United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, June 27, 1968*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Restore unto me the joy of Thy salvation; and uphold me with Thy free spirit.—Psalm 51: 12.

Almighty and most merciful Father, ever moving among Thy children and forever seeking entrance into the hearts of men, we pray for the world in which we live, a world in which we do not get along together in the spirit of brotherhood. Too often persons resort to procedures which produce pettiness in people, multiply the miseries of men, and add to the bitterness which blights the bright hopes of Thy children. Forgive, O Lord, forgive and restore unto us the joy of Thy salvation.

We pray for ourselves in this world that with a new spirit in our hearts, a new song on our lips, and a new strength in our hands we may work together to lift the fallen, hearten the disheartened, and give faith and hope to those whose spirits are low.

Lift up our heads, O Lord. Better still, lift up our hearts that we the Representatives of our Nation may lead our people to a better life for all, a higher hope for all, and a fuller faith for all.

In the name of Him who lived His faith to the very end we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 3931. An act to amend the act of April 3, 1952;

H.R. 8581. An act to amend section 11-341(b) of the District of Columbia Code which relates to the sales price for the reports of the opinions of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; and

H.R. 13373. An act for the relief of Richard C. Mockler.

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

H.R. 17268. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17354. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 17734. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17354) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17734) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 1514. An act relating to the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1628. An act to authorize suits in the courts of the District of Columbia for collection of taxes owed to States, territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, when the reciprocal right is accorded to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

THE LATE HONORABLE GORDON L. McDONOUGH, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House of Representatives of the death of our former esteemed colleague, the Honorable Gordon L. McDonough, of California, who passed away Tuesday evening, June 25, 1968.

Funeral services will be held Friday, June 28, at 11 a.m., at St. Ann's Catholic Church, Tenley Circle, Wisconsin and Nebraska Avenues NW., Washington, D.C. Interment will be in California.

Gordon served the 15th District of California with distinction in the House of Representatives for nine terms, serving in the 79th through the 87th Congress from 1945 through 1962. He was an active and prominent member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and was the ranking Republican on the House Subcommittee. He also served on the House Science and Astronautics Committee, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and on the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

Prior to his service in the House of Representatives he was a member of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors from 1933 through 1944, and served as chairman. He was active in many civic organizations and will be remembered in Los Angeles for the many public service duties he performed for all the people.

Gordon was a devoted public servant and a fine legislator. I feel honored to have been his friend and to have had the opportunity of serving with him in the House of Representatives.

He is survived by his loyal and devoted wife, Catherine Ann, two daughters, Mrs. Richard H. Miller and Mrs. John Mannelly, of Los Angeles, and five sons, Gordon, Vincent, and Thomas, of Los Angeles, and Paul and James, of Washington, and 31 grandchildren. They have the deep and heartfelt sympathy of Gordon's friends everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL].

Mr. ROYBAL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from California in expressing my deepest sympathy to the surviving family of Gordon McDonough. I remember Gordon very well as he served with distinction for 12 years on the board of supervisors of the county of Los Angeles starting in 1933. His dedication to his work and the excellent job that he did were so very much appreciated by his constituents, that they sent him to Wash-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ington, to represent them in the House of Representatives where he again represented them with distinction for 18 years.

Mr. Speaker, Gordon McDonough was indeed one of the most outstanding legislators that the State of California has ever produced. His death is a great loss not only to his family and friends, but to the city of Los Angeles, to the State of California and to the Nation.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from California and others in extending to the family of Gordon McDonough my deepest sympathy at his passing.

Gordon was a Member of the House when I came here. I quickly developed a close friendship with Gordon and our families became well acquainted. I quickly learned to respect his character and to have great admiration for his point of view on legislative matters. He was an outstanding Member of this body in every respect. He was a devoted family man and a friend of all of us. When he left this body, he left a fine mark for others to match.

I say again that the Nation has lost a fine citizen and we have lost a good friend. I extend to his family and to his loved ones our very deepest sympathy.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from California and his colleagues from his State and the distinguished minority leader in their expression of sorrow over the death of a man I learned to love and admire in the House of Representatives. He was a fine Congressman and an outstanding American.

I extend my deepest sympathy to those he has left behind.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to learn of the passing of my dear friend and our former colleague, Gordon McDonough. He and I not only served together but, more so, there developed between us throughout the years a very close feeling of respect and friendship.

Gordon McDonough was an ideal legislator, dedicated to his work in committee and on the floor of the House. He was a man who was serious in the performance of his duties, a man who studied legislation and knew the legislation coming out of committee and under consideration by the House. He made his mark in outstanding contributions during his 18 years of honorable and trustworthy public service.

He and Mrs. McDonough lived a beautiful life as husband and wife, an example for all others to follow.

We all grieve at the passing of Gordon McDonough. I join with my colleague from California and others in extending to Mrs. McDonough and her loved ones my deep sympathy in her great loss and sorrow.

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

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I yield to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to join in the remarks made, and particularly the remarks just made by the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Gordon McDonough was a dedicated Member of this body. He was on the floor constantly when he served here. He represented his constituency with ability and, as the Speaker said, he was a man devoted to his duties.

I might say also that he was a man who made friends easily. He had a great many friends. During his retirement he would come back occassionally. As all Members know, he would come by to visit with us. I enjoyed those visits immensely.

I am indeed sorry to learn of his passing, and I join the distinguished gentleman from California in extending sympathy to his family.

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was with genuine regret and a deep sense of loss, so far as I am personally concerned, that I read in the paper this morning of the passing of Gordon McDonough.

One of the privileges I have had here in the House of Representatives has been the opportunity to serve with great people. I say that advisedly, because in my time just about every Member of this House has been a great person. They have been great people not only because they have been statesmen dedicated to the welfare of their country; they have been great people because they have been good people, decent people, honest people, God-fearing people, family-loving people. Gordon McDonough was that sort of person.

I am proud and happy to call him friend, and I am sorry indeed at his passing.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise today to pay homage to a late colleague and former fellow member of the California delegation, the Honorable Gordon L. McDonough.

Gordon McDonough was a man whose career exemplified devotion to duty and love of country. It was my privilege to serve with him for 10 years, and I can testify that his selfless efforts in behalf of his constituency and our State of California will long be remembered.

Gordon McDonough pledged his life to public service. Before entering the House in 1944, he rendered distinguished service to Los Angeles County as a member of its board of supervisors and in several other capacities. Here in the House, he became senior Republican on the housing subcommittee.

To his wife, Catherine Ann, and other members of his family, my wife joins me in extending our most heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to my dear friend and former colleague, the Honorable Gordon L. McDonough, who served as a most distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from California from 1945 until 1962—the 79th through 86th Congresses.

He served on many committees in the House with great distinction and has always been a valued member of the Republican Party. He was a dedicated statesman, who through actions and words proved that he believed wholeheartedly in the great principles upon which our Nation was founded. He demonstrated, in everything he did, his ideals for liberty, respect for truth and love of justice. He was a great help to me when I first came to Congress.

Gordon was a devoted family man and a wonderful husband and father. I am privileged to have his son, Gordon L. McDonough, Jr., and his fine family residing in my congressional district.

Mrs. Smith joins me in expressing our deepest sympathies to his dear wife and family. We feel a deep sense of personal loss. We hope that his family will find comfort in their great sorrow in knowing that Gordon left behind him many, many devoted friends and a true example of American statesmanship at its best.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sorrowful sense of personal loss that I learned of the passing of the Honorable Gordon L. McDonough, and to his widow and other loved ones I extend my deepest sympathy. When I came to the 81st Congress and was assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee Gordon was in his third term in the House and on that committee. He was kind, gracious and helpful to me in every way and I came to number him among my dearest friends. When I last saw him not many months ago he seemed in happy spirits and robust health, and the announcement that he had passed on came as a shock. Hanging on the wall of my office in the Rayburn Building is a photograph of members of the Housing Subcommittee taken in Los Angeles some 15 years ago. That photograph will continue to hang on the wall of my office as long as I am here, and often I will look at it and seeing therein the picture of Gordon McDonough as he looked then in all the majesty of his presence will relive the days of one of the precious friendships of my years in the Congress. He was a brilliant legislator, a dedicated American and a priceless friend.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all my California colleagues, as well as those other Members of Congress who were privileged to know former Representative Gordon L. McDonough, were saddened to learn of his death this past week.

Although Congressman McDonough's remarkable service in the House ended just as mine began, I nonetheless enjoyed the pleasure of his friendship. He resided in my 31st Congressional District, and I was honored to know him, his wife Catherine Ann, his son Gordon, Jr., and his six other wonderful children. My wife, Betty, joins me in expressing our deep sorrow to his family on their great loss.

Los Angeles' 18th Congressional District was indeed fortunate to be represented by Congressman McDonough for 18 years, from 1944 to 1962. Previous to his service in the House, he was active in Los Angeles' civic life, serving three 4-year terms as a member of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and

as chairman of both the county flood control district and the county sanitation district.

A member of the original House Space Committee, Representative McDonough, on his retirement, was the senior Republican on the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency. His entire career was marked by energy, courage, and dedication. And, although in our two-party system one might have differed with his philosophic views, one could never doubt the integrity with which he held them.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life, character, and service of the late Honorable Gordon L. McDonough.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement on Monday, July 24, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1368) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1969, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 1368

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of the Government for the fiscal year 1969, namely:

SEC. 101. (a)(1) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1968 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriation Acts for the fiscal year 1969:

Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriation Act;

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Public Works for Water and Power Resources Development and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Act;

Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act;

Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act; and

Legislative Branch Appropriation Act.

(1) Appropriations made by this subsection shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriation Act.

(3) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this subsection as passed by the House is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the lesser amount or the more restrictive authority.

(4) Whenever an Act listed in this subsection has been passed by only one House or where an item is included in only one version of an Act as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower: *Provided,* That no provision which is included in an appropriation Act enumerated in this subsection but which was not included in the applicable appropriation Act for 1968, and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution unless such provision shall have been included in identical form in such bill as passed by both the House and Senate.

(b) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities which were conducted in the fiscal year 1968 and are listed in this subsection at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority:

Activities for which provision was made in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1968;

Activities for which provision was made in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1968;

Activities for which provision was made in the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1968;

Activities for which provision was made in the Military Construction Appropriation Act, 1968;

Activities for which provision was made in the Department of Transportation Appropriation Act, 1968;

Activities under the Higher Education Act of 1965;

Activities under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended;

Activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961;

Activities (grants for college work-study program) under part C, title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended;

Activities (grants for land-grant colleges) under section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 329);

Activities under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as amended;

Activities, other than grants, of the domestic agricultural migratory workers health program of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Activities, other than grants, related to regional medical programs of the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Activities under sections 3, 4, 7, 12, and 13 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended;

Activities under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965; and

Activities under the appropriations for "Ship construction" and "Research and development", Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce.

(c) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities for which disbursements are made by the Secretary of the Senate, and the Senate items under the Architect of the Capitol, to the extent and in the manner which would be provided for in the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1969.

(d) Such amounts as may be necessary for continuing activities under sections 104 and 105 of the Manpower Development and Training Act, but at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate.

SEC. 102. Appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall remain available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) enactment of the applicable appropriation Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) July 31, 1968, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 103. Appropriations and funds made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in subsection (d)(2) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds or to permit the use, including the expenditure, of appropriations, funds or authority in any manner which would contravene the provisions of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 105. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 106. No appropriation or fund made available or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity which was not being conducted during fiscal year 1968.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the joint resolution is engrossed, read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in connection with the joint resolution continuing appropriations, and insert pertinent tables and figures.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the unanimous-consent request that Members may revise and extend their remarks, but I was not aware of the fact that the joint resolution continuing appropriations would be adopted without debate.

I have no objection to considering the joint resolution in the House. Was that the request?

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot read the minds of Members. The Chair is sitting here, observing, and will protect the rights of Members.

Seeing no Member rise, the Chair acted in the next parliamentary procedure.

The Chair will always lean over backward to protect the rights of all Members.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it was my

understanding that the joint resolution was to be considered under the 5-minute rule. Some Members, I know, desire to discuss it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the action by which the joint resolution was engrossed, read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table, is vacated.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the end of the fiscal year on June 30. Thirteen regular, annual appropriation bills for fiscal year 1969 are scheduled for passage prior to the end of the session.

Eight of those bills have been passed by the House.

Three of those bills have been passed by the other body.

With the transportation bill which was reported today by the Committee on Appropriations, the committee will have considered nine bills for 1969. The four remaining bills not yet reported require authorization. One of the four—the District of Columbia bill—could be considered, but additional revenue should be provided before the bill is actually considered.

Only one of the regular bills, the Treasury and Post Office Department bill, has been enacted into law. The other body has sent us two other regular bills which are now ready for conference—the bills for Agriculture and Interior. We are moving toward the conclusion of the appropriations work for the session insofar as the House is concerned.

This continuing resolution provides that the Government may operate through July 31—for 1 month. It provides that nothing shall contravene the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 which was passed last week. Further, whatever expenditures take place in July under the resolution will have to be charged to the appropriations eventually made by the Congress, so they may be reduced pursuant to the expenditure reduction legislation. Also, no new starts are permitted in this legislation.

