arbitrary political judgments and actions toward such removal are only in crass violation of these articles and their legal provisions.

Turning now from the expulsion of members to the admission of new members, it is frequently held that these important questions are covered by Article 18 which in the Charter falls under the caption of "voting" and is thus procedural in character.[19] The article stipulates, for example, that each member of the General Assembly shall have one vote. It also specifies a two-thirds majority vote "on important questions," included among which are "the admission of new Members to the United Nations" and "the expulsion of Members." The so-called China question has in part been consistently played on the procedural points of this article. The seriousness of the present challenge demands, however, that the subject of Red China's admission be treated on substantive grounds rather than on procedural ones. And these are explicitly afforded in Article 4.

In Chapter II and under the caption "Membership," Article 4 quite clearly states: "1. Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations"; "2. The admission of any such state to membership in the United Nations will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council." [20] Applying the first part of this provision to Red China, it should be evident that the cumulative evidence of its aggressions and hostility, which the ROC ambassador would highlight in his introductory declaration, and the fact of the U.N.'s standing condemnation of Red China as "an aggressor" paint a rather misfit candidate for membership.

Based on these substantive grounds, the second part of the article is highly essential since the General Assembly decision is explicitly predicated "upon the recommendation of the Security Council." Plainly, any such decision presupposes this initial recommendation originating in the Security Council where, once again, the Republic of China has a permanent seat and also the right of veto. As indicated previously, Article 27 in the Charter guarantees this right, where, with reference to substantive rather than procedural matters, it expresses the guarantee in these words: "3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members." [21] The lack of concurrence on the part of the permanent members, of which ROC is one and sufficient unto itself, would nullify such decisions, substantively that of admitting Red China.

The Soviet Union has exercised this veto right against membership proposals, such as that of Nepal, and there is no principled or legal reason for the Republic of China to abstain from its proper and far more valid use in the case of Red China.

This legal foundation for ROC's defense of its position in the U.N. is more than adequate. However, being a state with a de facto population exceeding that of any of 97 other members in the U.N., ROC might also consider Article 19, dealing with financial delinquency of members and their right to vote in the General Assembly. If in this political scuffle many members of the U.N. should fail to observe the principles and Charter provisions of the organization, then there is no reason not to pull out as many plugs as the situation warrants. Very likely this may be unnecessary. The chief question remains: "Will ROC seize this opportunity to manifest its own established honor and integrity, to cause the U.N. to redeem itself in terms of its own Charter, and even perhaps to assist the U.S. in saving its own face?"

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Second Annual Presidential Review of United States Foreign Policy*, House Document No. 92–53, Washington, D.C. 1971, p. 2.

[2] Henry S. Bradsher, "Peking Affirms Support for Hanoi's Hard Line," *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., August 19, 1971.

[3] *Khrushchev Remembers*, Boston, 1970, p. 461.

[4] "How Nixon Signaled His China Policy Four Years Ago," *U.S. News & World Report*, Washington, D.C., August 16, 1971, p. 23.

[5] "Communist China Policy," *Congressional Record*, August 6, 1971, p. 30766.

[6] "Romania Urges Equality Despite Moscow Threats," *UPI*, Vienna, September 6, 1971.

[7] "China Seeks World Status," *Reuter*, East Berlin, August 24, 1971.

[8] *UPI*, Moscow, September 8, 1971.

[9] Lev E. Dobriansky, *The Geographical Expression of Mainland China: The Largest Captive Nation*. Congressional Record reprint, July 1971, p. 2.

[10] *The Human Cost of Communism In China*, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, USGPO, Washington, D.C., 1971.

[11] "Chou En-Lai, Murderer," *Congressional Record*, August 6, 1971, pp. 30773–30775.

[12] David Lawrence, "A New Detente Shaping Up in Asia?", Column, August 16, 1971.

[13] Statement by Secretary of State William P. Rogers, August 2, 1971.

[14] "Britain Will Back Peking U.N. Seat," *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., September 11, 1971.

[15] *Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice*, The United Nations, New York, pp. 6–7.

[16] Carl T. Rowan, "A Role for Taiwan in the General Assembly," *Sunday Star*, August 29, 1971.

[17] *Ibid*, p. 14.

[18] *Ibid*, p. 55.

[19] *Ibid*, p. 12.

[20] *Ibid*, p. 6.

[21] *Ibid*, p. 17.

EXTEND THE RENT FREEZE

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is almost incomprehensible that in this country one of the basic necessities of life—shelter—is becoming virtually nonaffordable for millions of Americans. Across the Nation, rentals have been spiraling upwards for years. Meanwhile, tenants have stood helpless—caught between the need for decent, adequate housing, and their increasing inability to afford that housing.

For some reason, homeowneship has always received the special blessing of Government. Homeowners receive Federal income tax deductions for the property taxes they pay. Similarly, they can deduct the interest costs they pay on their mortgages. The Federal section 235 homeownership program is geared to a 20-percent rent-income ratio. The Federal Housing Administration has served as the guarantor of billions in mortgages.

By contrast, tenants receive no tax deduction for their landlord's property taxes, even if those taxes are passed on to the tenants via rentals. The same applies to interest costs, and demonstration of how significant a role these play is the housing specialist's rule of thumb that each percentage point reduction in interest expenses translates into a rental reduction of $4.50 per room per month. Yet, the tenant receives no tax deduction for the interest expenses of his landlord, even though these are passed on to him in higher rentals. Finally, I would note that the analog to the section 235 program—the Federal section 236 rental assistance program—embodies a 25-percent rent-income ratio requirement, contrasting with section 235's 20-percent requirement.

In a different respect, also, tenants have been placed at a disadvantage. The law—both statutory and common—has always been far more ready to protect property ownership rights than tenant rights. Let me quote from a recent column by Sylvia Porter which appeared in the September 21 issue of the New York Post:

> (T)he typical tenant is helpless to get his landlord to make needed repairs . . . (M)any landlords reserve the right to evict their tenants for a wide range of good and bad reasons, to hike rents virtually whenever and by whatever amounts they choose, to enter rented houses or apartments more or less when the spirit moves them, to refuse to repay security deposits if they so wish, to refuse to perform certain repairs even in defiance of the lease . . . (I)n short, the attitude is what-are-you-going-to-do-about-it? . . .
>
> So medieval are our landlord-tenant laws that only a handful of states now require landlords even to provide "a place fit for occupation of human beings." Local penalties for violations of housing and health codes are still so frequently miniscule that badly needed repairs may be held up for months or even years. . . .

I recount these disparities between homeowners and landlords on the one hand, and tenants on the other, not for the purpose of disparaging the concept of homeownership. That is a status which all who aspire to it should be able to achieve. But, the fact is that one in three American families rents the apartment or home in which they live. And it is one of the ironies of this country, that a status so respected is so remote for so many by virtue of excessive costs and restrictive zoning. So I do recount this disparity, because I think it suitable preface to addressing an issue of such direct concern to so many: Soaring rentals.

I am most familiar with the rental situation in my own city—New York—but the problem is not confined to that city alone. Across the country tenants are facing a situation where they simply cannot afford decent rental housing.

Most recently, the situation has been exacerbated in New York State by the enactment of a very damaging vacancy decontrol law. This past July and early August, rents in New York City began to soar for newly decontrolled apartments.

The scene has been revealed as even bleaker by virtue of newly disclosed figures revealing that 93 percent of the tenants in New York City's 1.3 million rent-controlled apartments face rent increases on January 1, 1972. Nearly half of the tenants face increases of 45 percent to be levied in rises of 7.5 percent a year until new maximum rents are reached. This is the consequence of the misguided rent-control law adopted by the New York City Council last year.

The rent freeze which the President has promulgated offers relief for tenants across the Nation—but only temporarily. We must take advantage of this temporary respite and call, now, for permanent relief. I, for one, do not see how we can ignore this opportunity. In my own district, State, and city assisted housing—Mitchell-Lamas—are offering 3-bedroom rental units for $500 and more a month. And this is housing already receiving the benefits of governmental participation. Yet, these $500-a-month units are supposedly for moderate-income families. This is simply Alice in Wonderland figuring. What moderate-income family can afford $6,000 a year for rent?

There is an opportunity to obtain the permanent relief which is simply, starkly essential.

To that end, I have today introduced two bills which eight of my colleagues are joining me in cosponsoring. They are: Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. SCHEUER.

Both bills extend the rent freeze until April 30, 1972. One of them—H.R. 10945—applies across the board to all rental and cooperative housing. The other—H.R. 10946—applies to all federally assisted and federally insured housing.

The Federation of New York Tenant Organizations, made up of some 25 tenant groups from all over New York City, has cogently made the plea for this legislation in a telegram it has sent to President Nixon:

> The recently formed Federation of New York Tenant Organizations representing more than 25 tenant organizations of social and economic strata from black, Spanish-speaking, and white neighborhoods appeal to you and solicit your direct intervention to maintain rent freeze after 90 day wage and price freeze ends.

Similarly, the Emergency Committee for the Rent Freeze, made up of some 25 tenant groups, is urging the same action. And, in fact, around the country, tenant organizations are beginning to press for extension of the rent freeze.

I make no claim that this legislation is the final answer. I must acknowledge that, regrettably, likelihood of its pas-

sage is dim. But—and this is extremely important—this legislation serves as a focus, a lever, to magnify the visibility of the severe rental situation. It must serve to activate the millions of tenants who have for so long stood by powerless and helpless.

I make no claim, either, that this legislation is perfect. It makes absolutely no exceptions for landlord hardship. So long as the wage and price freezes continue—and there has been much more talk of that on the part of the administration than of perpetuation of the rent freeze—the landlord cannot suffer, since his expenses are not rising.

I would expect to see subsequent legislation making some provision for legitimate landlord hardship. But—and again this is a very significant consideration—I expect to see legislation which recognizes, affirmatively and aggressively, the plight of the tenant. It is he who has been powerless—unorganized, without strong lobbying representation. It is time—long past time—that equity replace landlord tyranny.

The time is ripe. Let me quote from the column by Sylvia Porter which appeared in the September 21 issue of the New York Post:

> Across the Nation, petitions and rent strikes are becoming daily affairs. Tenants' unions are being formed everywhere and are bargaining militantly with their landlords for more and better services ranging from cleaner halls to tighter security measures.

I join with the tenants' organizations who are seeking, demanding, relief. Either passage of the legislation we have introduced, or comparable administrative action by the President, must be achieved.

Included in these tenants' organizations is the following list:

West Side Tenants Union.
Lincoln Towers Tenants Association.
Middle Income Residents Association.
Tenant Power for Queens.
Bronx Council on Rents and Housing.
Washington Heights Tenants Association.
Joint Action Committee of West Side Mitchell-Lamas.
Lenox Hill Neighborhood Association.
Westview Neighbors Association.
Citizens Committee of Washington Heights.
Claremont Avenue Tenants Association.
East Mid-town Tenants United.
Inwood Tenants Association.
Tenants Against Demolition.
Manhattanville Development Center.
LABOR.
Cyprus Community Center.
Simpson Street Development Association.
Tenants Patrol Group of Bronx Park-East.
104–76 Association.
Queens Open City.
Bengonhurst Tenants Council.
Brownsville Community Crisis Center.
RENA.
Chelsea Coalition on Housing.