Insofar as I am able to say, there is no objection from any source to the consideration and passage of this legislation.

EXPENDITURE ACT REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATION BILLS, BASED ON HOUSE ACTIONS

Mr. Speaker, specifically as to House actions in the eight appropriation bills—certain actions in other bills may also have some effect:

First, $6,178 million of the $10 billion new budget authority reduction figure has been achieved. The transportation bill reported from committee this morning proposes another $267 million reduction.

Second, based on tentative approximations, some $1,732 million of the $6 billion outlay—expenditure—reduction figure has been achieved. The transportation bill reported from committee this morning proposes cuts that are estimated to reduce 1969 expenditures by approximately $304 million. In addition, reductions in expenditures that would have been made in 1969 from obligating authority requested in, but cut by the House from the second supplemental bill, 1968, may roughly approximate another $186 million.

It may be that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] will wish to say something at this point. I shall extend my remarks and include selected excerpts from the committee report and a table summarizing the bill totals.

Excerpts from the committee report:

This is the customary type of resolution brought before the House on the eve of the new fiscal year to avoid interruption of continuing governmental functions. The authority conveyed by this resolution is necessary to provide for the interim between June 30 and final approval of the applicable annual appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1969, which begins on July 1, next. The resolution follows the basic form and concept of similar resolutions of past years. Last year's initial continuing resolution became Public Law 90–38, approved June 30, 1967.

The time period covered by the accompanying resolution is limited to the month of July, 1968. There would be no need for an extension beyond July 31 if all the appropriation bills are sent to the President before the national political conventions.

SCOPE OF THE RESOLUTION

Comporting with continuing resolutions over a period of many years, including last year, the emphasis in the resolution is on the *continuation of existing projects and activities* at the lowest of one of three rates, namely, the current (fiscal year 1968) rate; the budget request, where no action has been taken by either House; or the more restrictive amount adopted by either of the two Houses. The whole thrust of the resolution is to keep the Government function on a minimum basis until funds for the full year are otherwise determined upon.

In those instances where the applicable 1969 appropriation bill has passed both Houses but not cleared conference, and the particular amount or authority therein differs, the pertinent project or activity continues under the lesser of the two amounts and under the more restrictive authority.

In those instances where a bill has passed only one House, or where an appropriation for a project or activity is included in only one version of a bill as passed by both Houses, the pertinent project or activity continues under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current fiscal year 1968 rate or the rate permitted by the one House, whichever is the lower.

In those instances where neither House has passed the applicable appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1969, appropriations are provided for *continuing* projects or activities conducted during fiscal year 1968 at the current rate or the rate provided for in the budget estimate for 1969, whichever is lower, and under the more restrictive authority.

The resolution does not in any way augment the appropriation for a given project or activity in the regular bills for the fiscal year 1969. In the words of section 105 of the resolution itself:

"SEC. 105. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law."

In other words, while this resolution—as in the case of similar resolutions of previous years—does not enumerate *specific* amounts that may be obligated and expended for the countless activities of government during the month of July (or such shorter period as the resolution may operate as to particular departments or agencies), the controlling factor, known to all who have any responsibility for the management of the programs or the obligation of the funds, is that whatever is used during this interim must be taken out of, or charged against, whatever amount is finally appropriated, or otherwise made available, for the whole years, as may be reduced pursuant to the expenditure reduction legislation.

Section 101(b) of the resolution is drawn along the conventional lines of similar past resolutions, and, generaly, encompasses those activities to be considered in connection with appropriation bills not yet reported from the Committee. This includes a number of items that had to be laid aside for lack of legislative authorization at the time the appropriation bills in which they normally would have been considered were reported earlier in the session.

Only one appropriation bill—the *Treasury-Post Office bill*—for fiscal year 1969 has cleared Congress. Thus prompt enactment of this resolution is the proper course of action under the circumstances. *Section 102 provides that the resolution ceases to apply* to an agency or activity concurrent with approval by the President of the applicable appropriation bill in which provision for such agency or activity is made. Thus *the scope of the continuing resolution constricts as each bill is enacted; the resolution will be wholly inoperative after the last bill for 1969 is approved, or July 31, whichever first occurs.*

Section 104 is standard in continuing resolutions, and is self-explanatory.

Section 106 is also standard in continuing resolutions, *forbidding* the use of funds provided in the joint resolution to *initiate any new project or activity or to resume any which was not being conducted in fiscal 1968.*

Common, of course, to all appropriations and funds that are used in 1969 for payment of salaries of civilian and military personnel will be the extra compensation, commencing in July, that must be paid as a result of the comparability pay increases granted pursuant to Public Laws 90–206 and 90–207. There is no administrative discretion in the matter of the extra payments to personnel. The line-item budget estimates for 1969 did not make specific allowance for these added costs (shown only as a 1-line item of $1.6 billion within the January budget totals), causing the committee to include, as section 303(a) in the pending Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill for 1968, a provision authorizing deficiency apportionments for 1969 to the extent any such pay increases cannot be absorbed within funds otherwise available.

EXPENDITURE CONTROL ACT REDUCTION PROVISIONS

The provisions of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 concern reductions in civilian employment, require a reduction of not less than $10 billion in new budget (obligational) authority for 1969, a reduction of not less than $6 billion in budgeted 1969 outlays (expenditures and net lending), and specific recommendations for recisions of $8 billion of previously granted obligational authority. These provisions introduce a new dimension to budgets of the departments and agencies of government in the fiscal year 1969 beginning on July 1, next. They cast something of a shadow over not only the unexpended carryover balances in innumerable accounts across the government but also over many of the specific appropriation and fund amounts now pending consideration at various stages in the legislative process. This underscores and emphasizes the fact that, whereas in previous years departments and agencies operating under a continuing resolution were required to hold obligations and expenditures to *not in excess of* the lowest of one of two or three rates, those minimums, with the aforementioned title II in the picture, take on something of the nature of "maximum minimums."

In this general connection, section 103 of the joint resolution follows the stereotyped form of provious continuing resolutions in waiving the time periods set forth in 31 U.S.C. 665(d)(2) for the submission and approval of papers on the apportionments of funds. This in nowise waives the basic requirement in the law for the apportionment of funds over the year by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, but merely dispenses with considerable paper work that as a practical matter cannot be usefully applied to 31-day temporary appropriation provisions. But in view of the title II reduction provisions applicable to fiscal 1969, the committee has attached to section 103 a proviso that: "nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds or to permit the use, including the expenditure, of appropriations, funds or authority in any manner which would contravene the provisions of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968."

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION BILL TOTALS OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY, 90TH CONG., 2D SESS., AS OF JUNE 27, 1968

[Does not of course include any "back-door" type budget authority; or any permanent (Federal or trust) authority under earlier or "permanent" law [1] without further or annual action by the Congress]

	New budget (obligational) authority (all figures are slightly rounded)		
	Bills for fiscal 1968	Bills for fiscal 1969	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests considered	$6,796,295,000	$54,060,171,000	$60,856,466,000
2. Amounts approved by House	6,426,465,000	[2] 47,372,815,000	53,799,280,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−369,830,000	[2] −6,687,356,000	−7,057,186,000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests considered	6,818,092,000	10,316,207,000	17,134,299,000
2. Amounts approved by Senate	6,453,116,000	8,593,779,000	15,046,895,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests	−364,976,000	−1,722,428,000	−2,087,404,000
4. Compared with House amounts in same bills	+26,652,000	+11,463,000	+38,115,000
C. Enacted:			
1. Budget requests considered	79,781,000	1,959,885,000	2,039,666,000
2. Amounts enacted	79,381,000	1,780,653,000	1,860,034,000
3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests	−400,000	−179,232,000	−179,632,000

[1] For fiscal 1969, according to the January budget, total new budget (obligational) authority is tentatively estimated at $214,600,000,000 ($201,700,000,000, net of certain budget presentation adjustments), of which $141,500,000,000 is for current action by Congress and $73,100,000,000 would become available under permanent law.

[2] Includes committee reported amounts for Transportation bill (subject to floor action). $6,445,069,000 of this figure would count against the "not less than" $10,000,000,000 cut pending in the tax bill; the $6,445,069,000 figure includes $2,685,000,000 of participation sales authorization reduction and $126,500,000 (committee bill, $256,000,000) stricken on floor point of order on State-Justice bill.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last two words.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has just reported, this is the usual continuing resolution made necessary because we have not completed action in the Congress, and there have not been signed into law yet all of the appropriation bills that will be required to provide the funds for the continued operation of the Government in the 30 days of the new fiscal year which will begin July 1 next.

Mr. Speaker, I think the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations might not wish to say this himself, because he is the chairman of the committee, but I can say on his behalf and on behalf of the committee that we do not feel the Appropriations Committee is responsible for this problem.

This House has already completed action on eight regular appropriation bills coming out of our committee so far this calendar year. The House has completed action on two supplemental bills reported by our committee—an urgent supplemental which has been in conference for many weeks now and the second supplemental bill which cleared this House several weeks ago and only cleared the other body yesterday. The Committee on Appropriations has been diligent and on target all year. And with respect to the four remaining regular bills we are ready to mark those up and report them to the House, but they are being delayed because of circumstances beyond the control of the Committee on Appropriations. The four remaining bills, excluding the DOT bill which cleared the committee today and which will be on the floor next Tuesday, are: District of Columbia, Department of Defense, foreign aid, military construction, and, of course, there will be a final supplemental.

But the record will show that eight of the regular appropriation bills and two supplemental bills have already cleared the House and by next Tuesday the score will be nine out of the 13 regular bills have cleared this House, leaving only four to go.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I support this continuing resolution. It runs only until July 31. It does not affect or make any change in the bills that have already cleared this House, because the spending limitations fixed in those bills are not changed by the resolution. The continuing resolution merely permits the expenditure of the funds in accordance with the provisions of the bills that have already cleared the House and, as I said before, that is eight.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Appropriations cleared the ninth bill this morning, which is a bill providing the appropriations for the Department of Transportation. That bill will be on the floor next Tuesday. When it is cleared, we will then have only four regular bills to be approved.

I would like to say a few things about the general situation which confronts the House. Members should be made aware of exactly where we stand with respect to appropriations and spending cuts so as to estimate our chances of meeting the goals the Congress assumed in adopting the tax bill and spending limitation which was enacted by the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968.

As I see it, there are two goals Congress set for itself under that legislation: First, to reduce new obligational authority by $10 billion; and second, to reduce spending by $6 billion. Before the action of the House yesterday on the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, new obligational authority had been reduced $6.3 billion below the budget, leaving only about $3.7 billion to go in order to reach that $10 billion goal. But the action of the House yesterday forced a retreat. That action restored $195 million of the NOA that had previously been cut on the 8 regular bills. So, we go down from $6.3 billion in aggregate cuts to $6.1 billion.

Today's action of the full committee on the Department of Transportation bill will, however, put us back up even with where we were before the action of yesterday, and slightly in advance of that position, because that bill recommends cuts of $267 million and when we take that into consideration you will see that NOA cuts are back up to $6.4 billion, including those in the DOT bill and assuming the House follows the recommendations of its Committee on Appropriations next Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. JONAS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the four regular bills left involve $84,271 million of budget requests and that includes $1.5 billion on the wrapup supplemental: the District of Columbia bill in the amount of $177 million, the Department of Defense bill in the amount of $77 billion, foreign aid in the amount of $3.4 billion, and military construction in the amount of $2,051 million.

Mr. Speaker, in order to reach the $10 billion cut in NOA we, therefore, have to cut out of the remaining $84,271 million to be considered another $3,556 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we can do that if we make up our minds to do it, because we have attained a reduction in NOA, assuming the action of the committee of today will be approved next week on the Department of Transportation bill, of $6.4 billion out of $57 billion.

We will have to cut an additional $3.5 billion out of the $84 billion yet to be considered, but of course $77 billion of this is for the Department of Defense.

Turning to spending, let us see what we have done so far toward hitting the goal of $6 billion in spending cuts.

Out of the nine regular bills that have passed the House, or will have passed if the House approves the Department of Transportation bill next week, spending cuts aggregating $2.2 billion will have been made in this House, leaving $3.8 billion to be cut in spending out of the remaining $84 billion yet to be considered, if we are to reach that $6 billion spending reduction goal.

As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means said, when he had the conference report on the floor recently, the House and the Congress ought to make these cuts. We ought to make these reductions. We should not leave it to the President to make them.

But we have our work cut out ahead of us, and it will be a tough job to cut $3.8 billion in spending out of the remaining four bills, and the wrap-up supplemental. We can do it. I believe the Committee on Appropriations will make the recommendations, but we cannot force the House to accept them.

By restoring $194.7 of the NOA cuts the committee had made, the House took a backward step yesterday. It is going to take cooperation on the part of the House, and of all Members who feel that Congress should accept the responsibility it assumed last week. If we will all just cooperate with the Committee on Appropriations, we can attain this goal and make the necessary reductions right here in Congress where they ought to be made.

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

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman from North Carolina to yield to ask him, as well as the chairman of the committee, to answer a question if I may propound a question.

Mr. JONAS. I will be happy to have the distinguished chairman propound his question.

Mr. MILLS. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget informed me that he understood the intent of Congress as to the limitation in title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, and the apportionment requirements of the Antideficiency Act, that he would enforce the provisions in this manner. Is the purpose of the provision in the bill relating to the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act intended to require the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to take into account the limitation in title II of the act in the period the continuing resolution is effective in the same manner as he said he would after the appropriations are passed?

Mr. JONAS. Answering for myself—and then I will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]—it is my intention that he do that, and it is my understanding that it is the intention of the Committee on Appropriations that he do exactly that. We tried to make that clear in section 103 and in the report of the committee on this resolution.

Now I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. I would say to the gentleman from Arkansas that in my opinion the very definite answer to his question is "yes."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank both gentlemen.

Mr. JONAS. May I say in addition to that that we have a very good hold on the Director, and on the administration, in that this continuing resolution will expire July 31. I am going to suggest to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that if a renewal of this continuing resolution becomes necessary, before we bring another resolution to the floor we have the Director of the Bureau of the Budget before the committee, and have him inform us of the actions he has taken under the apportionment requirements of the statute.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The joint resolution 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include pertinent extracts and tables at this point in the RECORD in connection with the House joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 17354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Messrs. KIRWAN, MARSH, FLYNT, JOELSON, MAHON, REIFEL, MCDADE, HARRISON, and JONAS.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL FROM NATIONAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILES OF BERYL ORE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 14367), to authorize the disposal of beryl ore from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, with a Senate amendment thereto, and disagree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "by negotiation or otherwise," and insert "by public advertising for bids and sale to the highest responsible bidder,".

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on December 14, 1967, the House passed H.R. 14367, a bill to authorize the disposal of approximately 9,888 short tons of beryl ore now held in the national and supplemental stockpiles.

The bill that passed the House contained the usual provisions permitting flexibility to the Administrator of the General Services Administration to dispose of this metal. Permitting this flexibility has allowed an orderly disposal of the stockpile surpluses and has made possible the sale and disposition with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets in accordance with the basic provisions of the Stockpile Act.

When the bill reached the Senate floor on April 26, 1968, it was amended to require the sale to be made by sealed-bid basis only to responsible bidders.

In their disposal sales of approximately $3 billion, the General Services Administration has normally viewed competitive selling methods, including sealed-bid sales, as the most efficient means of carrying out the intent of the Stockpile Act. There are circumstances, however, when such a procedure would run contrary to its legal mandate to avoid a disruption of the market.

When these situations present themselves, General Services Administration adjusts its selling methods accordingly. This was true in the disposal of aluminum. The procedure was worked out with the aluminum industry to absorb into the normal market channels over a period of years some million tons of aluminum. The alternative to this would have been for GSA to dispose of this commodity in relatively small amounts as the consumer market permitted. This would have involved, of course, a tremendous administrative expense over a much longer period of years.

So, gentlemen, you can see that sales of the various commodities in the stockpile require individual consideration and we should not be bound by any precedent as to the method of sale. To require an inflexible method of sale would, in itself, thwart the very nature of the basic laws which require sales to be made without market disruption.

As I have said earlier, the GSA has normally viewed the competitive selling method as the most efficient means of carrying out their responsibilities, and they expect to do so in the case of beryl ore. And at this point, I must say that beryl ore is needed badly by those holding contracts for some of our more important missiles and the release of this material is absolutely essential for our national defense purposes.

Our committee feels that we should be very careful not to establish a precedent

which might impair needed flexibility in the disposal program and possibly be disruptive in its effects on the markets. Therefore, I strongly recommend that we send this back to the Senate in the hope that the bill can be passed.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the subject of H.R. 14367.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 17268) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 5 over to and including line 10 on page 2 and insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 712(e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by striking out '$85,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$100,000'."

Page 2, after line 10, insert:

"SEC. 3. Title VII of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 718. The Comptroller General, in cooperation with the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall undertake a study to determine the feasibility of applying uniform cost accounting standards to be used in all negotiated prime contract and subcontract defense procurements of $100,000 or more. In carrying out such study the Comptroller General shall consult with representatives of the accounting profession and with representatives of that segment of American industry which is actively engaged in defense contracting. The results of such study shall be reported to the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date, but in no event later than eighteen months after the date of enactment of this section.'"

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendments in a little more detail than the Clerk simply reading them by title?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I shall be very glad to.

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the other body amended the House-passed Defense Production Act in two respects: first, to provide an increase in the authorization of funds for the Joint Committee on Defense Production from $85,000 to $100,000. This increase was necessitated by the recent pay raise. This amendment passed the other body without dissent. Second, Members will recall that the House-passed Defense Production Act called for the Comptroller General to develop uniform accounting standards to be applied to all negotiated prime contract and subcontract defense procurements in excess of $100,000. Under the House-passed language they are supposed to develop uniform accounting standards and make recommendations on the promulgation of such standards within 1 year. The Senate amendment on this subject called for the Comptroller General, in cooperation with other agencies of Government, industry, and representatives of the accounting profession, to undertake a study to determine the feasibility of developing standards for negotiated defense contracts, and within 18 months the GAO is required to report to the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Armed Services Committee of both bodies.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the distinguished gentleman from Texas correctly, this simply lengthens the time by 18 months, but in addition to that the study will determine the feasibility rather than mandatorily develop the guidelines in the GAO, is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct. Also it provides that industry will be conferred with, and representatives of the accounting profession, in addition to the Government.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I think the last comment is very salutary and appropriate.

I really find no objection to the extension of time and the slight increase of funds.

Mr. Speaker, was the action of the Senate germane to the House-passed resolution?

Mr. PATMAN. It was germane and unanimous.

Mr. HALL. I am not interested in whether the other body was unanimous or not, Mr. Speaker, but were there not some legislative restrictions as this bill left the House, based on points of order and matters that were germane to the House bill?

Mr. PATMAN. None, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the explanation, I believe this bill should pass. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the minority believes the recommendations made by the Senate are acceptable and urges passage.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5404) to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to make changes and improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 12, insert:

"'(4) to foster and support the development and use of computer and other scientific methods and technologies, primarily for research and education in the sciences;".

Page 2, line 13, strike out "'(4)" and insert "'(5)".

Page 2, line 25, strike out "'(5)" and insert "'(6)".

Page 3, line 8, strike out "'(6)" and insert "'(7)".

Page 3, line 12, strike out "institution," and insert "institution and appropriate".

Page 3, line 13, strike out "and private contractor".

Page 3, strike out lines 17 to 23, inclusive, and insert:

"'(b) The Foundation is authorized to initiate and support specific scientific activities in connection with matters relating to international cooperation or national security by making contracts or other arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) for the conduct of such scientific activities. Such activities when initiated or supported pursuant to requests made by the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense shall be financed solely from funds transferred to the Foundation by the requesting Secretary as provided in section 15(g), and any such activities shall be unclassified and shall be identified by the Foundation as being undertaken at the request of the appropriate Secretary."

Page 4, line 12, after "Board" insert "and the Director".

Page 5, lines 10 and 11, strike out "and be responsible for".

Page 5, line 19, after "education," insert "research management,".

Page 6, line 4, after "Colleges," insert "the Association of State Colleges and Universities,".

Page 8, line 9, strike out "14" and insert "15".

Page 9, strike out all after line 23 over to and including line 8 on page 10 and insert:

"'(e) The Director shall not make any contract, grant, or other arrangement pursuant to section 11(c) without the prior approval of the Board, except that a grant, contract, or other arrangement involving a total commitment of less than $2,000,000, or less than $500,000 in any one year, or a commitment of such lesser amount or amounts and subject to such other conditions as the Board in its discretion may from time to time determine to be appropriate and publish in the Federal Register, may be made if such action is taken pursuant to the terms and conditions set forth by the Board, and if each such action is reported to the Board at the Board meeting next following such action.'"

Page 13, strike out lines 21 and 22.

Page 13, line 23, strike out "(2)" and insert "(1)".

Page 14, line 1, strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)".

Page 15, after line 19, insert:

"(d) Section 11 of such Act is further demanded by striking out the word 'and' at the end of clause (h), by striking out the period at the end of clause (i) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word 'and', and by inserting at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

"'(j) to arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal agencies for the performance of any activity which the Foundation is authorized to conduct.'"

Page 15, strike out lines 1 and 2, and insert:

"SEC. 11. Effective September 1, 1968—

"(1) section 14 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is repealed, and notwithstanding the provisions of the first section of this Act, until such date the provisions of section 3(a)(9) of such Act of 1950 shall remain in effect for the purposes of such section 14; and

"(2) sections 15, 16, and 17 of such Act, and all references thereto in such Act, are redesignated as sections 14, 15, and 16, respectively."

Page 15, line 4, strike out "redesignated as section 14 and is".

Page 15, line 7, strike out "14" and insert "15".

Page 17, line 25, strike out "Sections 16 and 17" and insert "Section 16".

Page 18, line 1, strike out all after "1950" down to and including "15" in line 3.

Page 18, line 5, strike out "the section redesignated as section 15" and insert *"such section."*

Page 18, line 7, strike out "14" and insert "15".

Page 18, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 14. Subsection (a) of section 17 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) To enable the Foundation to carry out its powers and duties, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the sum of $525,000,000; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each subsequent fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. Sums authorized by this subsection shall be in addition to sums authorized by section 201(b)(1) of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966."

Page 18, line 8, strike out "14." and insert "15".

Page 19, line 4, strike out "15." and insert "16".

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the minority on the Committee on Science and Astronautics do agree with the Senate amendments and have no objection to this procedure.

Mr. MILLER of California. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it the intent of the chairman of the committee to insert in the RECORD a detailed explanation of the Senate amendments?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes, I will insert that at this point:

H.R. 5404 amending the National Science Foundation Act passed the House on April 12, 1967, on a rollcall vote of 391 to 22. The bill makes a number of improvements in the organization and operation of the Foundation, and culminates an extensive study of the Foundation which the committee began in the fall of 1964.

For the most part, the Senate adopted the House bill. However, it did make a number of changes, most of which merely clarify the role and responsibilities of the National Science Board and the Director of the Foundation.

The most significant of the Senate amendments occurs in section 17—page 20 of the bill—whereby the Senate provides for annual authorization of funds for the Foundation.

In view of the new applied research responsibilities of the Foundation and the other changes made by this bill, I believe annual authorization is necessary in order to provide an indepth review of the Foundation's programs.

I would also emphasize that although this bill authorizes certain new functions, it is not an appropriation bill and it does not appropriate any additional money.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the chairman of the committee at this point in brief terms explain what the Senate amendments do?

Mr. MILLER of California. The Senate amendments are procedural. The only amendment that is important is, this will set up authorization for the National Science Foundation and will give to the Committee on Science and Astronautics the right to review annual requests for authorization legislation, something which the committee has long felt should be done.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, on an annual basis, the Committee on Science and Astronautics will consider the program of the agency?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And it will report a bill on an annual authorization basis each session of Congress?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will this be by line item or total dollar amount?

Mr. MILLER of California. I presume it will be by line item.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. May I ask one other question. The annual authorization requirement does, I think, give to the legislative committee new responsibility, but with that new responsibility comes the need and necessity for prompt action on the annual program of the agency.

Can we have the assurance of the committee that the annual authorization legislation will be handled promptly at the beginning of each session?

Mr. MILLER of California. I can give that assurance. It will be handled with the greatest of facility we can give it. We do have the authorization bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I have not decided yet just what procedure we will follow, but I am under the impression we will appoint a subcommittee to handle this new authorization legislation, so that they can be handled within the same time frame and brought to the floor as quickly as possible.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLLECTION, COMPILATION, CRITICAL EVALUATION, PUBLICATION, AND SALE OF STANDARD REFERENCE DATA

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6279) to provide for the collection, compilation, critical evaluation, publication, and sale of standard reference data, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 7, strike out "1968." and insert "1969."

Page 4, line 9, strike out "1968" and insert "1969".

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—it is my understanding that the minority members of the committee do agree to the Senate amendments and have no objection to the procedure the chairman is taking.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct. We have consulted with them.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the chairman insert in the RECORD an explanation of the Senate amendment?

Mr. MILLER of California. I shall be happy to.

The standard reference data bill was passed by the House on August 14, 1967, on a rollcall vote of 319 to 2, and the bill authorized a $1.86 million program in fiscal year 1968.

A year has passed since the House action and the fiscal year is now almost at an end. Therefore, the Senate amended the House bill by substituting fiscal year 1969 for fiscal year 1968, and it authorizes the same $1.86 million in fiscal year 1969.

I might add that the President's budget request for the standard data program in fiscal year 1969 was $2.7 million. Consequently, by adopting this bill today we are reducing the program almost a million dollars from the amount requested.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN H.R. 5404 AS PASSED BY THE HOUSE AND AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The Senate version differs from the bill as passed by the House in the following respects:

First. The Senate adds a new section 3(a)(4) authorizing NSF to foster and support the development and use of computers and other scientific methods and technologies, primarily for research and education in the sciences.