REMOTE AREA COMMUTING EXPENSE DEDUCTION BILL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. RUNNELS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would allow certain taxpayers to deduct their commuting expenses from their taxable incomes. The taxpayers affected would be those workers who must commute to a job site located 10 miles or more away from available housing.

In New Mexico, we have a good number of workers who are prevented by law from residing near their employment. In particular, we have people working on Indian reservations where non-Indian housing does not exist or on Government installations where civilian housing does not exist. Other workers are required to commute to job sites located in remote forest areas which are far removed from any living facilities whatsoever. In short, the large quantity of public and Indian lands in our State has imposed a unique but serious hardship on many of our workers. That is why I am introducing this legislation.

I hasten to point out that my bill will not apply to every worker who commutes more than 10 miles to work. I recognize that, with our economy in its present condition, the loss of general revenues which would result from such a proposal far outweighs those arguments presented over the years in favor of making all commuting expenses deductible. I have drafted my bill so that commuters to job sites located within 10 miles of available housing will not fall within its scope.

The matter of allowing a tax deduction for commuting expenses to remote job sites has been litigated by the Internal Revenue Service. Unfortunately, the Service has taken the position that it will not allow this deduction unless the Internal Revenue Code is amended to allow a specific deduction for this expense. The courts have ruled that the code does not presently provide for a remote site commuter expense deduction. Thus, legislation is in order.

The following is the main provision of the bill I am introducing today:

> In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction all the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year in traveling to and from temporary, indefinite or permanent work at a site located ten miles or more away from housing available for use by the taxpayer (and his family, if any).

COMMONSENSE SAYS WE SHOULD TRADE WITH RHODESIA

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there is no valid argument to support a continuation of economic sanctions by the United States against Rhodesia and these sanctions should immediately be abandoned. I am pleased to note that the Senate, by adopting the Byrd amendment, has indicated dissatisfaction with the present situation. I feel that this action would be strongly supported in the House.

Those who support the U.S. punishment of this small country would have us believe Rhodesia, a nation smaller than California and with a total armed force of under 5,000 men, is a threat to world peace, because of certain domestic policies, chief among them being a government made up of a minority group.

If this be the chief reason for sanctions, then sanctions should be imposed against a majority of the member states of the United Nations and it could be remembered that the present administration in the United States came to power on something less than the will of the majority.

The people of Rhodesia always have been friends of the United States. There is no more dedicated nation on earth in the struggle against the Communist aim of world conquest.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that Rhodesia—our friend—is being penalized, because of the meddling of the U.N. and because we allow that organization to lead us around by the nose.

It should be equally disturbing that senseless sanctions not only are costing the American public in terms of dollars, it also is threatening the very security of the United States itself.

Prior to sanctions, the United States was purchasing chrome ore from Rhodesia at $26 to $32 a ton. In addition to the many domestic uses for chrome, it also is a vital element in the construction of our own military planes, missiles, and nuclear submarines.

Where do we purchase chrome ore now that we have banned the Rhodesian ore?

We purchase more than 50 percent from Russia, and a price of from $65 to $70 a ton. Although it is denied, there are those who have reason to believe much of the chrome ore we purchased from Russia actually was mined in Rhodesia. The Rhodesians themselves have told me that despite marked increases in costs of production in recent years they can sell ore to U.S. firms at $40 per ton f.o.b. or deliver it to U.S. ports at $48 per ton. What a ridiculous situation, Mr. Speaker. We purchase a vital defense commodity from the nation whose aims for world domination pose the greatest threat to peace, when we could get the same ore from a friendly nation at less cost. There is more to the story. The Rhodesians want to purchase heavy equipment, machine tools, and weapons from the United States. Because we will not sell to them, these items are being purchased from France and other nations. Those countries also are signatories to the U.N. Charter, but their governments have the good sense to ignore unrealistic and unworkable provisos. American industries need the business.

It is time this absurdity ended. It is time Congress stepped into the picture. We should support proposals that strategic materials may not be purchased from a Communist nation when trade restrictions prohibit similar purchases from free world nations. We should also take the necessary steps to set aside in toto the sanctions which prevent free trade between our country and Rhodesia.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to deal in a realistic way with the problem of normal relations with Rhodesia. When we do this, free nations will gain in the struggle to keep peace in the world and to hold back the onslaught of communism.

The British are having second thoughts about their relations with Rhodesia. A British negotiating team was in Salisbury recently. The press in both countries have speculated in an optimistic way about a successful outcome. The family of free nations needs Rhodesia and Rhodesia wants to be an active member of the team. Commonsense says existing differences should be resolved without further delay. The United States should exercise the needed leadership to help bring this about.

CUNA CHOOSES NEW MANAGING DIRECTOR

(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, Credit Union National Association—CUNA—the worldwide credit union trade association, has selected Herbert G. Wegner as its new managing director. Mr. Wegner replaces J. Orrin Shipe who resigned August 5 and subsequently has been appointed managing director of the Arizona Credit Union League.

Mr. Wegner honored me with a visit a few days ago and I was extremely impressed with his approach, background and dedication to the cause of credit unions. Although CUNA is headquartered in Madison, Wis., Mr. Wegner indicated to me that the greater part of the workload of that organization would be shifted to its Washington office.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been impressed with the type of people that are associated with credit unions, for they are among the finest people that I have ever known; and let me assure you that Herb Wegner truly fits into the category of my concept of a dedicated credit union official.

I am including in my remarks a story from the September 1971 issue of Key Notes, a publication of the Pennsylvania Credit Union League, which details the background of Mr. Wegner. Since CUNA International appears before many congressional committees, the background story of Mr. Wegner should serve as a preliminary introduction of him to Members of Congress.

CUNA NAMES NEW MANAGING DIRECTOR: HERBERT G. WEGNER PLEDGES FULL SUPPORT FOR LEAGUE PROGRAMS

Herbert G. Wegner has been named managing director of the Credit Union National Association Inc. (CUNA) effective September 6.

Wegner, 41, has been regional director of the Latin American Regional Office (LARO) of the World Council of Credit Unions in Panama City, Panama, since 1964. He was responsible for the direction and supervision of credit union development and technical assistance programs throughout Latin America. LARO's operations cover 17 countries with 3,000 credit unions and 17 national federations.

Before joining LARO, Wegner had served as a special projects officer for the Peace Corps, evaluating overseas programs, recruiting volunteers and developing regional small industry projects in Latin America. Prior to that, he had been an international relations officer for the U.S. Agency for International Development in Ecuador and Washington.

A native of San Francisco, California, Wegner holds a degree in political science and international relations from San Francisco State College. He also studied at the Coro Foundation and the American Institute for Foreign Trade.

He served in the U.S. Navy from 1953 to 1957 as a patrol plane pilot and holds a commercial pilot's license with multi-engine and instrument ratings.

Wegner's wife Sustan and their three children are expected to move to Madison, Wisconsin, in the near future.

In accepting the managing directorship of CUNA, Wegner indicated that he would be at the "beck and call" of all segments of the movement.

NAMES FIRST PRIORITY

"As a matter of first priority," he said, "I want to mobilize all of our efforts to support and cooperate with Leagues to give them and their programs all the assistance they need and deserve in their efforts to serve credit union members."

Wegner assumes the duties carried out by Evert S. Thomas Jr., who had served as acting managing director since J. Orrin Shipe resigned April 5. Thomas continues as director of CUNA's Washington office. Shipe has since been appointed managing director of the Arizona League.

JERRY VOORHIS PROPOSES REFORM OF AMERICAN BANKING SYSTEM

(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, since August 15 business and labor leaders, Members of Congress, and the public have commented on the merits and deficiencies of the President's new economic program. However, the long-run shortcomings in our monetary system have been largely ignored. While I am not discounting the necessity of stimulating the economy quickly through strong fiscal and incomes policies and a monetary policy to reduce interest rates, I am convinced that now is an opportune time to review and correct the basic monetary problems that have plagued our economy in the past.

Mr. Speaker, a trusted friend of mine whose judgment and advice I value highly, Jerry Voorhis, has submitted a statement on this subject to the Joint Economic Committee as part of the committee's review of the new economic program. Mr. Voorhis' statement is particularly useful since he has long been a student of our banking system both during his tenure in the House of Representatives and afterwards.

Mr. Voorhis advocates a reform that would return control of the banking system to the Federal Government, but that at the same time would also help restore a stable price level. He emphasized that—

> Banks should lend existing money. But, as the Constitution clearly requires, the money (or credit) of the nation should never be created by any private agency, but by an agency of the nation itself. It is the duty of Congress to provide for this by a carefully drawn statute.

This could be accomplished, according to Mr. Voorhis, by Government purchase of Federal Reserve Bank stock. The Federal Reserve should then become our national bank of issue. As Mr. Voorhis said—

> It should create Reserve Bank Credit as it does now. But that credit should be *credited* to the U.S. Treasury, not charged against it and the people as debt. As much such new credit should be created each year as is needed to keep our economy running at or near capacity—and no more than that. A stable price level could result.

Mr. Speaker, I include the excellent analysis presented by Mr. Voorhis at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT ON INFLATION AND DEBT-MONEY, PRESENTED TO THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

(By Jerry Voorhis, Former Member of the House of Representatives)

Until this nation's monetary system is radically changed, inflation may well be the price of survival of our economic system.

If that statement is a shocker in these days of wage-price freezes and usurious interest rates—so be it!

In Old Testament times the Hebrews had a law that all debts were cancelled every seven years. They knew that a limitless piling up of unpayable debt could never be endured by any people.

In more modern times two different methods of freeing nations from an insupportable debt burden have been used.

One of these has been runaway inflation such as Germany used after World War I. It wiped out all indebtedness, public and private, and made possible a new start for the German economy. France and other countries have done almost the same thing from time to time.

In the United States the method used in the years before the New Deal was the "panic" marked by waves of bankruptcies, which did away with much of private debt if not that of the government.

One of the decisions of the New Deal period—scarcely recognized at the time—was a decision that the nation should never again go through a period of panic and widespread bankruptcy. Instead the government would go into debt to whatever extent was necessary to obviate the necessity of private bankruptcy.

This was the beginning of deficit financing to revive a sick economy.

We are still at it—only more so.

The Nixon deficit for fiscal year 1971 was about $23 billion. And it may go much higher than in 1972. In fact, Treasury Secretary Connally has estimated the deficit for fiscal year 1972 at $28 billion. The reason why the Nixon Administration plans to incur these deficits is precisely the same reason that prompted the action of the New Deal.

Now there are valid reasons why the Federal Government should incur a deficit in periods of unemployment and shortage of people's buying p wer.

But a serious and increasingly dangerous problem looms ahead because of *the way* in which deficit financing is handled.

For if the actual desirability—even necessity—of a sharp inflation is to be avoided, deficit financing should—and must be accomplished without increasing the public debt.

The Constitution of the United States requires that this be done.

So does every decent moral consideration.

So does the survival of an even partially "free" economic system.

And there is no reason whatsoever why we, the Federal Government of the United States, cannot inject additional buying power into the economy, when needed, without increasing the nation's debt and without the necessity of inflation.

As background let us see what has actually happened since the close of World War II.

In 1946 our national debt stood at $269 billion. Interest rates then were at reasonable levels so the interest bill was $5 billion.

When the Eisenhower Administration came to power in 1952 all the measures which had successfully held average interest rates on government securities—short and long term—at less than 2 percent, even during the war, were abandoned. And interest began to skyrocket. That skyrocketing has not stopped since.

Today, in autumn 1971, our national debt stands at $411 billion, about one and one-half times what it was in 1946. But interest on that debt will probably exceed $25 billion in this fiscal year, five times what it was in 1946! For comparison, that $25 billion is about eight times the amount which the Federal Government provides for education.

In 1968, the last Democratic year, interest on the public debt was $14 billion.

In 1969, the first Nixon year, it went to $16.9 billion. In 1970, it was $19.6 billion. And in fiscal year 1971, the year ending June 30, 1971, it is estimated to have exceeded $21 billion. For 1972, as has been said, it will probably top $25 billion.

That is almost a 50 percent increase in the debt burden in just three years of the Nixon Administration.

The reason, of course, has been the highest level of interest rates since the Civil War. Even short-term, 15-month, U.S. bonds have been carrying an interest rate of more than 6 percent.

Now during the years since World War II, price inflation has been continuous. It is true that during the early years of the 1960's under Kennedy's and part of Johnson's Administration, inflation was nominal—not more than 1.5 percent in any one year. But in 1965 as a result of a 4 to 3 decision of the Federal Reserve Board to boost its rediscount rate by some 12½ percent, interest rates began to climb precipitously. And so did inflation.

As interest rates climbed so did the rate of inflation, even as the false excuse for high interest rates was given that they were "necessary to curb inflation." The cold figures make that excuse ridiculous. The rate of inflation in 1965–66 was 2.4 percent, in 1966–67 it was 3 percent, in 1967–68 it was 3.7 percent, in 1968–69 it was 4.9 percent, and in 1969–70 it was 6.2 percent.

In a way it was almost fortunate for the American people that they had to endure a 5 percent to 6 percent price inflation in 1969 and 1970. They might have suffered an even worse fate.

For let us see what would have happened had there not been inflation in the post-war years.

The dollar has lost more than half of its buying power since 1946. In other words each dollar represents only half as much real wealth as it did 25 years ago, which makes debts somewhat easier to pay.

Had there not been this inflation in the post-war years, the real debt burden today would be double what it is. We would be paying, in terms of real wealth of the people, not $21 billion or $25 billion in interest on the national debt, but $42 billion or $50 billion.

Even the most ardent of debt merchants and debt apologists would be a bit staggered by such a figure. It would be a quarter of our total national tax payments! And be it never forgotten that the larger the debt, public and private, becomes, the more vulnerable our country becomes to any downturn in economic activity. So the government must resort to more and more drastic action to avoid the danger of a cycle of defaults setting in. But the remedy thus far applied has been, and is in the present crisis, to still further increase the mountain of debt!

This is, indeed, a gospel of despair.

Thus it almost seems that some fateful, and perhaps benign, hand has been pushing up our prices so we could live with our soaring debt and meet its exactions with cheaper dollars.

But the grim tragedy of the matter is that neither the inflation nor the staggering burden of debt are at all necessary.

The Constitution of the United States says: "Congress shall have power to coin money and regulate the value thereof."

Congress does no such thing.

Here is the heart of our trouble. Private banks coin our money and regulate its value.

In doing so they take from the government and people of the United States a large chunk of their sovereignty, a large chunk of the taxing power, and the key to a prosperous economy without inflation.

This is no sudden discovery of mine. The most unimpeachable authorities in the land have said the same thing. For example, in testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives, Marriner Eccles, then Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board itself, said this:

"In purchasing offerings of Government bonds, the banking system as a whole creates new money, or bank deposits. When the banks buy a million dollars of Government bonds as they are offered—and you have to consider the banking system as a whole—as a unit—the banks credit the deposit account of the Treasury with a billion dollars. They debit their Government bond account a billion dollars, or they actually create, by a bookkeeping entry, a billion dollars."

Here is how it works:

The private banking system of our country creates our money in the form of demand deposits on the banks' books. The reason it is able to do this is because no bank is required to have in its vaults anything like the amount of money which its depositors think they have in the banks.

Banks are only required by the Federal Reserve System, which the banks are sure they own, to have in their vaults anywhere from $1 to $1.50 for every $10 of demand deposits on their books.

Thus for every $1 or $1.50 which people—or the government—deposit in a bank, the banking system can create out of thin air and by the stroke of a pen some $10 of checkbook money or demand deposits. It can loan all that $10 into circulation at interest just so long as it has the $1 or a little more in reserve to back it up.

This is, of course, the "fractional reserve system" of banking. It is more or less controlled by the Federal Reserve System, whose only stock is held by the private banks of the Federal Reserve System, without a single share of such stock being held by the government or people of the United States, as should be the case.

Now let's see what happens to the Nixon $23 billion deficit for fiscal 1971. This deficit was caused by the economic recession, for the recession meant less earnings for businesses and individuals, hence less taxes collected by the government. So there is need to revive the economy by having the government put into the stream of commerce more money than it takes out. This, as always, is calculated to increase buying power and effective demand, and thus to get some of the 28 percent or idle productive capacity back to work.

It is important to remember that deficit financing is engaged in to bring about greater production, more employment, and more full use of productive capacity when much of it is idle. In other words we use deficit financing because we are confident that it will increase production, hence increase tax revenues, and hence *broaden the base of the nation's credit.*

Now to the extent that government bonds are sold for cash to individuals or to institutional *purchasers other than banks* the government is taking out of circulation approximately as many dollars as it will put back in when it spends the money.

To do any good, deficit financing must result in the creation of *new money*, and the use of it to increase mass buying power. Only if this happens will there be any stimulation of idle plants to go back into production, or more employment.

Under these circumstances what *ought* to happen is that the *credit* of this great nation should be drawn upon directly by the government—not that it should go more deeply into debt.

For the credit of this or any nation is squarely based upon and derived from the production of wealth by the nation as a whole and the power of the government to tax.

By whatever percentage it can be anticipated that production and hence potential tax revenues will increase as a result of deficit spending by that same amount the credit of the nation and its government will be increased. This same percentage of the volume of money previously in circulation should appear on the books of the Treasury as a credit entry to be drawn upon just like tax revenues. To do that would be nothing more than rational and proper bookkeeping. It would also be morally right bookkeeping.

But this is not what happens at all. Instead the sovereign government of the United States goes hat in hand to the private banking system and asks it to create the new money that the economy needs.

But not for nothing! No Sir! Despite the fact that it costs the banks considerably less than nothing to create the money in the form of brand new demand deposits or checkbook money; they are rewarded for such action by the receipt of very substantial interest from the taxpayers' pockets.

The government *gives*—the word is used advisedly—it *gives* to the banking system, including the Federal Reserve banks, government bonds, the debt of all the people. Interest bearing bonds, that is, bonds bearing as high an interest rate under today's regime as the banks decide to demand. Else they won't buy the bonds.

The banks "buy" the bonds with newly created demand deposit entries on their books—nothing more. It is fountain pen money and it is considerably *more* inflationary than would be the same amount of dollar bills created by the government, as will be explained.

Unlike other demand deposits which they create, the banks, by permission of an indefensible act of Congress, need have *no reserves at all* to back the demand deposits they create when the government bonds are given to them.

The deposits the banks create with which to own your debt and mine are backed by nothing *except the bonds themselves!* In other words, they are backed by the credit of the American people.

What the government has "borrowed" from the banks, what the people must for years pay high interest on, is nothing more nor less than the credit of the nation, which obviously the nation possessed in the first place or the bonds would be no good!

At long last, a few years ago the Federal Reserve made tacit acknowledgment of the facts just stated. As a direct result of logical and relentless agitation by members of Congress led by Congressman Patman, as well as by other competent monetary experts, the Federal Reserve began to pay to the U. S. Treasury a considerable part of its earnings from interest on government securities. This was done without public notice and few people, even today, know that it is being done. It was done, quite obviously, as acknowledgment that the Federal Reserve Banks were acting on the one hand as a national bank of issue, creating the nation's money, but on the other hand charging the nation interest on its own credit—which no true national bank of issue could conceivably, or with any show of justice, dare to do.

But this is only part of the story. And the less discouraging part, at that. For where the commercial banks are concerned, there is no such repayment of the people's money.

We said a moment ago that the banks buy the bonds for less than nothing. This is true because the bonds once acquired can be counted as reserves by the banks possessing them. And for every $1 of such bonds which the banks hold they can create roughly another $9 of demand deposits and lend them into circulation at interest.

Good business if you can get it.

Good business if any sovereign nation is foolish enough to give it to you.

When the commercial banks create money, as they do when they acquire government bonds, they levy a tax on every person in the United States. This is so because every new dollar that is created makes every dollar previously in existence worth somewhat less than it was worth before. This is the very heart of inflation.

It is also taxation without representation with a vengeance.

Until this system is changed our debt will continue to skyrocket without limit, and the fixing of debt limits by the Congress will continue to be an exercise in utter futility. And unless there is inflation to reduce the debt burden, it will become insupportable by the economy much sooner than would otherwise be the case.

What ought to be done?

Eventually, no doubt, banks should be required to actually have in their vaults a real dollar for every dollar their depositors think they have in the bank. This is called 100 percent reserves. But such a reform could not and should not be accomplished quickly. It could and should be realized by a gradual increase in reserve requirements for *demand* deposits (but not for savings deposits) over a period of years. Such increases in reserve requirements should be geared to the flow of money in the economy, as brought about by the creation of credits on the nation's books through a true national bank of issue.

Once this reform were instituted we, the people, would have to—and should—pay our banks honestly and fully for the very real service they render in servicing our accounts. But that would be a cheap price to pay for the establishment of a livable monetary system, in which the nation's supply of money would no longer be dependent upon ever-increasing debt.

Banks should lend existing money. But, as the Constitution clearly requires, the money (or credit) of the nation should never be created by any private agency, but by an agency of the nation itself. It is the duty of Congress to provide for this by a carefully drawn statute.

The stock in Federal Reserve Banks should be purchased by the government from their present private bank owners. The Federal Reserve should then become our national bank of issue. It should create Reserve Bank Credit as it does now. But that credit should be *credited* to the United States Treasury, not charged against it and the people as debt. As much such new credit *should* be created each year as is needed to keep our economy running at or near capacity—and no more than that. A stable price level could result.

Then and only then can we expect to overcome recessions, to put our people to work, and to do this without the danger of—indeed necessity for—the inflation, or the ever-increasing debt which are inescapable under the present monetary system.

ECONOMICS PROFESSOR CRITICIZES FEDERAL RESERVE FOR LACK OF SOCIAL RESPONSIVENESS

(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, I have recently received a copy of an address on the Federal Reserve System delivered by Prof. William L. Casey, Jr., at Babson College, Babson Park, Mass. Professor Casey argues that the effect of Federal Reserve independence has been to make the System unresponsive to newly emerging social and economic needs. The impact of monetary policy on the economy is such that the System's insistence on the status quo has in many cases hampered the efforts of other Government agencies to meet these needs. As Professor Casey demonstrates, some of our economic and social problems are caused by the Federal Reserve itself as it pursues policies which represent the conventional monetary wisdom but which play havoc with areas of the economy such as housing and small business.

Mr. Speaker, Professor Casey's address is as follows:

THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM: A CASE STUDY IN INSTITUTIONAL UNRESPONSIVENESS

(By William L. Casey, Jr.)