Second. In section 3(a)(6)—3(a)(7) of the Senate bill—the NSF is required to maintain a program to determine the total amount of money for research received by each educational institution, nonprofit organization, and private contractor in the United States. The Senate version differs in that only amounts received by educational institutions and appropriate nonprofit organizations need be determined.

Third. In section 3(b) the Senate bill differs from H.R. 5404—passed by the House—by requiring that when the NSF supports scientific activities relating to international cooperation or national security at the request of the Secretary of State or Defense, such activities shall be unclassified, funded solely by the re-

questing Secretary, and shall be identified as to the requesting Secretary. The Senate bill also authorizes the NSF to undertake at its own initiative, support of activities relating to international cooperation or national security. H.R. 5404 as passed by the House merely authorizes NSF to support such activities at the request of either Secretary.

Fourth. In section 3(d), H.R. 5404—as passed by the House—provides that the Board shall recommend and encourage the pursuit of national policies for the promotion of basic research and education in the sciences. The Senate version states that the Board and the Director shall perform this function.

Fifth. In section 4(c), the Senate adds "research management" as a field from which Board members may be drawn and adds the Association of State Colleges and Universities as an organization which may recommend to the President nominees for Board membership.

Sixth. In section 5(e), H.R. 5404 as passed by the House provides that the Director shall not make any grant, contract, or other arrangement without the prior approval of the Board if such award involves a new type of program, or a total commitment of over $2,000,000, or over $500,000 in any 1 year, or a commitment of such other amount or amounts and subject to such other conditions as the Board shall determine and publish in the Federal Register.

The Senate bill provides that the Director shall not make any award without prior Board approval, except that an award involving less than $2,000,000 or less than $500,000 in a year may be made pursuant to terms and conditions set forth by the Board, provided that each such award is reported to the Board at the next meeting. The Board may lower—but not raise—these dollar limitations by publishing such lower limitations in the Federal Register.

Seventh. The Senate adds a new section 11(j) of the act which authorizes the Foundation to arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal agencies for the performance of any activity which NSF is authorized to conduct.

Eighth. Both versions of H.R. 5404 abolish the NSF's weather modification authorization in present section 14, and also delete section 3(a)(9) on the same subject. However, the Senate provides that these deletions shall not occur until September 1, 1968, while the House action makes them effective upon passage of the bill.

Ninth. The House bill continues the permanent appropriation authorization in present section 17. The Senate would substitute in section 17 a requirement for appropriation authorizations, and authorizes for fiscal year 1969 the sum of $525,000,000.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER EXPENSES OF CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 179, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 1591) on the resolution (H. Res. 1196) providing for further expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 179, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1196

Resolved, That for the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 179, Ninetieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

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

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, delete "$75,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$60,000".

On page 2, line 7, add the following:

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

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 1592) on the resolution (H. Res. 1198) to provide funds for the Committee on Agriculture, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1198

Resolved, That, effective June 1, 1968, the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 83, Ninetieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed an additional $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

SEC. 4. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, delete "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$40,000".

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I have a question, Mr. Speaker. Both of these resolutions, House Resolution 1196 and House Resolution 1198, refer to funds being paid by the committees—and I find no objection thereto—"out of the contingent fund of the House." Are these not the same funds that we had to pass a special resolution for on yesterday, allowing them to borrow about $2.5 million in order to pay for the clerk hire of the House?

Mr. FRIEDEL. What we did last night was out of the contingent funds, and this money will come out of the contingent funds. This is the usual procedure.

Mr. HALL. I know it is the usual procedure, but that is not the answer to my question, and maybe one should not expect it, but if the gentleman's statement is correct that it is the same fund, it is in pretty bad shape. So how can we vote this additional money, even though the committee did a good job of paring down the committee requests, if the fund is "busted," without borrowing more?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Then, it will be put in in a supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. HALL. But the supplemental appropriation bill is not yet law.

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. And there is no indication that it may be law before the using committees will need to begin to use these funds in part, according to the statement in the bills. Is that correct?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct. They have been using the money and this money is to sustain them for the rest of the year.

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

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield to gentleman from California if he can clear up whether the contingent fund of the House is the same as that which the Clerk of the House uses to pay the employees of the House.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. The contingency fund had a balance in it and, because the payroll had to be paid, they borrowed from the contingency fund to pay the payroll until the second supplemental was passed, but this is the same fund. However, it has a balance in it.

Mr. HALL. This is not the one that was defunct and for which we had to borrow in order to pay the bills of the Clerk

of the House that were expected to come due on July 1, as of last evening. Is that a good statement?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. The fund depleted was the payroll fund for clerk hire and other expenses and not the contingent fund.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that explanation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to sit on Monday, July 1, during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO PROCLAIM AUGUST 11, 1968, AS "FAMILY REUNION DAY"

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 165), authorizing the President to proclaim August 11, 1968, as "Family Reunion Day."

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 165

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating August 11, 1968, as "Family Reunion Day", and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2986, TO EXTEND PUBLIC LAW 480, 83D CONGRESS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2986) to extend Public Law 480, 83d Congress, for 3 years, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist upon the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. POAGE, GATHINGS, JONES of Missouri, PURCELL, BELCHER, TEAGUE of California, and Mrs. MAY.

AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, on this date 10 years ago a small group of concerned Americans gathered. Their concern was the future of our Republic with its system of checks and balances—and the continued freedom of those who would inhabit it.

From that meeting a new political force appeared, Americans for Constitutional Action—ACA. Its announced goals—active support of our Constitution and to further its aims by helping those who believed in it seek or retain congressional seats.

Working with persons of both national parties—ACA has steadily increased its assistance to constitutional conservatives through a variety of programs geared to individual use.

Many of us in both Houses have received their biannual Distinguished Service Awards throughout the years offered and value them as a reminder that we have retained our faith in the wisdom of the Constitution.

I am sure that many of my colleagues join me in saluting ACA today for what it has accomplished thus far—for the real help given to so many and the future assistance to all those who will follow.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, today we are observing an important milestone in our country's political history. A major positive force in American politics is observing its 10th anniversary. Americans for Constitutional Action—ACA—under the inspired leadership of Adm. Ben Moreell, has served and continues to serve its purpose admirably.

Dedicated to promoting responsible, constitutional government, ACA has supported candidates of both parties, awarded recognition to Members of the Congress who have upheld the precepts of constitutional government, and provided a rallying point for responsible opposition to the dangerous trend toward arbitrary, centralized Federal power.

Because of the restrained and reasonable approach of ACA, and the fact that it concentrates its time and energy in supporting candidates and officeholders dedicated to sound, conservative principles rather than in promoting publicity for itself, it is possible that some Americans are unaware of the indispensable work this fine organization is doing.

For this reason, I am taking advantage of this 10th anniversary to publicly salute Americans for Constitutional Action and commend them for the high ideals they stand for and the remarkable achievements they have to their credit.

To the distinguished Americans who serve on the board of trustees, to the competent and courteous members of the Washington staff, and to the thousands of concerned citizens whose contributions have kept ACA alive and growing, I extend my sincerest congratulations and thanks. Ten years of impressive achievement now lie behind you. In the crucial years of national decision which lie ahead, your role promises to be even more important and even more impressive.

SUPPORT FOR LYNDON JOHNSON'S PROPOSAL TO LOWER THE VOTING AGE

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has focused the Nation's attention on one of the greatest inequities in our national life—the barriers we have erected between the voting booths and the 18-year-olds who wish to vote.

The President has performed a great service to the Nation by asking Congress to vote a constitutional amendment that will permit tens of thousands of young Americans to have the opportunity of voicing their political convictions by voting for the candidate of their choice.

Our voting laws desperately need revision. For too many years we have allowed outmoded regulations to block the way to young people who have proven their maturity and sound judgment as citizens of this country.

The President has reminded us of the fact that many of these same young people whom we have denied the right to vote are now serving their country on the battlefield in Vietnam. He has reminded us further that many of these same young people are taxpayers, who deserve a voice in how the Government spends their hard-earned money. If our courts and our schools regard the 18- to 21-year-old group as responsible adults, then I think we in Congress should join this cause.

I also think we must realize that this Nation enjoys the benefits of having developed a remarkable mature and knowledgeable youth generation that deserves a more meaningful voice in the Nation's affairs.

I believe we will be a better nation for passing this constitutional amendment. And I join with President Johnson and urge my colleagues to enact it promptly.

TRIBUTE TO MEMORY OF LAMINE GUEYE OF SENEGAL

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pause a moment to pay tribute to the memory of Lamine Gueye, President of the National Assembly of Senegal, who passed away on June 10. Lamine Gueye was born 76 years ago in the French Sudan and lived to become President of the legislative body of an independent Senegal. After receiving a doctorate in law from Paris, President Gueye engaged in the practice of law but soon entered political life. He served as mayor of the important Senegalese town of St. Louis and also as mayor of Dakar for 16 years. Immediately following the Second World War he was a member of the French National Assembly. In 1960 Mr. Gueye contended with Leopold Sedar Senghor for the Presidency of the Mali Confederation. He lost the election but in a pragmatic, patriotic way that was so typical of him he immediately forgot the rancors of the campaign and loyally served his Chief of State and his country as President of the National Assembly.

We had the pleasure of welcoming him as a leader grantee to the United States in 1965. Madam Gueye also came to our country as a leader grantee in her capacity as a prominent figure in the Senegalese National Red Cross.

It is therefore fitting that we stop to pay tribute today to the memory of this great African statesman and friend of America.

PELLY COMMENDS ICC REQUEST FOR TRAIN STUDY

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, 99 years ago a golden spike was driven into the ground near Ogden, Utah, marking the connection of East-West railroad service. Today, in less than a century, train passenger service is far from golden. In fact, Ogden, Utah, has become known by travelers on the Union Pacific's train No. 6, between Los Angeles and Omaha, Nebr., as the site of a 35-minute dinner break.

This is only one example of hundreds which could be cited of the deterioration of rail passenger service. It is well known to the Nation's train travelers that the Southern Pacific, in its desire to discontinue its New Orleans to Los Angeles train, the Sunset, even eliminated sleeping and eating facilities. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, under ICC regulations, even cattle are to be fed and watered every 24 hours; the same provisions do not appear necessary for humans by some passenger train carriers.

So, today I commend that part of the Interstate Commerce Commission's recommendation which calls for a study to be made either by Congress or by the Department of Transportation on the need for a national railroad passenger system.

Mr. Speaker, modern rail transportation is vitally needed in the United States. There is no doubt that faster and sometimes less expensive transportation is available. But, there is a segment of our population that wants and deserves train transportation, and it should not be the prerogative of the management of some carriers to cause disouraging discomforts in their quest to discourage passenger service. And, there is the national need in time of emergencies which must be remembered.

I have discussed this problem with the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], and urged him to investigate this problem. His committee has a grave responsibility to seek a solution for the plight of the train traveler.

LACK OF DEBATE ON CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised, and regret to say no longer shocked, to find that the House proceeded in a disorderly fashion by taking up the continuing appropriation before the 1-minute rule. I had waited around last night believing this was scheduled at that time, and was anxious to participate in the debate. The Republican leadership was not informed of this procedure nor was the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee, the committee handling the bill.

This is a serious matter, and it should never have been passed in such a fashion.

I want to read the following from the UPI wires of June 25:

> The White House indicated Tuesday that it might be months before President Johnson reaches any decision on where to cut $6 billion from his budget for fiscal 1969. White House Press Secretary George Christian said he did not see how the President could make any cuts until all appropriation bills for the budget have been approved by Congress.

Now fiscal year 1969 begins on July 1, and if there is any real cutting of expenditures, it is already planned and in being.

The answer is that the President is not about to abide by this restriction of the Congress and now apparently he openly states it.

This needed to have been discussed during the debate on this continuing resolution because Congress has the right to do something about it and get hold of this situation.

I might say I am writing to the President to find out the correctness of this press release. This matter is approaching a point where possibly impeachment proceedings may be the only way to get the President to abide by the laws.

CONGRESSMAN SMITH INTRODUCES KIOWA, COMANCHE, AND APACHE TRIBE JUDGMENT FUND LEGISLATION

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which authorizes payment by the Government of $6 million in judgment funds to the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Oklahoma.

The Indian Claims Commission has found that these tribes are entitled to a judgment award of the above moneys, and the judgment has been entered on dockets 258 and 259. The Congress appropriated the funds necessary to pay these funds this year, and the President signed the payment bill into effect on June 19, 1968.

The bill authorizes payment to the members of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Oklahoma on a per capita basis based on the enrollees of the tribes appearing on a roll prepared in accordance with the act of September 21, 1959, and approved by the tribes on May 20, 1960. The roll is authorized to be updated to include the addition of newborns and the deletion of decedents as of the date of enactment of the legislation.