In a 1964 publication Dr. Eric Berne amused the American reading public with a penetrating description of those "games people play." If a second edition is ever forthcoming, it will inevitably include the psychological and sociological parlor games played by those who relish the opportunity to interpret the motives and meaning of youthful discontent and disillusionment. Unfortunately, it has become more fashionable to critique the revolutionary outcries of the young than to look beneath the rhetoric for the underlying causes of alienation.

Certainly, our youth are problem-oriented; they are often criticized for focusing too much on problems and too little on solutions. To make such a criticism, however, is to miss the point completely. Despite the apparent arrogance of youth, one central fact of life is acknowledged by all; significant social change must be sponsored by those in power or by those with power. To expect the young to contribute in the rendering of solutions is to ignore the very essence of power. It is not the existence of problems that disturbs the young; rather it is the indifference and the insensitivity of those with the experience and the power to act. The rebellion is directed at institutional inertia and inaction at a time when social change is urgently called for.

Recognition of the potentiality of American society and concern for the value of human life have led a growing number of young to severely criticize contemporary institutions and institutional arrangements.

Of course, American social and economic institutions have always been subjected to criticism. After all, this form of criticism is one function of scholarship and the American experience has in no way been devoid of social commentary. However, institutions have too often been evaluated by their efficacy in achieving internally-determined goals. What is being questioned today is not the degree of success in achieving traditional goals but rather the validity of those goals *per se*.

Socioeconomic imbalance and inequity within our society are subjects of growing concern. Attention is being directed to the ways in which economic insitutions—including public insitutions—create and distribute income, wealth and power. The goals of these institutions are being scrutinized in light of social problems and social needs. However, few of today's social critics are so naive as to expect sudden drastic changes in institutional goals. A second fact of life is recognized in this regard; namely, that institutional arrangements inevitably breed inertia and that instiutional changes are painfully slow in evolving. Condemnations are reserved for those that are completely unresponsive to newly emerging social needs and conditions, as evidenced by the unwillingness to engage in self-examination.

The responsibility of periodic self-examination is clearly most appropriate in the case of the *public* institution since (1) it is commissioned to serve society and since (2) the needs of society change. Such an institution is the Federal Reserve System. At a time when a multitude of economic ills have beset the American economy, many of which are monetary in nature, it is appropriate to cast a critical eye on that institution that has assumed the responsibility of monetary control and regulation.

Of course, the Federal Reserve System has not been without critics. Throughout the history of the "System" economic journals have been filled with scholarly critiques of Federal Reserve policy. For the most part, unfortunately, scholars have accepted without question the validity of Federal Reserve goals and have focused their attention on the efficacy of policy measures designed to achieve them.

It might be argued, of course, that Federal Reserve goals are not internally established since the central bank is but an arm of Congress. Some claim that the Fed was given the responsibility of domestic monetary management by Congress and was commissioned to employ tools of monetary control for the purpose of minimizing economic instability and maximizing employment and economic growth. However, neither the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 nor the subsequent Act of 1935 explicitly contain such a commission. Explicit reference to the Federal Reserve responsibility for national monetary management was first made by the Governors themselves in the annual report that followed the 1935 enactment. The point is that Congress has never established a clearly-defined course or set of goals for the Fed to follow. Rather, Federal Reserve responsibilities today are the products of internal interpretations of Congressional enactments that left ample room for liberal interpretation.

This is not to say that central bank monetary management *per se* is unnecessary or undesirable, nor should the implication be made that the aforementioned goals, adopted by the Federal Reserve, are in any way inappropriate. But are these goals all-embracing? In an age of rapid social change new social and economic goals naturally emerge—goals that are achievable only if funds are available and are properly channeled into problem areas. The fact remains that the Federal Reserve controls and regulates the money supply and the availability of credit. It is undeniably true that the nature and direction of monetary policy significantly determine the channeling of funds throughout the economy. Of course, many other Federal agencies and institutions channel funds into the private sector of the economy, but, unlike the Federal Reserve, they cannot create money and they do not enjoy the same autonomy with respect to policy formulation and spending decision-making; their dependency on Congressional appropriations guarantees some degree of responsiveness to social wants and desires. The Congressional power over the purse, which the Federal Reserve escapes, establishes a chain of communication between the Federal agency created to serve society and the voting members of society who determine the composition of Congress.

The question of Federal Reserve autonomy has been argued *ad nauseam* but one fact is irrefutable; our central banking system is uniquely insulated from executive and Congressional pressures, which is to *say*, the normal chain of communication between those who serve and those who are served is simply non-existent. Federal Reserve independence

per se does not create unresponsiveness or irresponsibilty; rather it is a condition that creates the potential danger. Unfortunately, there is growing evidence that this potential is being actualized.

Value judgments have been made and are being made by Federal Reserve officials on matters ranging from the mortgage market crisis of recent memory to the problem of structural unemployment. Unfortunately, the public is not given the opportunity to weigh the merits of Federal Reserve decisions and to translate words into actions through the power of elected Congressmen. Obviously, the Fed should have the right to disagree with specific Congressional recommendations; this is not the point. In reacting to Congressional appeals for change, however, they do have the obligation to argue their case openly, frankly and fully without retreating within the sanctuary of Federal Reserve autonomy.

The disturbing effect of monetary contraction during the late 1960's on the housing market is now a fact of history. It is also a fact that Federal Reserve officials vociferously opposed a wide range of Congressional proposals which were aimed at the heart of the problem. These included proposed Federal Reserve purchases of the obligations of the Federal Home Loan Banks, the Farmers Home Administration and the FNMA, proposed Federal Reserve loans to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and a proposal to allow member banks to count investments in the securities of Federal housing agencies as part of their required reserves.

In arguing their case, Federal Reserve officials retreated quickly within the sanctuary of the "conventional monetary wisdom." Rather than carefully weighing the merits and weaknesses of such proposals, they chose merely to cite their real or imagined costs; i.e., that these programs would be discriminatory, would interfere with traditional monetary arrangements and would be costly in terms of the achievement of traditional monetary objectives.

In refusing to channel funds into specific sectors of the economy, the assertion that special policies of this type would interfere with general monetary management is not sufficient justification nor is it responsible. The fact that two policy goals may conflict does not justify the refusal to consider *even* the relevance of one or the other. The granting of special credits in support of the mortgage market may indeed interfere to some extent with general monetary policy but policy trade-offs are a fact of political life. The U.S. Government through A.I.D. grants soft loans to developing countries despite the adverse effect that this can have on our balance of payments.

Public welfare cannot be maximized unless all policy possibilities and implications are carefully considered and weighed. In refusing to seriously consider special purpose loans, the Federal Reserve has failed to defend its position. In refusing to reassess the validity of its policy goals in the light of newly emerging social and economic needs, the Fed has rendered a disservice to the public it serves.

Clearly, any Federal Reserve program designed to alleviate a special problem will be discriminatory in the sense that a resource reallocation effect will necessarily be produced if the program succeeds. This would hardly be a dramatic departure from traditional Federal Reserve practice since general monetary policy is by nature discriminatory. The tight money period of the late 1960's demonstrated this quite clearly. One example among many was the discriminatory effect on the small business sector. Since large corporations have built-in immunities against the ravishes of high and rising interest, they did not share equally in the cost of the Federal Reserve's campaign against inflation. Such inequity is built into the system. During periods of tight money large corporations are in a much better position to generate their own investible funds internally, whereas small businesses remain highly dependent on the availability of external funding, e.g., bank credit. Furthermore, since expected investment returns of large corporations are typically much higher than those of small businesses, high interest rates are clearly more damaging to the profit expectations of the latter than to those of the former.

It is illogical for the Federal Reserve to argue against the discriminatory effects of special loan programs while at the same time defending its general traditional policies which have proven to be equally discriminatory. It is difficult to imagine how Federal Reserve involvement with the housing market or with any other sector of the economy could be more discriminatory than the by-products of its *special* relationship with the commercial banking community or of its *special* responsibilities to the Treasury.

The time has arrived for policy reassessment and the Fed must take the initiative in this regard. It is a mistake to assume that the initiative rests with Congress. Certainly, new policy goals and approaches could be written into law in the form of revisions to the Federal Reserve Act but, realistically, what is the probability of political success in the face of Federal Reserve opposition. In the arena of public debate, reform-minded Congressmen are no match for the army of Federal Reserve economists who are well equipped to defend the *status quo*. The perpetuation of Federal Reserve autonomy and a continued adherence to the conventional monetary wisdom are possible only because of the built-in technical and professional expertise within the system.

No one would argue that the Fed should not employ professionally trained experts. The argument is with the ways in which these skills are utilized. Considering the inefficacy of recent monetary policies, considering the discriminatory effects of recent policy on certain sectors of the economy, and considering our newly emerging social and economic needs, the time has come for a complete internal assessment of policy tools, policy approaches and policy goals.

A comprehensive, objective self-evaluation by the Federal Reserve may indeed justify continued adherence to the "conventional wisdom." New empirical evidence may indeed demonstrate that the adoption of new approaches or new goals would prove to be too costly in terms of the overall welfare of the American economy. Before such comprehensive self-studies are undertaken, however, *a priori* conclusion relating to the "undesirability" of fresh approaches must be rejected.

It is time for this servant of the people to account for its stewardship and to seek new ways to serve us better.

WOMEN UNITED FOR THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT WITHOUT WIGGINS' AMENDMENT

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, since the House will soon be debating the equal rights amendment, House Joint Resolution 208 by Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS, I would like to call to the attention of all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle a communication which has been sent to the Members of the 92d Congress by "Women United."

When the subcommittee of which I am chairman held the initial hearings on this proposal, representatives of this fine organization provided us with excellent insights into both the social and legal ramifications of a constitutional amednment to provide for equal rights for men and women.

Since I believe that the Members will find the following communication from "Women United" to be of considerable interest, I would like to insert it in the RECORD today.

WOMEN UNITED,
Washington, D.C., September 14, 1971.

Re Equal Rights Amendment expected to come up for action in early September.

To All Members of the 92nd Congress:

We seek your support of the Equal Rights Amendment without the crippling Wiggins amendment. The Wiggins Amendment is unacceptable to the women's groups including, among others, those listed on the attached sheet (Exh. A).

THE AMENDMENT AS APPROVED BY SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4

Sub-committee No. 4, chaired by Congressman Don Edwards and comprised entirely of lawyers, had two versions of an Equal Rights Amendment before it when it heard over 800 pages of testimony (March–April, 1971). This Subcommittee reported out H.J. Res. 208 as introduced by Congresswoman Griffiths without change, viz.

"Section 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

On June 22 the full Judiciary Committee voted 19 to 16 to cripple the Equal Rights Amendment (as has been done in every Congress except the 91st). The crippling Wiggins Amendment reads:

"Section 2. This Article shall not impair the validity of any law of the United States which exempts a person from compulsory military service or any other law of the United States or of any State which reasonably promotes the health and safety of the people."

WHY THE AMENDMENT IS UNACCEPTABLE

The amendment is totally unacceptable because:

(1) It would freeze into the Constitution the hundreds of discriminatory labor standard laws the elimination of which is the very purpose of the Equal Rights Amendment, and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

LABOR LAWS

(2) It would retain and reinstate labor standard laws which have already been declared invalid under Title VII by several Federal Courts, causing endless litigations in our now already cluttered courts; and

(3) The word "reasonably" invites endless litigation as every lawyer will recognize.