In keeping with our American principles of government and fair play, I am pleased to introduce this important legislation which will meet the requirement of equity and responsibility. I am grateful for the privilege of serving these tribal members of our American Indians, most of whom live within the congressional district that I represent. The Indian people of Oklahoma have a long and distinguished heritage, but the history of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache tribes stands out as a credit to my State and our Nation. I urge speedy action on this measure by my colleagues.

AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an important date and to salute the Americans for Constitutional Action. On June 27, the ACA will observe its 10th anniversary. I join with its many friends throughout the Nation in congratulating

the organization upon its first decade of public service. Also to extend my personal good wishes for its continued success.

The ACA performs an important function. It is a nonpartisan organization dedicated to promoting a better understanding of the Constitution and our Republic. The ACA has achieved a splendid record for integrity, as well as the clear and concise reporting of the programs it conducts to perpetuate constitutional government.

We are proud of the work the ACA is doing. Its high ideals and purposes are essential to the understanding of freedom and responsible government. I certainly commend those in charge of the organization for their devotion to the public weal and for the efforts they make in explaining the broad ramifications of traditional Americanism.

I also wish these leaders and the ACA well in their future endeavors. Theirs is a vital task. In seeing to it that the Nation is informed, it is necessary to know the forces at work that keep the Republic functioning as it was conceived and formed when the Founding Fathers drafted the first government of its kind in the history of the world.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. 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. 213]

Ashley	Holland	Resnick
Baring	Howard	Scheuer
Bolling	Jones, Mo.	Steiger, Ariz.
Bow	Karsten	Sullivan
Burton, Utah	Kornegay	Taft
Corman	Laird	Thompson, N.J.
Downing	Long, La.	Vanik
Edwards, La.	May	Watkins
Evins, Tenn.	Mayne	Willis
Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara, Mich.	
Hawkins	Passman	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 402 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1401 UNTIL MIDNIGHT, JUNE 29

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight, Saturday night, June 29, to file a conference report on Senate bill 1401, to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate today on the legislative appropriation bill.

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

There was no objection.

VIVA HEMISFAIR! VIVA HENRY!

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it was my real privilege to be able to visit HemisFair '68 in San Antonio, Tex., last weekend, and there on Sunday, the 23d, participate in Henry B. Gonzales Day. To say he is held in high esteem by his fellow citizens is an understatement. He is a real hero to his people. Again and again we heard shouts of "Viva Henry!"

My reason for taking this time today is to say to the House that those who supported the funding for HemisFair need never apologize to anyone at any time. Without detracting from our neighbors to the north, HemisFair has everything you could find at Expo '67 without having to walk several miles to see it. HemisFair is compact and yet contains a wide variety of attractions. With the theme, "Confluence of the Americas," HemisFair is a brilliant meeting ground for all countries and all peoples to display and compare history, religion, cultures, and, not to forget, the people's pleasures.

Some of you may be wondering why a Missourian is so lavish in his praise of a Texas fair. My reply is this fair earns the praise of anyone who visits it. Every exhibit I visited was excellent. Most refreshing of all is that you can walk the grounds, and the business district of San Antonio, and never find a hippie or a beatnik.

We know our Members will have no free time from now until after October 6, when HemisFair closes, yet I hope you will not neglect to urge your constituents to this year re-visit America, including HemisFair, to see the most interesting, exciting, brilliant, and impressive series of exhibits which make up HemisFair '68.

CONGRESSMEN SHOULD BE PUT ON RECORD

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the performance of our House of Representatives yesterday was disgraceful.

We spent over $17 billion of the taxpayers' money, but could not get enough Members to stand up and have a record vote.

Amendments were adopted increasing the bill by millions of dollars, and this after all of the hot air in the debate supporting a tax increase which was supposed to include budget cuts.

I think the House rules should be changed in two major respects. First, all legislation appropriating money should require a record vote of the Members. Second, because of the "sweetener" technique where much of the bad is included in good, for purposes of passage, it seems to me this lumping together business should be discontinued and prohibit more than one executive department in single appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, in 1965 I introduced House resolutions in an effort to accomplish amending the House rules along these lines, and I am today again introducing identical resolutions to meet this problem.

Obviously the merits of appropriations for the FBI should not be saddled with questionable funds for some State Department program. And whenever taxpayer funds are voted, the American people are entitled to know who voted for the spending and against the spending, as a matter of record.

HENRY B. GONZALEZ DAY AT THE HEMISFAIR

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I gladly join the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] in his comments upon our visit to the Hemisfair on the weekend just passed. Particularly were those of us from the House delegation thrilled with the reception that was given to our colleague, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, on the day designated as "Henry B. Gonzalez Day" last Sunday at the Hemisfair.

This fair is truly an exciting exhibition. Indeed, it surpasses all of the other international fairs that I have been privileged to attend. I believe all of us who might see it would appreciate and applaud the U.S. exhibit at the Hemisfair, dedicated as it is to this great melting pot of ours consonant with the Hemisfair theme, The Confluence of Civilizations.

The entire exhibit stresses the strength of the United States derived from this melding cauldron into which have been poured so many diverse metals which create the American alloy, stronger and

more durable than any one of its ingredients.

The U.S. exhibit demonstrates the great progress that has been made in blending and weaving into the mainstream of American life these divergent strands of thread that have become together the great and colorful fabric of American life.

The exhibit does not ignore our problems, but its theme is both honest and hopeful.

I think it is a great exhibit and one that all of us in the Congress should see, and I believe that once seeing it, everyone of us would agree that our Government's money was well spent.

The HemisFair itself is fully worth the visit.

TEXAS HEMISFAIR

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was privileged to visit HemisFair in San Antonio, Tex., last weekend with several of our colleagues including the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] who is absent today by necessity and who told me last evening that he had to be away; our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN]; the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]; and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] who has just spoken with eloquence, and with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT]. Together with our wives we visited HemisFair.

It was indeed an amazing thing—even for those of us from Texas who, of course, may be afflicted with bias. HemisFair offers more than we are able to recite to you here but I give you assurance that it will afford you a most wonderful experience.

I am quite a long way from that area, but the reception there—the tribute paid to our colleague, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, was an experience. It was inspiring to see the wonderful response to a Member who represents them here in the House of Representatives. It was an outpouring of appreciation—yes, affection for a dedicated public servant.

I hope all our colleagues will have the opportunity to go to Texas to the HemisFair this fall. I know you will be highly pleased and I can assure you the "red carpet" will be laid out for you.

LES ARENDS—25 YEARS AS WHIP FOR REPUBLICANS

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, for 25 years, a quarter of a century, our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, has served the Republicans in the House of Representatives as our whip.

He has served not only me, but my predecessors, with loyalty, wisdom, skill, and with dignity.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, wish to express my appreciation to LES ARENDS on this occasion. I speak as well for those who for one reason or another cannot be here just now.

Mr. Speaker, LES ARENDS has been and is a good friend of mine and, as I said a moment ago, no one could ask for more in the way of loyalty or service or assistance.

I congratulate and commend LES for this long and able service which I think is a record in the House of Representatives for the job of whip—I know on our side of the aisle—and I suspect the same is true for the Democrat side of the aisle.

I praise LES ARENDS for his great accomplishments of the past and wish him the very best in the future.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to take the floor and pay a tribute to a man who is to continue in our midst. Generally, our remarks are directed to those who are retiring or have passed away.

I am pleased to say a word about my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, who has for a quarter of a century been our whip on the Republican side of the aisle.

As the regional eastern whip of the organization, I know something about the way in which he has conducted the duties of his office. His lashes as whip have never been biting—he has always attempted to steer the Members on this side of the aisle through friendly persuasion. I believe he has done a truly effective job. I knew the name of LES ARENDS long before I came to this House. I knew much about him. He has certainly measured up to the wonderful things that I had heard about him. I consider him among my closest friends in this House, and I look forward to having him serve here for many years to come.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to and expressing commendation for our great friend LESLIE ARENDS, of Illinois. As one of the members of the whip organization, I have been in touch with this gentleman for nearly 10 years. I have found him a delightful person with whom to work, a man who is dedicated, not only to his party, but also to his country. He has rendered great service to his Nation in his capacity not only as a Member of Congress, but as part of the leadership on our side of the aisle.

I would like to join my colleagues, in congratulating LES ARENDS for having served in this capacity for a quarter of a century, and also in expressing our desire that he commence and continue to serve for another quarter of a century.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve under LES ARENDS' leadership now for 8 years. Prior to that time I had the benefit of his counsel during the days when I was contemplating and undertaking a campaign. It has been a great rewarding experience for me, and I know that I speak for my colleagues from Illinois in expressing appreciation for the great leadership to his country that LES ARENDS has provided.

I share the feelings just expressed by the gentleman from Ohio. In respect of LES ARENDS, 25 years is just a good beginning.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to have the opportunity of saying a few words with regard to the minority whip on this occasion. The 25 years of service as minority whip is a new record.

I would like to say that I have had the privilege of working with this distinguished and dedicated American for some 8 years as assistant whip, and since that time as part of the leadership. He is a member of the Coordinating Committee on which I have the privilege of serving with the leadership, as well.

I would like to say to my good friend LES that I wish, as I know all Members of this House wish also, that he shall have the opportunity of serving the Congress many, many more years in the dedicated fashion that he has served it in the past.

I congratulate him for the manner in which he conducts that office.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we Members of the House all like LES ARENDS, of Illinois. It is a pleasure to have LES ARENDS continue his duties as Republican whip.

We of the progressive wing of the Republican Party like Congressman LES ARENDS just as much as the conservative wing of the Republican Party.

I hope LES ARENDS will continue for many years as Republican whip even though the pay is zero, the hours long, the chase hard, and in the end usually the thanks are also zero, and the leadership gets the credit for successes. Congressman LES ARENDS is the "but if" section of the Republican Party. If there is a close vote loss, LES ARENDS gets the "but if" routine from everybody. "But if," so many were not absent—"but if," LES ARENDS had used more pressure instead of understanding the Member's problems in the district back home, "but if" LES ARENDS was not such an agreeable, friendly guy, and so forth. In fact, it is a whip with a pleasant ring of cheerfulness that Congressman LES ARENDS wields. It is not a whip that stings at all. We Republican Members like LES ARENDS and hope that he will continue his friendly, zig-zag course, which always keeps his actions within the bounds of

the possible and keeps a wry smile in the face of defeat, and a surprised happy look on manna from the skies on occasional unexpected victories.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the aisle wish to join the minority Members in congratulating LES ARENDS on attaining 25 years of service as whip with the minority party. We join in wishing him well for another 25 years as a leader for that Grand Old Party which fortunately for us will likely remain the minority party.

Seriously, we of the majority party, have often wished that LES ARENDS were on our team instead of on the opposing team. So we salute a worthy adversary, but a great American, nevertheless.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join our colleagues in congratulating LES ARENDS. I think we have been very fortunate to have a man of his disposition and his caliber in the Congress of the United States. I just want to add my voice from the Minnesota delegation in congratulating LES ARENDS and thank him very much. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, one of LES ARENDS' best friends.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that LES ARENDS does not have a better friend in the House than GEORGE MAHON. We came here together. We have enjoyed a close association and friendship for nearly 34 years. We have often discussed the problems which confront our country in the legislative area and otherwise. I continue to take great pride in the accomplishments and sterling qualities of this very outstanding American citizen, friend, and legislator.

Congratulations, LES.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to LES ARENDS. I knew LES even before I came to the House as a Member. We became acquainted shortly after he entered Congress in 1935, when I was serving as secretary to former Congressman Edwin M. Schaefer.

After I entered the House as a Member in January 1945, my first committee assignment was on the old Military Affairs Committee. I served on that committee with LES, and for the past 22 years I have served with him on the Armed Services Committee. He is also a member of another committee on which I have the privilege of serving, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

If I have any criticism at all of LES, it would be that he has been too efficient and too effective as minority whip, and sometimes we on the Democratic side of the aisle have felt the results of his efficiency.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to and offering sincere congratulations to a great legislator, and to a really true friend.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, anyone who can survive for 25 years as Republican whip in the House of Representatives has got to be good. In many ways, the job of whip is a thankless assignment that involves a lot more than just taking polls, calling Members to the floor, and putting out notices of the program for the following week. And I must say, the title "whip" is really a misnomer. You just do not line up Members—especially if you are in the minority—by applying the lash.

Believe me, it will not work, as LES ARENDS can attest.

What success in the office of whip—or any other position of leadership—requires is a personal facility for conciliation, for bringing together divergent views through reason and, may I say, through an ability to persuade. As one of LES ARENDS' earliest supporters for the position he has held for 25 years—longer than anyone else in the history of the Congress—I think I can qualify as an expert on the outstanding job he has done.

In the many legislative battles, during the time I served as majority leader and minority leader, he was my strong right arm on the floor of the House.

And I know, first hand, how much new Members have benefited from the generously given counsel by my colleague; sound counsel born of knowledge gained through experience.

Beyond that, I know of the contributions he has made as a member of the Republican leadership which met regularly with President Dwight D. Eisenhower during his 8 years in the White House, contributions which he continues to make as a member of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership in its meetings since General Eisenhower's tenure.