THE DRAFT

(4) A Constitutional exemption of women from the draft could be a national disaster in time of atomic attack.

Some Congressmen in all sincerity seem to fear military life will be detrimental to womn. We would like to point out that the one President who recommended the enactment of the Equal Rights Amendment in his message to Congress January 16, 1957, was Dwight D. Eisenhower. That same President, who as General, had had first hand information on the place of women in the military service, stated:

"The platforms of both major parties have advocated an amendment of the Constitution to ensure equal rights for women. I believe that the Congress should make certain that women are not denied equal rights with men."

The advocates of the Equal Rights Amendment do not question that it would make

women subject to the draft. At the same time they point out that women would be subject to the same deferments and exclusions as men, i.e. mothers, just as fathers; female students just as male students; ministers and other occupations; and 4F—women physically or mentally not capable for military service—would not be drafted. Combat duty would continue to be assigned by the Generals on the basis of physical capability and training. Military deferment should remain a flexible legislative right, not a Constitutional straitjacket which would result from the Wiggins Amendment.

DISCRIMINATORY INTERPRETATION OF 14TH AMENDMENT

While the Negro obtained his right to vote by the 15th Amendment in 1870, women did not obtain that right until 1920 by the 19th Amendment. Negroes (but not women) have achieved full Constitutional recognition under the 14th Amendment which reads in part:

"Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States . . ."

In this section the word "persons" has been interpreted by the Supreme Court to include Negroes but not women! Hence women are neither citizens nor persons. Yet Section 2 reads:

"Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State . . ."

IS A WOMAN A PERSON?

Here, women were considered part of the "whole number of persons" and were thus citizens of the U.S. when it came to apportionment of representatives.

It is ridiculous that women are excluded or included at the whim of interpretation by the Courts. Moreover, the legality of the election of pre-1920 representatives was open to challenge along with the legislation they enacted, since the women whose numbers were recognized in the state's population were not permitted to vote as citizens of that state.

The right of all qualified citizens (persons) to participate fully in the power process is fundamental to any democratic society. The only right granted women under the Constitution is the right to vote. Women, in urging their cause, could well quote from the Declaration of Independence:

"In every stage of these oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury."

Women are uniting in a consciousness of their responsibility to participate in the decision making and ruling of their country. Don't force women to unite against men; let us unite together, men and women, to work for our common goal—the health and welfare of our country and its people.

Let this truly be a Government of the people, by the people and for the people.

MARGARET LAURENCE,
Chairman.
MARGUERITE RAWALT,
Vice-Chairman and Counsel.

EXHIBIT A

The Equal Rights Amendment is supported by:

General Federation of Women's Clubs.
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.
National Woman's Party.
National Association of Women Lawyers.
National Education Association.
United Automobile Workers.
American Medical Women's Association.
American Society of Woman Accountants.
American Women in Radio and Television.
National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs.
Wisconsin Women's Conference AFL-CIO.
Women's Christian Temperance Union.
Professional Women's Conference.
D.C. Commission on Status of Women.
Association of American Women Dentists.
Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon (as a candidate).
12 State Legislatures (N.Y., N.D., Minn., Md., Conn., Pa., Del., Mass., La., Calif., Fla., Neb.).
Council for Women's Rights.
League of American Working Women.
Citizens Advisory Council on Status of Women.
Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities (President Nixon).
National Federation of Republican Women's Clubs.
American Association of College Deans.
National Organization for Women.
Women's Equity Action League.
Federally Employed Women.
Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation.
St. Joan's Alliance of Catholic Women.
Soroptimist Federation of the Americas.
American Society of Women Certified Public Accountants.
Women's Liberation Movement, New York, and District of Columbia.
Women's Bar Association of the District of Columbia.
Washington Forum.
Women's Bureau Conference—50th Anniversary.
Zonta—Cape Kennedy, Washington and other clubs.
American Association of Women Ministers.
National Democratic Committee.
Quota International.
American Society of Microbiology.
United Methodist Church—Women's Division.
American Nurse's Association.
American Home Economics Association.
American Association of University Women.

MANDATORY DRUG TREATMENT

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, I introduced H.R. 8216, the Armed Forces Drug Abuse Control Act in which I have been joined by over 50 cosponsors from both parties. The bill would establish a drug abuse control corps within each branch of the service, and would create a uniform amnesty program. The key feature of this legislation would require that no addicted serviceman be discharged until judged free of habitual dependence.

The thrust behind this latter section is that drug rehabilitation programs must be mandatory in order to be effective. The military recently discovered this when it decided to make help available to GI drug users on a voluntary basis. Between July 1 and September 10, 86,082 servicemen took urine tests and 4,440 or 5.15 percent showed positive reactions. During the same period, however, only 23 GI's volutarily agreed to treatment.

Fortunately, the Army reversed its policy following this trial period, and is now requiring mandatory treatment, as I have long advocated. Detected GI addicts must now receive rehabilitation treatment up until discharge.

However, my legislation would take this new directive one step further by requiring that addicts receive mandatory treatment beyond the time of their discharge. Drug dependent soldiers would not be released from the service until found free of dependence by medical authorities. The advantages of this are obvious. GI addicts can be more easily identified in the service, and then treated and cured before being returned to civilian life.

The President has asked for authority to extend for 30 days the tour of duty of any serviceman who is found to be a drug addict. I am pleased that the administration has accepted my basic position of treating GI's while still in the service. However, I am sure that most would agree with me that a 30-day period is completely inadequate to achieve effective rehabilitation. The addict would abstain during his 30-day mandatory treatment, knowing he would be discharged after a month. He could then return to a habit which he was never forced to quit.

I would like to include at the close of my remarks what I believe to be one of the finest editorials I have seen on this subject from the September 16 edition of the Bridgeport Post. The Post also believes that mandatory treatment is necessary, and that GI addicts must be treated before receiving their discharge. I urge my colleagues to give this editorial their thoughtful consideration, and then join me in working for passage of H.R. 8216.

The editorial follows:

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, Sept. 16, 1971]

MANDATORY TREATMENT

A few months ago when the drug plague among soldiers in Vietnam was brought to public attention, a debate ensued about how to treat the narcotics users. Representative John S. Monagan of Waterbury held strongly to the opinion that any rehabilitation program would have to be mandatory to be effective. He subsequently introduced legislation to retain and treat addicts in the service until they are cured.

The military took a different approach. It decided to make help available to drug users on a voluntary basis. The intentions were good but the results were not. Of the 4,440 soldiers found using hard drugs between July 1 and September 10, only 23 volunteered for treatment. A few days ago the Army admitted its failure and switched tactics.

Now it requires drug-addicted personnel to receive treatment prior to discharge. The Pentagon is also seeking legislation to authorize the military to extend by 30 days the tour of duty of patients who have not been cured.

This is progress in the right direction, but Mr. Monagan's plan makes even more sense. His bill, which is cosponsored by 54 lawmakers, would keep drug users in the service and in treatment centers until they are free of habitual dependence.

Mr. Monagan argues correctly that in many cases effective rehabilitation can take much longer than one month. A 30-day time limit would be an unfortunate mistake.

Hearings of the measures began today and will continue this month in a House Armed Services Subcommittee.

The facts have already borne out Mr. Monagan's contention that treatment must be mandatory. The next step is to make cer-

tain those who have fallen victim to narcotics while serving in the armed forces are given every chance—more than 30 days if need be—to resume normal lives.

INVOCATION BY DR. RICHARD C. HERTZ ON OCCASION OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S VISIT TO DETROIT

(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, on Thursday, September 23, the President of the United States, the Honorable Richard Nixon, visited Detroit, Mich., and participated in a historic dinner of the Economic Club of that city. The President answered questions from a distinguished panel of local citizens for almost an hour with the program broadcast live on national radio networks and Detroit area television.

It was an outstanding program and Michigan was highly honored to have the President visit our State on this occasion.

The invocation, given by Dr. Richard C. Hertz, senior rabbi, Temple Beth El, Detroit, Mich., was superb in content and beautifully given. Because it appropriately set the stage for the President's participation, I am privileged to include the text as a part of my remarks.

INVOCATION BY DR. RICHARD C. HERTZ

Almighty God and Father of us all, Thou who guidest the destinies of men and nations under Thy supreme moral law; humbly we invoke Thy Divine blessing upon him who honors us with his presence, the President of the United States.

Enlighten with Thy wisdom and sustain with Thy courage him whom the people have set in authority. Guide him and guard him, we pray Thee, with wisdom and understanding, that he may lead the people of this nation and the peoples of the earth toward peace with justice. Implant the spirit of wisdom in his heart and in the hearts of all his counsellors and advisors, that they may uphold the peace of the realm, advance the welfare of the nation, and deal justly with all its citizens. Grant him strong health and spiritual strength that he may bring our nation closer to its historic dream of equality and brotherhood for all our citizens. Bless him with the satisfactions of acomplishment in the cause of world peace, so that the family of nations may find his leadership inspired by Thy Divine will, to "help perfect the world under Thy Divine sovereignty."

As a troubled nation awaits his message, we pray that we who gather here may find our minds enlightened and our spirits uplifted by the measure of him in whose hands rests the awesome power to alter the quality of life. We ask Thy blessing, too, upon all those associated with our nation's welfare and with the guardianship of our rights and liberties. May the message go forth from these walls which will reassure every man everywhere that he may ever continue "to sit under his vine and under his figtree with none to make them afraid." Amen.

INTRODUCTION OF FOREIGN TRADE AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 1972

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the United States needs new and realistic solutions for the problems of today's rapidly changing world economy. Headlines in the newspapers show that all nations of the world are worried by recent changes. Realism demands that America try to answer questions Americans have a right to ask: What is the impact on jobs? What is the effect on the American standard of living? What kinds of jobs will my children have if America's productive base is continually lost? How can America remain a first-rate industrial power?

The Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972, which I am introducing today, provides new methods for helping this country to solve today's problems and answer today's questions. The rapid changes of the past 10 years, the international bankers' meeting this week, the newspaper stories of joblessness and trade losses—all these events of the recent past—show that such a set of new tools, a package of proposals, needs public attention.

The fact of needed answers is clear: America's trade position has been declining. Every section of this country has unemployment. Jobs are needed, but jobs are not there for millions of Americans. Production is needed, but production is down to less than three-fourths of its potential. The dollar will not buy as much as it did. High unemployment and rising prices are daily experiences in the United States.

While America faces these problems, other industrial countries are still doing well, with full employment, high production and a rising standard of living.

No simple answers will be enough. Complicated changes have been taking place: American jobs are being exported, as huge amounts of money are shipped abroad to build plants to make goods for sale in the United States. American jobs are being lost, also, because that foreign production often takes the place of possible U.S. exports. Products as varied as airplane parts and shoes, clothing and automobiles—all kinds of jobs are at stake.

A new kind of business has developed in the world, the multinational corporation, which can produce an auto engine in Germany, a transmission in England, a radio in Taiwan, assemble the parts in Canada and sell the final car in the United States.