Beyond my respect for LES ARENDS as a distinguished legislator is my affection for him as a close, personal friend. Ours is a friendship that dates back to the days when we met as freshmen of the 74th Congress.

The district he has represented through the years—the 17th of Illinois, and the one I represent—the second of Indiana, are adjacent.

As a result, it has been my pleasure to meet and know many of his constituents, and I can assure you that many of mine know and admire LES ARENDS as a result of the many times he has visited with us.

All you need to do to know LES ARENDS is take him on in a game of golf. You will find him a fierce competitor who plays by the rules of the game, for fun or for keeps.

This is the LES ARENDS I know, and I am proud to have him as a friend.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the occasion of the 25th anniversary of my good friend and colleague from the State of Illinois, LES ARENDS, as the Republican whip. Since his election as whip in 1943, he has distinguished himself in the service of the Republican Party in particular and the Congress in general.

Few Members of this great body can boast of the dedication to service and country which accounted for his rise, in less than 10 years in these Chambers, from freshman Congressman to minority whip, one of the most responsible positions in the Congress.

LES ARENDS developed his talents and abilities well as he grew up in his home district, the 17th Congressional District in Illinois. He received his college education at Oberlin College in Ohio, and pursued graduate studies leading to a LL.D. degree at Illinois Wesleyan University.

In 1934, LES ARENDS came to Congress to serve the people of his area and to assist in the great task of charting a course for our Nation, then barely regaining its footing after a devastating depression. Since that time we have fought a world war and have experienced a wealth of other national and international crises. In each new Congress since that one in 1934, LES ARENDS was there to provide dynamism and strength to the efforts of the Congress in meeting our problems, national and international. He has, further, been a man of integrity and action in the cause of the Republican Party, and deserved well the recognition bestowed on him in his 1943 election as minority whip.

In 1952, I came to this House, and as a freshman Congressman was grateful for the leadership and interest shown by this veteran in newly elected Members. Nearly 16 years later, as we finish the second session of the 90th Congress, I find that his interest in his colleagues and in the work of the House has grown even deeper and more devoted.

His dedication to the work of Congress and to the principles of the Republican Party continues to be filled with the same zeal that we find in ourselves in those first few years here—a zeal which sometimes fades with the passing of time. LES ARENDS has grown with the times; he has become, in the years that he has spent in this Chamber, more determined than ever in his drive to move America forward. He has, in his 25 years as the Republican whip, furthered the cause of republicanism, and therefore, the great political system which is unique to our country.

For some years now I have served under LES ARENDS as the regional whip for the States of Michigan and Wisconsin and I have always been impressed by the enthusiasm and interest he has shown in his work. It has been one of my greatest pleasures to have served with the gentleman from Illinois, and I look forward to many more pleasant and productive years as this Nation and its people move forward.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the opportunity I have had to serve as a regional whip under LES ARENDS has been a source of real pride. It has been an experience which has been made pleasant and rewarding because of his leadership. His long tenure of service is due primarily to his devotion to the duties of whip which he has performed faithfully and conscientiously. Probably no leader has dedicated himself more to his job than has LES ARENDS. During the years I have

served him as a regional whip, I have yet to find one instance where there was an error in judgment or a lack of attention to every single detail. In addition to being a perfectionist, he has a personality which is ideally suited to the demands of the office. I am pleased to add to the tributes which are being directed to him at this time in recognition of his great contribution to the legislative process over these many years. And I certainly extend to him my congratulations and best wishes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join in this richly deserved, spontaneous tribute to my dear, valued friend, committee colleague, and colleague in the House for many years, LES ARENDS.

The bonds of warm, loyal friendship hold us closely together in this great legislative body, and it is an honor and high privilege for me to add my sincere expressions to the remarks made so aptly and so eloquently by our able, esteemed, distinguished friend, the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

LES ARENDS is one of the finest gentlemen that I have ever known. He is warm, friendly, and courteous by instinct, and he is a great human being, considerate and generous of impulse.

He is an engaging companion and a loyal friend, possessed of a keen, alert mind, outstanding ability, a great American, totally dedicated to his district, State, and country.

Throughout the years of his distinguished service, he has made many splendid, enduring contributions to the procedures and efficiency of the House and to the defense, progress, and advancement of the Nation.

In the field of defense and security alone, these contributions have been truly magnificent, and they have been commendably motivated solely to keeping our great country strong and enduring, not only militarily but materially, and spiritually as well, so that no enemy, or combination of enemies, can ever successfully challenge or endanger the safety of our shores and homes, the national interest and security, and the freedoms we so dearly prize.

I could not speak too enthusiastically or stress too much the loyalty, the patriotic spirit, the fine personal qualities, the many outstanding achievements of this very dear friend and admired and beloved colleague.

Heartiest congratulations to him, his lovely wife and family, and all his dear ones, and his constituents on this occasion, when he is so proudly and joyfully hailed and saluted by his colleagues, regardless of partisan labels.

Today, we pay tribute and honor to a cherished friend and great American, LES ARENDS.

I wish for him and his family continued good health, success in his endeavors, and real peace, contentment, achievement, and happiness for many years to come.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, LES ARENDS has completed 25 years as Republican whip in the House. To be recognized for a position of leadership by his peers is a remarkable achievement in itself, but when it extends for 25 years it is all the more outstanding.

I have only been in the House for 1½ years, but I have become well acquainted with LES ARENDS as our whip. In times of trouble—needing advice—or frivolity, LES has been there.

I commend LES for these 25 years of service, but moreso I commend the Republicans in the House who have seen fit to keep him in this position of leadership.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. His 25 years of service as Republican whip is only one of many records set by him in service to the people of this Nation. It is a great honor to serve with this dedicated American and to have him as a friend.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to my good friend, LES ARENDS. Since I came to Congress, now nearly 8 years ago, I have served on the Republican whip organization. LES has been a real friend and adviser to me. I know of no Member of this House that has been more generous with his time and help than has LES. I recall as a freshman in this House, now many years ago, LES would always take time to explain the complex procedures of this body, and give me advice and assistance in the problems that faced me. I shall always be grateful to LES ARENDS, and wish him every success and many more years in his position of leadership. I have enjoyed knowing him, and my service under him on the whip organization has been most enjoyable.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] for his long service as Republican whip.

Having served longer than any other whip is a tremendous record, one which will probably never be excelled in length of time.

Length of time is of small moment, however, when the quality and dedication of his service is evaluated. The excellence of his performance is also unexcelled. He has served several floor leaders all with consistent competence and dedication.

I am grateful for the special opportunity to serve with and for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. He has added stature and respect to the important function of party whip.

I wish for him many more years of service in the House and as Republican whip.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in extending my heartiest congratulations to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable LESLIE ARENDS on the occasion of his 25th anniversary as Republican whip of the House. I have been privileged to serve with him on the House Armed Services Committee and have enjoyed working under him in the 89th Congress as assistant whip of the New York delegation.

LES ARENDS' personal attributes are well known to us all. The genuine affection and respect which he commands on both sides of the aisle is the mark of distinction which should be an inspiration to all of us here and indeed to all Americans who follow in his footsteps.

It is my hope that the district he so capably represents in Illinois will continue his service in the Congress for many, many more years.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in my 16 years as a Member of this body, I have participated in dozens of oral tributes paid by the membership to distinguished colleagues. In adding to the justly deserved accolades paid to my good friend, LES ARENDS, I do so with an unusual degree of pleasure.

Just yesterday I happened to make the statement in the Republican Cloakroom that if I were asked to name the man I thought was "the nicest guy in Congress" I would name the smiling and kindly gentleman from Illinois, LES ARENDS. Today I am motivated to make that statement publicly as a part of the RECORD, because, Mr. Speaker, there could be no nicer man alive or one I respect more than our Republican Party whip, the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS.

Party responsibility is one of the principal pillars upon which free government is built. Without a division of responsibility between those who propose and those who conscientiously oppose when the national need requires it, we would have no democracy. The result would be either the sterility of a government dominated by narrow ideas and ideals, or it would be the chaos of too many ideas channeled everywhere, but getting nowhere. LES ARENDS has been the type of man who has understood partisanship and has served it well, but at the same time he has been a great respecter of the individual Member's sincerely held views or opinions.

In my experience in this body, I know of no person who has contributed more to free and honest government, or who has more justly earned the deep respect and love of his colleagues.

I am proud to consider myself a friend of the man who has ably served the Republican Party for 25 years as its whip—the nicest guy in Congress—the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join in this tribute to one of our most outstanding colleagues, LES ARENDS. His efficiency and effectiveness as Republican whip are well known.

This effectiveness would not have been possible were it not for his pleasant manner and agreeable personality.

LES has certainly contributed greatly not only to our party, but to our Nation, in the years that he has served in the Congress. I hope that we may have many more years of service together in the House, and wish him very well in the future.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I find great pleasure in this opportunity to offer a few words of commendation and praise to our highly respected colleague and Republican whip, the Honorable LES ARENDS, of Illinois. I think back to when I first came to this Congress, now almost 10 years ago. I guess I shall always remember the gracious welcome and most thoughtful offer of assistance that he conveyed to me on the opening day of

that session. I am sure that I speak for a good many Members of this House when I say that new Members have always found sound and reliable counsel from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] during their first session, when such counsel is of great help and importance.

It has already been mentioned that the assignment of whip is a difficult one. It takes great diplomacy and finesse to accomplish the objective of the whip assignment and still keep everybody happy. The many testimonials offered here today attest to the fact that he has performed with great proficiency and finesse.

One could go on at great length in talking about the outstanding qualities and character of this man. May it suffice for me to say that my days here in this House have surely been made more productive and more pleasant by the fact that I have been able to number him as one of my friends. It has been my experience that his concerns always gave consideration to my wishes and welfare. While my life as a Member of Congress has been greatly enriched, probably it is more important that this country, his district and State, and, in fact, the entire world have been enriched because of his dedication to the best interests of all of our people.

I want to extend to him and his family my fondest hope that the future will hold for him many more years of service to his country, and that they may be as rewarding and satisfying to them as his services have provided satisfaction and comforts to all who have known and worked with him.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues and pay tribute to my friend and colleague, LES ARENDS. A man of sterling qualities. LES ARENDS has served his country, State, and party long and well. The fact that the Republican membership of this body has elected and reelected him as its whip for the past 25 years is evidence of the confidence and high regard in which they hold him. He has that rare ability to counsel, not demand; to reason, not to dictate.

LES ARENDS has not only served the Republican Party ably, his sage advice has saved many new Members from political embarrassment.

I salute you LES. May you serve the Republican Members in this body for many years to come.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to join the distinguished minority leader in saluting our dear friend and colleague, LES ARENDS, for his 25 years of service as Republican whip. As one who has had the opportunity to work closely with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois in our day-to-day efforts to move forward with the business of the House of Representatives and the business of the country, I can say without hesitation or equivocation that he has always put the business of the country above party or self.

He has served is party and this House well and ably during his 25 years as whip. He is a stanch Republican, but more than that a great and patriotic American.

We look forward to many more years of distinguished service from our good friend. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Michigan has taken the time to allow us to express these sentiments today. I am very proud to be able to join in congratulating our friend, LES ARENDS, on this occasion.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our esteemed friend and long associate, LES ARENDS.

We have a saying in my part of the country that "a man's word is his bond." I have found this true in my contacts with the able and distinguished gentleman from Illinois who is respected by everyone.

I congratulate him, the Republican Party, and our country by reason of his leadership and his service in this body on the occasion of his 25th anniversary as the Republican whip in the Congress.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to join in the accolades that are being bestowed upon the distinguished minority whip, the Honorable LES ARENDS, upon this 25th milestone of his service.

The best testimonial to LES ARENDS' effectiveness is the number of times he has been reelected to this responsible position.

From a more personal standpoint, few Members of the House have been more helpful to me than has the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. He, in large part, is responsible for the cohesiveness and the esprit de corps that has been developed on this side of the aisle under the able leadership of the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

When I came here as a fledgling Member, LES ARENDS was never too busy to give me words of advice and counsel which quite possibly saved me some embarrassing votes later on. His parliamentary genius and ability to foresee complicating circumstances and to put first things first are recognized by all who have been privileged to serve under his guidance.

So I count it a privilege to join today in honoring the distinguished minority whip, a Congressman's Congressman and an outstanding and helpful gentleman who does credit to his State, to this body, and to the party in which he serves.

My only hope is that his status can be elevated from the minority to the majority in the new 91st Congress opening in January.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] is presently in his 25th year as Republican whip in the House of Representatives. I am pleased to join with my colleagues today in honoring the gentleman for his remarkable record. No other Member of this body, past or present, has served as party whip for such a long period of time. As a relative newcomer to the House, I look with considerable awe upon my colleagues, such as the gentleman from Illinois, who have managed to survive politically for 25 years and more. To be returned to the House election after election is in itself a great tribute. But, it seems to me, it is an even greater tribute to a Member of this body to be elected, Congress after Congress, to an important position of party leadership. In every Congress since 1943 the gentleman from Illinois has been selected by vote of the Republicans in this body to the position of party whip. This speaks more highly of LES ARENDS and more effectively dramatizes the confidence, esteem, and respect in which he is held than any words of mine can do. I salute the gentleman for having served for such a long period of time, and I salute him for having served so well. Obviously, had he not carried out the functions of the important office he holds with great skill and dedication, he would not have been returned to it with such regularity. It is my privilege to serve as an assistant regional whip and work under the gentleman's direction. I can personally testify to his effectiveness. I can further testify that, in terms of genuine concern for the House of Representatives and its Members, the gentleman from Illinois has no superiors. We as a party are fortunate indeed to have him here, but in a larger sense, the House of Representatives as an institution is fortunate that he serves here. May LES ARENDS be with us for a long time yet, and may his kind increase.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has been my great pleasure and honor to serve as one of the assistant Republican whips under the able leadership and direction of the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois. I considered it a great honor to have been appointed to this job and I have enjoyed my position immensely.

On thing that I have observed is the very fine and excellent way in which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] conducts the office of whip on the Republican side. He is a person dedicated to the minority party, always is faithful to the principles and policies as enunciated by the leadership and uses all of his efforts in getting as many Republicans as possible to support the Republican cause.

I had previously served as whip for 4 years in the Pennsylvania State Legislature and I know what a trying position the office of whip is. The whip is the good right arm of the floor leader, and I have often said that a floor leader is as strong as his whip.

I would say that the reason for the strong Republican position in this session of Congress has been because of the able direction of the whip organization as led by the gentleman from Illinois. The Congress has certainly been well rewarded by his presence here and he has been a devoted servant to his party, to his State, and to the Nation.

It is my great pleasure to join with others in celebrating his 25th anniversary as whip.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, there are a few jobs more important, and more thankless, than that of party whip. For 25 years LES ARENDS has quietly and conscientiously held the reins on Republican House Members, applying the whip when needed. The thanks we owe him is long overdue and entirely inadequate, but certainly most sincere.

As a personal note, may I add that I have had frequent occasion to visit in Illinois' 17th District, since my daughter and family reside there. I know of the high regard with which he is held by the

"folks back home," and indeed they are fortunate to have had LES working for them in Washington since 1935.

We House Republicans are fortunate, also, to have had LES as our whip this past quarter century. We salute you, LES, for a job well done.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a wonderful thing just to serve in this House of Representatives and particularly so when we can be a party to history in the making. I recall the day in this House when the late distinguished Speaker, Sam Rayburn, exceeded the record of Henry Clay for serving longer than any other man as Speaker.

Today is another memorable one, for my neighboring colleague, who has represented the 17th District of Illinois so ably for 34 years, has now served as whip of our party in this body for longer than any man in the history of our country. Twenty-five years is a mighty long time, but how much more dramatic when we consider his 25 years in a leadership role as whip of his party.

We all have a great affection for LES ARENDS. I can recall his taking me under his wing when I came to this body as a freshman Member. I have always appreciated his willingness to spend time with the junior Members and give of his best advice and experience, acquired over the many years he has been here. Now, it is my good fortune under his tutoring to serve in his whip organization, and I hope the association will continue for many years to come. I want to extend my heartiest congratulations to my leader and great friend, LES ARENDS, on his most notable achievement.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper, to paraphrase another great statesman from Illinois, for this House to honor today LES ARENDS. It is further fitting and proper that this honor come from both sides of the aisle. I do not believe that another American in the history of our Nation has served his party as whip longer than LES ARENDS. This Congress and this Nation can be proud of the courtly and gentlemanly manner in which the gentleman has served as whip. He has always added luster, and reflected great credit on the House of Representatives as an institution—the people's institution.

We admire LES ARENDS, because without question, he has always placed the welfare of our country and the House of Representatives above any other consideration. He has upheld and protected the prerogatives and honor of the House of Representatives. LES ARENDS has been a warm personal friend to all of those who served with him. This House is a greater body because LES ARENDS has served for 25 years as whip of his party—as majority whip and as minority whip.

When I first came to this House in January 1947, one of the men who stood out was LES ARENDS. I did not hesitate to seek his wise counsel and advice. He was particularly kind, courteous, and encouraging to the young and new Members of the House.

On this day, LES, when you have reached 25 years of continuous service as whip, may I congratulate you. Mrs. Dorn and my people whom I represent, and who have permitted me to remain here and vote very much as you have voted, join with me in wishing for you every continued success, much admiration, and highest esteem always.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to the many others who have spoken out in tribute to our esteemed colleague, LES ARENDS, who has served the Congress and his party with a devotion and dedication envied by most of his fellow Members, and certainly admired by all.

It is my understanding that a thorough study of the evolvement of the duties of a party whip has shown that our colleague has held this vital position longer than any man on either side of the aisle. I would add that I would believe that he has been as effective as any other man who has ever held the position, and far and away more effective than most. I salute LES ARENDS, and hope that he will continue to serve the Nation of his party for many more productive years. I have many fond recollections of LES giving assistance to a new and naive Wisconsinite who came to Congress in January 1961, and I shall never forget the trouble he took to make me feel at home. I salute his 25 years as Republican whip, but I also salute LES ARENDS the man.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the junior Members of this great body, I want to join with his many friends and admirers in this tribute to the distinguished minority whip, LES ARENDS.

LES has been as thoughtful, kind and considerate to all of the Members, both freshmen and senior, as is humanly possible. His patience, his advice, his helpfulness have been constant. He has earned the gratitude, respect and warm friendship of every Member on this side of the aisle, although as the distinguished Speaker has so aptly said, his duties as whip sometimes require that he crack the whip.

I believe it fair to say that this tribute to the distinguished Member from Illinois is unreservedly joined in by every Member of the House on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members of the House today in heartiest congratulations to LES ARENDS on the 25th anniversary of his service as a Republican leader in the House of Representatives.

LES ARENDS has served well and faithfully both as a Republican leader and as the Representative of his district in Illinois. His friends in Congress and throughout the country are legion and I am sure they would want to be included with all of us in congratulations and good wishes on this occasion.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, LES ARENDS is a native of Ford County in Illinois and in his warm personality, his friendliness, his open and honest approach to people and to problems, he truly represents the spirit of the five men and women of the county where he was born. I am happy to join my colleagues in a salute of appreciation and of affection to him on the completion of 25 years of service as the Republican whip of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.

Joseph Cannon, of Illinois, was Speaker of the House in four Congresses. Henry Rainey, of Illinois, was Speaker of the House in the 73d Congress. James Mann, of Illinois, was minority floor leader of the House from the 62d to the 65th Congress. Adolph Sabath, of Illinois, was elected a Member of the House in 24 Congresses, a record. Thomas O'Brien, of Illinois, was a Member of tremendous influence in many Congresses, was a determining factor in the election of Sam Rayburn as majority leader, leading to his eventual election as Speaker of the House.

In this select group of sons of Illinois, among the "immortals" of the House must be included LES ARENDS. A quarter of a century as the whip of one of the two great parties, a quarter of a century of uninterrupted leadership in the Congress of the United States, is a record that stands out as the sun in the skies.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join my colleagues in paying tribute to LES ARENDS of Illinois for his remarkable record of 25 years as Republican whip in the House of Representatives.

The fact that Republicans in every Congress since 1943 have seen fit to place their trust in LES ARENDS' leadership is a compliment which I cannot match with words. Personally, I owe a great deal to the gentleman. The quality of his guidance; the skill and dedication which he brings to the job has been a source of inspiration to many of us during this last quarter century. Regardless of whether one is a veteran of 2 or 20 years, he can appreciate the value of such a friend and colleague.

LES ARENDS has served this House and our country long and well. May he continue to do so for another 25 years.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the Honorable LES ARENDS, the gentleman from Illinois, who has earnestly served the Republicans in the House of Representatives as our party whip for the past 25-years. I have found LES ARENDS to be a delightful person to work with, a man who is dedicated not only to his party, but also to his country. He has rendered a great service to his Nation in his capacity, not only as a Member of Congress, but as the party whip. His efficiency and effectiveness as Republican whip are well known to his colleagues; this could have only been made possible by a man whose sincerity and pleasant personality are of the highest degree. This distinguished gentleman is one of the most dedicated Members of the House.

During my service in the Congress I know of no person who has contributed more to free and honest government, or who has more justly earned the deep respect and admiration of his colleagues.

While my years as a Member of Congress have been greatly enriched through my association with LES ARENDS, it is more important that this country, and the entire world, has been enriched because of his dedication to the best interests of all our people.

I take great pleasure in congratulating and commending LES ARENDS for his long and able service. I also want to extend to him and his family my fondest apprecia-

tion for his continuing efforts. I hope that he may be privileged to serve many more years in the House, and wish him and his family well, in the future.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a proud day for our Republican whip, my colleague from Illinois, LES ARENDS. Indeed, it is a proud day for the Congress of the United States that we can honor LES ARENDS on the 25th anniversary of his service as Republican whip of the House.

As a fellow Representative from the State of Illinois, I feel that we have a special asset in Congressman LES ARENDS. He is part of the leadership which is consulted and which helps to formulate policy in the Congress and in the Nation. In addition, he is a courageous and independent thinking citizen. LES ARENDS helps to guide the legislative branch of our Government along the path of sound lawmaking and in its policy decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I have never found Congressman LES ARENDS at a loss for words to express himself clearly and emphatically in behalf of those principles to which he has adhered throughout his public career. He has brought dignity, honor, and respect to these legislative halls and he has exhibited a warm friendship for me and many others in the Congress.

Congressman LES ARENDS is thoughtful, considerate and, when occasion requires it, he is deeply compassionate and understanding. I have personally appreciated these qualities in my friend, LES ARENDS, and I am happy to publicly attest to this appreciation.

The youth which he exhibits in his lively stride and in his pleasant sense of humor as well as with his youthful and attractive wife, Betty, give assurance that he will continue serving as one of America's great political and legislative leaders for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate LES ARENDS on the 25th anniversary of his Republican leadership in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the Republican whip organization, I am proud of my commander in chief, LESLIE C. ARENDS. He is the epitome of what a whip should be. My service as a member of his organization has been an enjoyable one and I have learned much about the workings of Congress and our democratic system of government. He truly should be called Mr. Whip.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with everyone on both sides of the aisle in once again extending congratulations to my colleague from Illinois, LES ARENDS, as he completes 34 years in Congress and 25 years as Republican whip in the House.

LES ARENDS is almost legendary in the Land of Lincoln, and only four Members of the House have served longer than he has here in Washington, an inviable record which attests to his faithful service and leadership ability. It is, of course, impossible to measure his endless contributions to the welfare of the people of his district and State and the Nation in general throughout the years. It has been said, however, that friendships are the true reward of public service, and if this be true, then LES ARENDS is rich, indeed, for no one commands greater respect and affection both at home and here in Washington.

LES has served as whip longer than any person of either party in the history of the Congress, and I predict that he will serve for many years to come. I consider it an honor and a privilege to be included among his host of friends.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks and express their views on this occasion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Members have heard me say on a number of occasions that the middle aisle means nothing where friendship is involved. This is one of those occasions where on both sides of the aisle and in both bodies we rise and express—and those who do not speak it, in their minds express it—the deep friendship and sentiment and respect that we all have for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

I know something of the responsibility of leadership, having been majority leader for over 16 years and then, during the 80th and 83d Congresses, when our Republican friends led the House, when I served on that occasion as minority whip. It is a very responsible position. LES ARENDS performs his duty with dignity and with strength.

I admire him not only as a legislator and a great man, but also I deeply value the friendship that exists between us.

Twenty-five years of occupying the position of whip has carried with it many great responsibilities. I agree with the statement made by the distinguished minority leader, that our good friend LES ARENDS has occupied the position of whip, either majority or minority, longer than any other man in the history of the House. The statement is correct. I know, I occupied the position of majority leader for the longest period in the history of our country.

So our dear friend has been honored by his party, and he has also served this House and this country with diligence, and has occupied that position longer than any other man, as I see it now in looking back through history, longer than any other man in the entire history of the country, either whip of the Republican Party or whip of the Democratic Party.

It is a pleasure to me to express, speaking for the Democrats, if I may—and I know I do—to convey to LES ARENDS our deep feeling of respect and friendship, and to congratulate him on the outstanding service he has rendered as whip to his party and as a Member of this great body. We are all honored in having a friend like LES ARENDS.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the observations of our Speaker and the complimentary comments of our Speaker reflect the views of all of LES ARENDS' friends in the House on both sides of the aisle.

The tribute from the Speaker, as he has so well expressed it, I am sure, means a great deal to LES ARENDS, perhaps more than words of anybody else in the House of Representatives.

Inasmuch as I have already asked for and received unanimous consent for all Members to extend their remarks on this matter, I think it appropriate to conclude at this point with the wonderful tribute paid by the Speaker of the House to a most deserving gentleman, our dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois, LES ARENDS.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORTS

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

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

There was no objection.

ENLARGING THE AMERICAN FRANCHISE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 334)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The ballot box is the great anvil of democracy, where government is shaped by the will of the people. It is through the ballot that democracy draws its strength, renews its processes, and assures its survival.