A single firm now has a shoe plant in Spain, a retail store in another country, a paint factory in a third, and so on. What used to be called a "runaway shop" in New England, has changed in form and name and country. Spread throughout the world, the new business giants are called "conglomerates," or "multinational firms." The nations of the world have different laws from the United States, and different customs, and different ways of life. The old-fashioned runaway shop has become a global runaway, but the U.S. law is not designed to meet this new development.

This new development affects America in a manner different from the old "runaway shop."

Each country of the world makes its own tax and trade laws. The other countries can and do encourage U.S. firms to move into them. The old runaway shop was an occurrence within the United States, where Congress could set the tax and labor standards, and other legislation.

And something else is new: The kinds of industry that leave the United States are both the old and new—the textile industry and the electronics industry, the aircraft industry and the shoe industry. The speed and size of the change is a 20th century problem, affecting workers in every part of the United States.

As American taxpayers help industry develop new scientific wonders, the new technology is exported, along with jobs, to other parts of the world. U.S. consumers are paying American prices for American brand name products, often made by the cheapest labor in the world.

The new law tries to add jobs, increase manufacturing and preserve technology in a great many ways, because there are so many different kinds of changes occurring at the same time. It is not a perfect solution. It will need changes as it goes through the Congress, because new problems will raise new questions. But it begins to set up ways to meet the restrictive trade practices of other countries while assuring the maintenance of our own economy and our own standard of living.

The bill would substitute modern trade regulations for the old-fashioned Government practices that were designed for another period of American history. The bill recognizes that other countries are now strong and that the United States law needs to be firm and clear. The bill recognizes that airplanes can now transport parts of factories from one country to another, so that trade alone is not the issue. The bill tries to make sure that there is a combination of ways to solve complex problems. This is neither a free trade nor a protectionist bill. The bill recognizes that a world with computers and global banks and multinational firms needs new legislation designed to give Americans who live in our cities and towns across the Nation realistic solutions to their problems.

With all of these changes, the bill sets up the following new methods of handling change:

First, the tax laws of the United States which actually encourage businessmen to go abroad are amended to remove that encouragement. Some of these advantages were put into law when Americans were isolationists and did not want to trade. Now most of America's big companies, and many small ones, have plants or offices in other countries. The encouragement is no longer needed. Some of these tax provisions were put into the law before the new multinational firms started spanning the world in the mid-1960's. They need to be changed.

These changes can help stop the export of American jobs, of American technology, and of American capital. They can help establish fair choice for a U.S. business which wants to make goods in the United States by removing the advantages for producing abroad.

Second, the investment practices of U.S. firms abroad will no longer be allowed to funnel billions of dollars abroad

to substitute for U.S. production without anyone keeping an eye on the purposes of the effects. The other countries of the world make many demands on American investors and make many provisions to regulate how American capital behaves in any country. This bill would prevent the operations of America's business ventures outside the United States from being a secret to the American Government and the public.

Third, the U.S. taxpayer and jobholder and businessman will be protected against the loss of America's production from the subsidized, unregulated export of technology. The bill does not stop technology flows. All countries of the world are closer together and technology will flow. But there will be a responsibility of the U.S. Government and U.S. business to make sure that the U.S. inventive genius and the U.S. mastery of know-how is not sent out to the world willy nilly, while the U.S. taxpayer and jobholder—whether he is a scientist or a production worker—foots the bill. The bill provides for supervision and regulation so that this Government will not be a "helpless giant" while other governments tell our companies what to do. This Government will no longer sit by and watch a company's desire for profits abroad weaken America's production and tax base at home.

Fourth, the present patchwork of legalistic, bureaucratic trade restrictions and regulations will be replaced by a modern regulatory mechanism to supervise trade into and out of the United States. This regulatory mechanism is based on the idea that this Nation should be able to make all kinds of products within its vast borders, just as other nations assure their citizens of all kinds of production. A new way of halting the export of jobs while assuring that the tide of imports will be stemmed has been designed and is in the bill. There is no precedent for this mechanism, but it is built on the past practices with an eye toward the future. The objective is to assure a fully employed, productive, U.S. economy for a nation with such resources in manpower and machinery.

The new mechanism will take effective shape only if the purpose is understood. The concept is that U.S. production and the nature of this economy has been eroded in recent years. This erosion must cease. The United States needs to employ skilled and unskilled workers—for a nation of over 200 million citizens—and to produce all kinds of products for the mass market that is here. That market will not be closed to the rest of the world. The idea of an impregnable wall is as outmoded as the idea of free trade. Other nations will have access to this market, but our Nation will not be required to lay waste its industrial base.

Unlike the frustrating past, when businessmen and labor groups vainly tried to get attention for their problems, while the Nation ignored the need for coordination of its trade practices, the new law will set up a brand new Trade and Investment Commission, with new responsibilities and new authority. It is not designed to merely reconstitute the Tariff Commission, which has ignored so many interests of all Americans for so long. It is designed to replace the hodgepodge bureaucracy which now makes sure that nothing is done in trade problems until it is too late, or, as far as American workers are concerned, that nothing is done in their interest. Labor will be represented on this Commission.

The new agency will represent American industry, labor, and the public. The three-man Commission will establish quotas on imports based on their relation to U.S. production in the years 1965–69. Its task is to make sure that U.S. production and jobs will be maintained, developed and expanded in a modern economy. The new agency will be given power to establish enough flexibility so that U.S. production and markets will not be disrupted nor jobs lost through technicalities and rigidities that now pervade the bureaucracy. That power is not unlimited or hidden from the public, because the law requires the Commission to make its activities known and to report on its decisions.

The new Foreign Trade and Investment Commission is designed to help keep trade moving without setting up a wall of tariffs that punishes or deceives the American consumer.

The new agency will be geared to remain current with the latest developments in trade and foreign production throughout the world as it affects the U.S. needs and situations within its borders. The United States will then be able to see to it that it enjoys all kinds of industry and the jobs that go with them within its vast borders.

Nor will the quota-setting authority in the statute result in the erection of an insuperable trade wall against foreign goods. Sometimes I get the impression the free trade lobby is describing the Great Wall of China when they talk about the effects of quota legislation, so carried away do they get. The program I am recommending today avoids this extreme. A cursory reading of the bill would indicate the number of exemptions contained therein which taken as a whole go a considerable distance to avoiding the disruptive impact predicted for a quota system by its opponents. In short, both quota authority and the specific exemptions have been designed in this legislation for the purpose of maintaining and restoring this economy, not to punish others. For the fact of life is that without a strong, well-balanced American economy, there can be no strong, well-balanced world economy.

To borrow a phrase we have all heard so often lately, this is an idea whose time has come. The events of the past months have proved beyond any doubt that the existing International Trade order is falling apart at the seams. It is creaking along, gasping for breath. It has proved its inability to respond to fundamental crises and seemingly permanent shifts in the balance of trade. The existing international agreements upon close examination can only be found wanting and lacking in flexibility. The letter of these agreements is defeating the spirit of the agreements, I am more and more convinced each day.

The whole point behind Bretton Woods was to usher in a new era of international cooperation and prosperity. The United States at the time possessed most of the chips and could afford to be generous and indeed entered into agreements which put it at a distinct disadvantage to other potential trading partners. Events since Bretton Woods have proved the wisdom of the arrangements entered into then, beyond anyone's wildest hope. The balance in favor of the United States has shifted dramatically to the point where today we can see the United States is at a distinct disadvantage, vis-a-vis, the other newly industrialized, highly competitive, nations of the world. It is now time to reexamine these institutions, these policies, in light of this dramatic shift of economic advantage. In short, the arrangements of the immediate postwar era have outlived their usefulness and there is need for a new order.

But even under existing, and I say outmoded, arrangements every signatory was assured that its domestic prosperity would not be held hostage to International Monetary Agreements; that every nation had the right to respond to internal domestic economic crises by resorting to emergency devices, vis-a-vis, other nations. In other words, Bretton Woods did not deny the most fundamental and inalienable right of all nations—self-defense. Recently the United States has given the impression of an economic giant with both hands tied behind its back and the impression has been created that it had surrendered its right to protect the economic conditions and wellbeing of its own citizens when it signed on the dotted line at Bretton Woods. I am convinced that our citizens have been forced to pay too high a price to enable our political leaders to continue to pay lipservice to pure free trade theory, while every other industrial nation in the world, at one time or another, has found it perfectly in order to suspend and change its international commitments in the name of domestic health and order. This is the background against which this legislation should be viewed by our friends abroad—not as an avoidance of international responsibilities and commitments, but as an adaptation within the framework of international cooperation to the changed facts of life.

No President of the United States ever signed an agreement to stand by and lose America's productive power. No amount of legalistic jargon will make that interpretation plausible. Both the agreement to establish the International Monetary Fund and the Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, GATT, entered into in the 1940's were signed in good faith in the United States. Both of these agreements have provisions that allow a nation, and that includes the United States, that has problems at home related to trade and investment, to protect these interests.

I am convinced that the time is right for the filing of this legislation. The papers yesterday reported yet another trade deficit for the United States—the fifth month in a row that this has occurred. At no other period in American history has this occurred. While I hesitate to bandy about a word such as "crisis," it is time we stopped being com-

placent and recognized the present situation for what it is. As I have predicted all along, once our dollar started fluctuating up and down in a manner which threatened the foreign holdings of American businessmen, bankers, businessmen, and Government experts are now meeting late into the night to try to come up with a solution. Prediction never has the force of fact, so I am not surprised that nothing has been done until now. But now there is hardly an American who is not aware that we are living in troubled times, from an economic viewpoint. Now all my constituents—all your constituents—know of these troubles firsthand. Millions of Americans are out of work. Hundreds of American communities from Maine to Florida, from New York to California, from Georgia to Washington, are economic disaster areas. My own State of Massachusetts has an unemployment rate higher than the national average. It is not just the old industries that are in trouble from cheap foreign competition. The new industries—what people thought was the hope of the future—are in trouble. Joining the shoe and textile workers in my State who have been pleading their case to no avail all these many years, are the electronics workers.

While no one listened in the past, now every town father is aware that the health of a local community depends upon full employment in order to keep open schools and enjoy the protection of police and fire departments. As the tax revenue has fallen off, everyone is learning that unemployment costs more than just unemployment compensation. This legislation is not creating the crisis or starting a trade war, but rather addressing itself to something that already exists. If something is not done and done soon, the crises or trade war predicted by opponents of quota legislation will be a lot worse.

Now, no one suggests that all of America's problems are caused by international trade and investment. But these are key elements to the health and well-being of any nation. This new legislation recognizes the reality of 1971: International trade and investment policies of this Nation do, in fact, affect the people of the United States in every city, every town, and every farm. This is not surprising in a world which has drawn closer. The policies and practices of our trading partners have a direct effect on production and jobs in this country. This effect has become more obvious and more pronounced than when our existing laws and legislation in this field were drafted.

The new Trade and Investment Act of 1972 is designed to modernize existing legislation. It closes the tax giveaway loopholes which have crept into law and contributed to our problems. I am not talking about a few unscrupulous individuals who have got rich quick because of these loopholes. What I am concerned about is the resulting outflow of billions of dollars, which in turn, have come to haunt us in the form of cheap foreign competition and loss of jobs for American citizens.

This legislation ends the period of unsupervised export of American capital and technology, which has helped produce a crisis for the United States and other countries. It sets up a sensible way of regulating trade so goods can be available to U.S. buyers without destroying their jobs and their buying power. It sets up an agency to be responsible to the Congress and the public so that trade and investment becomes publicly accountable and open to detailed examination and publicity. It directs the Government to make sure that information is collected on wages, employment, profits and sales abroad, as well as home. It gives the consumer, ultimately the one whose job is at stake, the right to know what he is buying and where it is made.

The Trade and Investment Act of 1972 calls for responsibility. It seeks to assure a healthy economy with jobs for all of its citizens. Those who want to rebuild the cities, those who want to improve their quality of life should join with those who are facing the prospect of losing jobs and the fact of job losses. Other nations have been able to keep track of their trade flows, their production, and their employment. Other nations have been able to modernize their government structures to serve their expanding public needs. It is time for the Nation with the great educational and productive genius to put its brains to work to make sure that this kind of legislation can be enacted.

IMPACT OF FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS ON SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, as part of a series of hearings on the impact of Federal installations on small business, the Small Business Subcommittee on Small Towns and Urban Areas conducted a hearing recently on the effect on local small business of the Defense Department's plans to build and operate motels.

At field hearings held in Denver earlier this summer, the subcommittee heard numerous complaints from small businessmen that the Defense Department's construction of additional motel-like units on military bases constituted unfair competition and threatened to force some of them out of business.

In typical fashion, Subcommittee Chairman JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI began an immediate and thorough investigation of the problem. High-level Pentagon officials were called to testify before the subcommittee, and I have no doubt that the investigation will continue until Chairman KLUCZYNSKI determines that the Federal Government is not needlessly intervening and competing with private enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the vigor with which Chairman KLUCZYNSKI has sought to offset the adverse effects of Federal installations on our communities. All of us, and particularly the small businessmen of America, are indebted to him. As ranking minority member of the subcommittee, I consider it a unique privilege to be a part of his efforts.

To underscore the importance of the September 16 hearing, I wish at this time to include the text of Chairman KLUCZYNSKI's opening statement in the RECORD:

IMPACT OF FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS ON SMALL BUSINESS

Today's hearing is a continuation of a series of hearings being conducted by this Subcommittee on the Impact of Federal Installations on Small Business. Previous hearings were conducted here in Washington on June 15, 16 and 17, 1971, and subsequently in the field on August 9, 10, 12 and 13, 1971.

We heard testimony during the course of the Washington, D.C. hearings which indicated that Federal installations may not be the blessing some communities anticipate. Due to the heavy demands on educational and municipal services and a corresponding tax exemption, Federal installations may in fact be an economic burden to a local community. Small businesses may be required to shoulder a larger share of local taxes in order for a community to furnish the necessary support services of an installation.

It is my opinion, therefore, that in light of these circumstances, the Federal Government has a clear responsibility to make aggressive efforts to off-set such an adverse impact of its installations.

It is interesting to note that the Boise Cascade study of Montgomery County, Maryland, presented to the Subcommittee during the Washington, D.C. hearings, showed that Federal installations have a negative cost/benefit ratio of .69, whereas hotels and motels showed a positive cost/benefit ratio of 1.59. Thus, for every dollar Montgomery County spent on account of Federal Installations, it received only 69c in tax revenue. On the other hand, for every dollar spent on account of hotels and motels, the County received $1.59. This appears to demonstrate how small businesses such as hotels and motels can offset adverse effects of Federal installations.

During the course of the field hearings in Denver, Colorado, the Subcommittee received testimony to the effect that the Department of Defense, through the various military services, was constructing and operating motel-like units on military bases. It appears that the Federal Government's ownership and operation of motels is a direct entry by the Government into private enterprise. A privately owned motel pays taxes and returns profits to the local community, whereas a Government owned enterprise is exempt from state and local taxes and returns no profits to the local community.

It is my information that some 10,000 small businesses went bankrupt last year. The continued inflation and increase in unemployment, together with high interest rates, have made the plight of the small businessman more severe than ever. It has been my goal during my service in the Congress to promote and help small business. Small business has been the cornerstone of our free economic system, and I intend to assert every effort to help this country's small businessman.

Recent plans by the military services to expand and extend motel facilities on bases are of grave and serious concern to this Subcommittee in light of the impact such plans may have on small business. Let me make it clear that I wholeheartedly approve of temporary lodging quarters for our men in the service, where it is necessary. But needless intervention and competition by the Federal Government with private enterprise is unjustified. The Federal Government should help small business, not hurt it, and I hope the testimony we hear today will reaffirm that position.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S STATEMENT ON THE FAST BREEDER PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on June 4 of this year, President Nixon, in an unprecedented energy policy message to the Congress, announced a national commitment to develop a liquid metal fast breeder reactor—LMFBR—by 1980. On that day I made a statement before this body complimenting the President on his overall energy message; and, in particular, stating my full endorsement and intent to cooperate in assuring that the atomic energy related portions of his program would have my full support.

Sunday, while visiting the atomic energy installation at Hanford, Wash., President Nixon observed that the cooperation hoped for on the part of the electric utility industry has been obtained and now permits a full go-ahead for the first demonstration plant to get underway. Further, the administration would soon be seeking authorization for a second LMFBR demonstration plant. I am particularly pleased with this latter point because I, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as a whole, have from the beginning supported the idea that two or more demonstration plants should be started. This is necessary in order to provide a desirable element of competition in this undertaking, and it will contribute significantly to the necessary development of a viable industrial base which will form the foundation for the building of other plants to follow.

In the accomplishing of any long-term goal, there are a series of milestones along the way. In this particular instance we have passed some milestones and a number lie ahead. The President's commitment of June 4 is an important milestone, and his announcement yesterday is another one. I would like to compliment the members of industry and the representatives of the Federal Government who have been working on this effort in the interim. I compliment them on the work they have done to find a basis upon which to proceed. I urge them to continue to work hard so that the details of the cooperative arrangements for these demonstration plants can be worked out in order that the program can proceed on schedule. A utility company or group must take the lead, a reactor manufacturer must be selected, a site chosen, and the specific commitment for construction and operation of the first demonstration plant must be made. The 1980 goal will require a great deal of hard work—but it is achievable, and we must push forward so that construction can be started as soon as possible.

At the Fourth International Conference on Atomic Energy held earlier this month at Geneva, the Russians, British, and the French made clear that they recognized the importance of developing a fast breeder and that they have active construction programs underway on their own demonstration plants. We must not fall behind. This Nation was the first to operate an experimental fast breeder reactor. We should pursue vigorously the development of large, commercially attractive breeders for the production of the electrical energy needed by this Nation and, indeed, the entire world.

I am heartened by the President's announcement; I am heartened by the reports of cooperation from the industry. I compliment the new Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Dr. Schlesinger, for his quick grasp of the importance and priority of this work and the actions he has taken to assure that the Commission moves along promptly in this important development.

I include the portion of the President's remarks delivered at Hanford pertaining to the LMFBR program at this point in the RECORD. Also I include an article which appeared in the September 27, 1971, issue of the Los Angeles Times:

Text of prepared statement given by President Nixon at Hanford, Wash., Sept. 26

I know that people in the Tri-cities area are aware of our national energy policy announced in my message of June 4, 1971.

At that time I called on the private sector to join Government in financing one demonstration liquid metal fast breeder reactor to begin to move this nation into an era of plentiful, clean and safe atomic power.

Today I am happy to be able to say that private industry has, according to our latest information, subscribed over $200 million for this important project. This assures that our first reactor can go into construction. Further, I have decided to order the authorization of a second liquid metal fast breeder reactor in order that we can move forward as rapidly as possible toward the achievement of our energy goals.

We are not today in a position to announce the locations of these experimental reactors, but those interested in the continued growth of the Pacific Northwest recognize the unique position which the Hanford reservation occupies in the future of atomic energy in our nation. I am confident that Hanford will continue to grow and that this area will most assuredly prosper as we move forward with the liquid metal fast breeder reactor and other energy programs.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 27, 1971]

NIXON VOWS TO PUSH FOR "CLEAN" REACTOR—SPEAKS AT HANFORD, WASH., NUCLEAR CENTER ON WAY TO MEET HIROHITO

RICHLAND, WASH.—President Nixon, heading Sunday for a meeting with the emperor of Japan, promised expanded development of peaceful nuclear energy "that is clean and does not pollute."

Mr. Nixon stopped here for a briefing at the Hanford Atomic Works. He said the new, fast flux test facility now under construction is a major advance in this program.

"This technology," he said in a statement, "will develop into the liquid metal fast breeder reactor, a process that will yield abundant energy that is clean and inexpensive."

The breeder gets its name from the fact that it produces more nuclear fuel material than it consumes.

Mr. Nixon stopped at Hanford on the way from Portland, Ore. to Anchorage, Alaska, where he will climax a three-day tour of the Northwest by meeting with Emperor Hirohito. It is the first time a Japanese emperor has visited foreign soil in more than 2,500 years of imperial reign.

TOTALLY NEW ERA

The meeting with the emperor indicates the beginning of a "totally new era in the relationship" between the United States and Japan, Mr. Nixon said.

"The people who were enemies," he said, "can and must be friends. Japan and the United States must never be enemies again."

The President said private industry's response to plans to develop a prototype fast breeder reactor had been so encouraging that the program would be expanded.

Instead of developing one prototype by 1980, Mr. Nixon said, the aim is to work up two, using different approaches in each of them.

Officials estimated that each of the fast breeder reactors would cost about $500 million.

His announcement was loudly applauded by a crowd of 15,000 at this nuclear research center.

Mr. Nixon said many people were afraid of nuclear power because of the destruction it could cause. But, he said, there was no reason for this fear and the power should be harnessed for peace.

The reactors will be built at separate locations, the President said.

While Mr. Nixon had promised a significant statement at the Hanford facility, he stopped short of saying the center would be the site of one of the projected reactors. He said sites for the reactor prototypes would be announced later.

He had committed the Administration last June, in a partnership with industry, to development of one such reactor.

He urged that it act swiftly.

EXPORT OF NUCLEAR REACTORS

Dr. James R. Schlesinger, Atomic Energy Commission chairman, told newsmen export of nuclear reactors and components already produce about $400 million a year from foreign sales and are expected to become an important producer of foreign exchange for the United States.

Sales should rise to $1 billion by 1975, $2 billion by 1980, and then level off at about $4 billion thereafter, Schlesinger said.

"Yes," the President interjected at that point, "think what the export of jet aircraft has meant to the United States."

At an airport reception at Portland, Mr. Nixon told a crowd behind a fence that he was approaching the meeting with Hirohito at a time when there are great opportunities for peace in the world.

Japan has been critical of the President's new economic program, especially the important surtax.

Mr. Nixon also accepted for his Anchorage stay an invitation to a reception in the home of the man he fired from his Cabinet. Former Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel lost his job last Thanksgiving Eve and has just come out with a book that takes a few critical jabs at what happened to him during his sojourn in the Cabinet.

Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, one of the top presidential advisers, joined Mr. Nixon Sunday in Portland.

Emperor Hirohito Nagako and Empress are en route from Tokyo to Europe for a visit to seven other nations, and Alaska is a refueling stop going and coming.

Mr. Nixon served as a naval officer in the Pacific during World War II while Hirohito was commander-in-chief of all the imperial Japanese armed forces—including those that seized some of the remote Aleutian islands during the early days of the war.

In these times, U.S.-Japanese differences are more in the economic arena. For one thing, Japan is unhappy about the 10% tax Mr. Nixon imposed on imports as part of his new economic policy. The Japanese have called for its elimination and have talked of hitting back with taxes of their own.

But there also have been amicable developments in Japanese-American relations. Japan, for example, cosponsored the U.S. resolution to admit Communist China to the

United Nations while retaining a seat for the Nationalist Chinese on Taiwan.

And, in a move with conciliatory overtones, Mr. Nixon submitted to the Senate on Sept. 21, for ratification, an agreement to put Okinawa and related Pacific Islands back under Japanese sovereignty while reserving for this country the right to retain military bases there for "the mutual security of both countries."

Mr. Nixon's message to the Senate regarding the pact said that "it meets United States security needs and places our relationship with our major Asian ally on a more sound and enduring basis. It fulfills long-held aspirations of the Japanese people, including the people of Okinawa, for the reunification of these islands with Japan."

COURT UPHOLDS A-TEST PROTEST

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.—Only hours before President Nixon's scheduled arrival Sunday, the Alaska Supreme Court ruled that a protest group should be allowed to hold a demonstration against the planned nuclear test on Amchitka Island.

The Supreme Court ruled that the protestors should be allowed to hold their rally on a park strip several blocks away from and parallel to a motorcade route for the President.

The city of Anchorage had denied rally and march permits to the "Alaska Coalition Against Cannikin."

The protesters, who want the President to cancel the five-megaton blast nicknamed Cannikin, then challenged that the city ordinance used against them was unconstitutional.

On Friday Superior Court Judge James E. Hansen ruled that the ordinance was unconstitutional and the city took the case to the Supreme Court, asking for a stay of Hansen's ruling.

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. FORSYTHE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HARVEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. FUQUA, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PODELL, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. HAMILTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FRASER for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RUNNELS, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. SIKES in five instances.

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

Mr. SPRINGER in three instances.

Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in four instances.

Mr. ROBISON of New York in two instances.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. MCCLORY in four instances.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in three instances.

Mr. PIRNIE in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. PETTIS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. THONE.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY in two instances.

Mr. HARVEY in two instances.

Mr. MICHEL in two instances.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

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

Mr. SCHEUER in five instances.

Mr. FISHER in four instances.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.

Mr. EILBERG in two instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. RARICK in five instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in five instances.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. BINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. ABBITT.

Mr. FOLEY.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. FRASER in five instances.

Mr. SIKES in five instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in 10 instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. PICKLE in five instances.

Mr. WRIGHT in two instances.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON.

Mr. DOW.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. EDMONDSON in two instances.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in eight instances.

Mr. PATTEN in two instances.

Mr. DOWNING.

Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.

Mr. ROY.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1733. An act to amend the Act of September 26, 1970 (84 Stat. 884); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on September 28, 1971, present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 10090. An act making appropriations for public works for water and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration and other power agencies of the Department of Interior, the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 782. A joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to issue a proclamation to announce the occasion of the celebration of the 125th anniversary of the establishment of the Smithsonian Institution and to designate and to set aside September 26, 1971, as a special day to honor the scientific and cultural achievements of the Institution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 29, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1172. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting urgent requests for appropriations for fiscal year 1972 in budget authority and in proposals not increasing budget authority (H. Doc. No. 92-164); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

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. UDALL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 3808. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 932. An act to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a revision in the cotton ginning report dates; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 10577. A bill to authorize the foreign sale of certain passenger vessels; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 624. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 8787, a bill to provide that the unincorporated territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands shall each be represented in Congress by a Delegate to the House of Representatives (Rept. No. 92-520). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 625. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10538, a bill to extend the authority for insuring loans under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 (Rept. No. 92-521). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 626. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 10729, a bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-522). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 10367. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska Natives, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-523). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2. A bill to establish a Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-524). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. ABZUG:

H.R. 10909. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize grants and loans to private nonprofit organizations to assist them in providing transportation service meeting the special needs of elderly and handicapped persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:

H.R. 10910. A bill to provide that the lock and dam referred to as the "Jones Bluff lock and dam" on the Alabama River, Ala., shall hereafter be known as the Robert F. Henry lock and dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself and Mr. ASPIN):

H.R. 10911. A bill to provide reimbursement for losses incurred by commercial fishermen, as well as allied sport fishing camps, as a result of restrictions imposed by a State or the Federal Government; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. RARICK, Mr. LENNON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. SCHMITZ, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. KEMP, Mr. YATRON, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 10912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 10913. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to exempt small farmers from its requirements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 10914. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to promote full employment and restore a diversified production base; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to stem the outflow of U.S. capital, jobs, technology and production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10915. A bill to amend the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 in order to provide for more effective control of aircraft noise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 10916. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 10917. A bill to provide an incentive for the production of motion pictures in the United States by excluding from gross income, for Federal income tax purposes, a part of the gross income derived from the distribution or exploitation of motion pictures produced in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT (for himself and Mr. MORGAN):

H.R. 10918. A bill to provide for cooperation between the Secretary of the Interior and the States with respect to the regulation of surface mining operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 10919. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments, annuity and pension payments under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, and payments under any Federal retirement program shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a veteran's or widow's pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 10920. A bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments for the purpose of developing and improving communication procedures and facilities with respect to the prompt and efficient dispatch of police, fire, rescue, and other emergency services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 10921. A bill to protect marine mammals; to establish a Marine Mammal Commission; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 10922. A bill to promote the economic well-being of the United States by providing authority to negotiate commercial agreements including the granting of Most Favored Nation treatment with countries having nonmarket economies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARMATZ (for himself, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLARK, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. GROVER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KARTH, Mr. KEITH, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. MILLS of Maryland, Mr. PELLY, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mrs. SULLIVAN, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 10923. A bill to amend the Cargo Preference Law; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GETTYS:

H.R. 10924. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, to prohibit financial assistance thereunder to any public transit authority engaging in charter bus operations outside the urban area within which it provides mass transportation service; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JARMAN (for himself and Mr. ADAMS):

H.R. 10925. A bill to amend part V of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to extend the time of payment of interest or principal of existing Government loan guaranty to a maximum period of 30 years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCULLOCH (for himself and Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. CULVER, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts):

H.R. 10926. A bill to exempt from certain deep-draft safety statutes a passenger vessel operating solely on inland rivers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLS of Maryland:

H.R. 10927. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States a condition in a deed conveying certain lands to the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 10928. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 10929. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise the eligibility conditions for annuities, to change the railroad retirement tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10930. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to increase unemployment and sickness benefits, to raise the contribution base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 10931. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 10932. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Sickle Cell Anemia Institute; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NIX, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MINISH, and Mrs. MINK):

H.R. 10933. A bill making supplemental appropriations to carry out the lead-based paint poisoning prevention program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NIX, Mr. STOKES, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REES, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STEELE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 10934. A bill making supplemental appropriations to carry out the lead-based paint poisoning prevention program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NIX, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MINISH and Mrs. MINK):

H.R. 10935. A bill making a supplemental appropriation for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for detection and treatment of, and research on, sickle cell anemia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NIX, Mr. STOKES, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. REES, Mr. ROE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. STEELE, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 10936. A bill making a supplemental appropriation for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for detection and treatment of, and research on, sickle cell anemia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 10937. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for informal entry under regulations of certain educational articles manufactured in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUNNELS:

H.R. 10938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer to deduct the cost of commuting to work at a site where no housing is available within 10 miles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 10939. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to facilitate direct communication between officers and employees of the U.S. Postal Service and Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 10940. A bill to establish a national land use policy; to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to encourage and assist the States to prepare and implement land use programs for the protection of areas of critical environmental concern and the control and direction of growth and development of more than local significance; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 10941. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of police officers and firefighters killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 10945. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, to direct the President to stabilize rentals and carrying charges through the period ending at midnight April 30, 1972; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10946. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that the rentals and carrying charges charged for accommodations in federally assisted housing may not exceed, for the period ending at midnight April 30, 1972, the levels at which rentals have beeen stabilized pursuant to Executive Order 11615; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAFFERY:

H.J. Res. 890. Joint resoltuion asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 891. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America providing a 4-year-term for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KARTH, Mr. QUIE, and Mr. ZWACH):

H.J. Res. 892. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to participate in FARMFEST—U.S.A. and the World Ploughing contest in September 1972; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Texas):

H.J. Res. 893. Joint resolution to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to authorize disaster loans with respect to certain losses arising as the result of recent natural disaster, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 894. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Con. Res. 410. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA:

H. Con. Res. 411. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain claims of nationals of the United States against the Government of the Peoples Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H. Con. Res. 412. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the designation of the years 1973 through 1978 as the World Environmental Quinquennium to involve all nations of the world in a global environmental research program of both national and international scope; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PODELL:

H. Res. 622. Resolution to create a Select Committee on Penal Reform; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H. Res. 623. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; 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. BOW:

H.R. 10942. A bill for the relief of Thomas R. Jakmides; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 10943. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Carleton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 10944. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie E. Yotz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

142. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Grand Council, Order Fraternal Americans of Virginia, relative to unrestricted immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TWENTIETH CENTURY RENAISSANCE WOMAN

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in the September issue of The Retired Officer appears an articled entitled, "Jacqueline Cochran: A Renaissance Woman for the 20th Century." Miss Cochran aptly fits the description; her interests are broad and she meets all challenges with the same energy and determination that has made her the world's outstanding woman flier. It has been my pleasure and privilege to know Miss Cochran for many years. All who know and work with her admire her enthusiasm for life, her deep religious convictions, and love for her fellowman. I want to join her legion of friends in honoring this great lady and commend to my colleagues the reading of the inspiring article which follows:

JACQUELINE COCHRAN: A RENAISSANCE WOMAN FOR THE 20TH CENTURY

According to a definition in the *Random House Dictionary of the English Language*, a Renaissance Man is "a present-day man with many broad interests who has the opportunity to indulge himself in them so as to acquire a knowledge of each that is more than superficial." That is Jacqueline Cochran, Colonel, USAFR-Ret.

Left an orphan at a very early age, Colonel Cochran grew up with poor foster parents in the South. Although her formal schooling stopped with the third grade, she had a natural curiosity to learn combined with an insatiable reading habit and she is today a well-educated woman who sits on the board of directors of George Washington University (in Washington, D.C.) and has four honorary doctors degrees.

At the age of eight she began a 12-hour night shift in a cotton mill at 8¢ per hour. Through a determination never again to be hungry or sleep on the floor, she became a highly paid beauty operator, a trained nurse and, in the 30's, established a cosmetics manufacturing firm that she developed into a multi-million dollar business.

Most Americans, however, will remember "Jackie" Cochran primarily as a pioneer in the field of aviation. Since she began flying in 1932, she has set many aviation records and was the first woman to break the sound barrier. During the war years she was the Army Air Corps' director of women pilots and has served her country since that time in many important capacities.

TRO recently had the rare opportunity to interview Jacqueline Cochran and bring to our readers some of the wise and sensible thoughts of a woman whose many accomplishments must surely be an inspiration to young and old alike.

EDUCATION

Colonel Cochran has definite ideas on the need for education and the type of education necessary. TRO asked: If you could remake our educational system to serve our youngsters better, what would you do? What