Throughout the life of our Republic, no single, enduring question has so engaged generation after generation of Americans as this: Who among our citizens shall be eligible to participate as voters in determining the course of our public affairs?

On four occasions we have amended our Constitution to enlarge or to protect that participation. In recent years, Congress itself has been attentive to sheltering and assuring the free exercise of the right to vote.

Such a concern is altogether fitting. Under a government of, by, and for the people, the right to vote is the most basic right of all. It is the right on which all others finally stand.

Such a right is not to be idly conferred or blindly withheld. But the stability of our Republic from the beginning has been served—well and faithfully—by the willingness of Americans to lay aside the constraints of custom and tradition and heed the appeals of reason and reality to welcome into the American electorate those of our citizens fitted by the precepts of our society's values to participate in the exercise of the ultimate right of citizenship.

At the inception of the Republic, the promise of the new Nation was strengthened because our forefathers cast aside tests of religion and property.

At midpassage, America's moral strength was fortified when the test of color was removed by the Fifteenth Amendment. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 has reinforced this principle for all time.

At the beginning of the modern era in this twentieth century, reason and reality wisely prevailed when the women in America—through the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution—were granted the equality of citizenship so long denied them.

In 1961, the Twenty-Third Amendment to the Constitution gave citizens of the Nation's capital the right to vote for President and Vice President.

Four years ago, the Twenty-Fourth Amendment struck down the tests of the poll tax which had for almost a century disenfranchised thousands of Americans.

ENLARGING THE AMERICAN FRANCHISE

In all these instances time has affirmed the wisdom and the right of these decisions to enlarge participation in the Nation's affairs. Time, too, has already affirmed the wisdom and justice of our continuing efforts in the last decade to perfect, protect and shelter the right of all citizens to vote and to put an end to the unconscionable techniques of studied discrimination.

Today, I believe it is time once more for Americans to measure the constraints of custom and tradition against the compelling force of reason and reality in regard to the test of age. The hour has come to take the next great step in the march of democracy. We should now extend the right to vote to more than ten million citizens unjustly denied that right. They are the young men and women of America between the ages of 18 and 21.

The practice of admitting young Americans to the electorate at the age of twenty-one has its roots in the dim and distant mists of medieval England—but it is a practice and limitation without roots in the American experience.

Throughout our history as a young Nation, young people have been called upon by the age of eighteen to shoulder family responsibilities and civic duties identical with their elders.

At the age of eighteen, young Americans are called upon to bear arms.

At the age of eighteen, young Americans are treated as adults before many courts of law and are held responsible for their acts.

The age of eighteen, far more than the age of twenty-one, has been and is the age of maturity in America—and never more than now.

Reason does not permit us to ignore any longer the reality that eighteen year old young Americans are prepared—by education, by experience, by exposure to public affairs of their own land and all the world—to assume and exercise the privilege of voting.

The essential stability of our system is not served, the moral integrity of our cause is not strengthened, the value we place on the worth of the individual is not honored by denying to more than ten million citizens—solely because of their age—the right to full participation in determining our country's course.

This denial of the right to vote limits our democracy. It diminishes every modern concept of citizenship.

The young people of America in this decade are far more ready, far better qualified, far more able to discharge the highest duty of citizenship than any generations of the past.

We know—and the young men and women know also—that this is so.

They are better educated than their counterparts of a generation ago. They graduate from high school and enter college in greater proportions. Already this group—although many have not yet completed their schooling—have a higher education level than the general electorate.

Mass communication and greater opportunities for travel expose them earlier and more frequently to the issues of the day than the young men and women of the 1940's, or even the 1950's.

The young men of today serve their Nation in uniform with the same devotion as their fathers and brothers of earlier days showed. But duties unknown a decade ago have summoned the devotion of young men and women alike, by the tens of thousands. Their participation in the Peace Corps, in VISTA, and in other community ventures has elevated our national life and brought new meaning to the concept of service.

For myself, I deeply believe that America can only prosper from the infusion of youthful energy, initiative, vigor and intelligence into our political processes.

We live in a world that is young and growing younger each year. Of all nations, none has more generously invested in preparing its young people for constructive citizenship and none has been more faithfully served by its young than has America.

Today, the young people of America are asking the opportunity to give of their talents and abilities, their energies and enthusiasms, to the greater tasks of their times. I believe their proper request can and must be properly answered by a national affirmation of our faith in them. For a nation without faith in its sons and daughters is a nation without faith in itself.

WHAT I PROPOSE

I accordingly propose that the Congress of the United States approve and submit for ratification of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide, as follows:

The right of any citizen of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age if a citizen is eighteen years of age or older.

In proposing submission of such an amendment I am mindful that:

—The State of Georgia since 1943, and the State of Kentucky, since 1955, have permitted eighteen year old residents to vote.

—The two new States of Alaska and Hawaii have permitted nineteen and twenty year old residents, respectively, to vote.

—The first proposal for such an amendment was advanced in 1942 by Senator Arthur Vandenberg.

—President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in his 1954 State of the Union Address, urged an Amendment to lower the voting age to eighteen.

—In the 90th Congress, more than fifty proposed Constitutional Amendments to extend voting rights to eighteen year old citizens have been introduced, and many of these measures have broad bi-partisan support.

The concept has been tried and tested. Its merit has been established. Its rightness is now beyond dispute.

FULL PARTICIPATION IN OUR AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

The time has come to grant our youth what we ask of them but still deny to them—full and responsible participation in our American democracy.

In this year of national decision, as Americans in every State prepare to choose their leadership for the decisive and fateful years before us, the Congress has a rare opportunity through the submission of this amendment to signify to our young people that they are respected, that they are trusted, that their commitment to America is honored and that the day is soon to come when they are to be participants, not spectators, in the adventure of self-government.

Every time before, when America has extended the vote to citizens whose hour has come, new vitality has been infused into the lifestream of the Nation, and America has emerged the richer.

Now the hour has come again to take another step in Democracy's great journey.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 27, 1968.*

L. B. J.: A PRESIDENT WHO UNDERSTANDS YOUNG PEOPLE

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, in this Nation the age of adult responsibility is 18. In almost every significant area of life, the 18-year-old must bear the legal and social obligations of adulthood. That he generally shoulders these obligations with competence, intelligence, and patriotism few among us would doubt.

Yet, in only two States of the Union, Georgia and Kentucky, can the 18-year-old exercise the most fundamental right of citizenship—the right to vote, to have a voice in the many governmental policies and programs which so intimately affect his own life and welfare. Through most of our country, a young man or woman is graduated from high school infused with an interest in the affairs of government, then must face the frustration of inability to effectuate his enthusiasm through participation in the political process.

A constitutional amendment such as that proposed by the President in his message will preserve that youthful enthusiasm and channel it to the benefit of the entire electorate. I strongly support the President's recommendation

that we take action now to guarantee the right to vote to our citizens between the ages of 18 and 21.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I support the President's recommendation to permit 18-year-olds to vote and concur in his view that this should be done by a constitutional amendment.

We have never had a better informed generation of young Americans than we have today in this country. They have been prepared well for participation in the Nation's decisionmaking procedures.

The interest of 18-year-olds in the political process is evident in their active participation in political campaigns. Their interest in public affairs and their potential for contribution at home and abroad are manifested by the dedication of thousands to programs like the Peace Corps and congressional and Government internships. And, of course, their capacity for commitment to the high aims and goals of our society is nowhere more forcefully demonstrated than in their splendid service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Our young people of 18, 19, and 20 are bound like the rest of us by the decisions which are reached by Government, and those decisions often affect their futures drastically. Surely they should also be allowed to participate in the choice of political representatives who make those decisions, including the President and Vice President of the United States.

I hope we will soon see favorable action on the proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has taken a major step forward to strengthen democratic life by asking Congress to consider a constitutional amendment that will lower the voting age to 18. The President is absolutely right in making this request—a request long overdue.

More than 10 million young Americans between 18 and 21 are now unable to participate fully in the political life of this country. Yet, many of these same young people are being called upon to defend America's freedom around the world.

I think we would all agree that there is no outstanding virtue that endows a 21-year-old with superior wisdom and intelligence as he goes into the voting booth.

America can take pride in producing the best informed youth generation in its history. These young people have proven their dedication, time and again, to the cause of progress and justice in America's society. They have earned the right to vote.

I feel certain that an overwhelming majority of my colleagues agree that these young people should be given the opportunity to vote in our elections. And I believe that their parents, as well as an overwhelming number of Americans share this belief.

I commend President Johnson for his leadership in proposing this vital legislation. I hope and expect the Congress will not delay its passage.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has submitted to Congress one of the most important and vital matters dealing with our democratic life.

The full participation of the American people in the right to vote is fundamental to the political processes in the United States.

In his proposal today to amend the Constitution so that 18-year-olds may be allowed to vote, President Johnson has demonstrated his vision and leadership in strengthening the fabric of our democratic society.

I fully support him in this urgent matter.

Earlier in the 90th Congress I introduced a joint resolution to lower the voting age to 18 years.

This Congress has the unique opportunity to extend the voting franchise and to eliminate the last vestiges of discrimination against many of our citizens in the important matter of the right to vote. I think we must face the fact that some 10 million of our young ciizens are being discriminated against.

In effect, we have told these young men and women that while they are old enough to go to Vietnam and risk their lives in democracy's cause, they are nevertheless too young to exercise the wisdom and judgment necessary to vote for public officials. This is, indeed, discrimination. And the 90th Congress must help bring it to an end.

I commend the President for his forthright leadership in this matter. I am hopeful that the 90th Congress will act quickly and overwhelmingly to pass this important legislation.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as one who has long favored and cosponsored legislation to permit 18-year-olds to vote I would like to take this opportunity to speak in support of President Johnson's call for a constitutional amendment to carry out this proposal.

Throughout our history, we have continuously broadened participation in democracy by extending the right to vote to an ever increasing number of our citizens.

In colonial times, religious and property qualifications were eliminated as prerequisites for voting. In the last century, we did away with the color of a man's skin as a barrier to voting. In this century, women were granted the right to vote. Most recently, barriers such as the poll tax were outlawed by the 24th amendment.

Now, I firmly believe, the time has come to extend voting rights to our young people between the ages of 18 and 21. Democracy will surely gain from this action, for it will rejuvenate the democratic process with an infusion of fresh blood, new thinking and moral energy.

It is my hope that the House will give this legislation the earliest possible consideration and that it will be forwarded to the States for ratification at the earliest possible date.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, young people are becoming more interested and more involved in the political process. They have studied the issues and they are familiar with the candidates.

While they actively participate in political campaigns—often without compensation—they cannot support their candidates at the ballot box.

Because I think it is essential that we retain the interest and enthusiasm of these college-age citizens I am today introducing a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution making citizens who have attained 18 years of age eligible to vote in Federal elections.

I urge prompt action on this measure.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the President for his message to the Congress calling for legislation to lower the voting age to 18. With the President's leadership and under his sponsorship the legislation will be given the consideration it deserves.

On February 21, 1967, I sponsored House Joint Resolution 342 to lower the voting age to 18. Over 50 other proposed constitutional amendments to change the voting age have been sponsored by Members of the House on both sides of the aisle.

The President in his message to Congress today stated:

> Today, the young people of America are asking the opportunity to give of their talents and abilities, their energies and enthusiasms, to the greater tasks of their times. I believe their proper request can and must be properly answered by a national affirmation of our faith in them. For a nation without faith in its sons and daughters is a nation without faith in itself.

The arguments for and against lowering the voting age have been stated and restated many times, by past Presidents, by Members of Congress, by the youth of our Nation, and by organizations throughout the United States.

The President has today gone further by expressing his personal faith in our youth and asking the Congress to declare its faith in our young people. I believe that the 10 million citizens between the ages of 18 and 21 deserve the right to vote and will respond by exercizing that right with responsibility, thereby bringing new life and energies to our democratic system.

In these troubled times, proposed legislation will give us the opportunity to bridge the "generation gap" by reaching out to the youth of the Nation and not merely allowing them—but asking them to join hands in the process of self-government and share in the establishment of the goals necessary for the improvement of our society.

I urge my colleagues to support the President's proposal to amend the Constitution and to broaden the base of our democratic system.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can rely on strong bipartisan backing for the President's proposal to extend the franchise to 18-year-olds.

Millions of adult citizens—most of whom are as well-informed and as concerned about political affairs as their parents—are now barred from full participation in our Nation's political processes because of their age. Young people of 18, are as mature today as those of 21 were a generation or two ago.

The continuing concern expressed by our youth on numerous national issues reflects their deep and abiding interest in the political process. We can expect no more of any voter than that he be informed and sensitive. Our young people score high on both counts.

There is little apathy to be found in

this group, and there would be even less if 18- to 21-year-olds were given a political voice. Our idealistic young people could be expected to take to heart the responsibility given them, and to cast their votes with exceptional care.

It is essential that our young people be given political responsibility at a time when they are ready and willing to exercise it. The constitutional amendment proposed in the President's message would accomplish this purpose. I fully support such an amendment and sponsored House Joint Resolution 842 proposing its adoption.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's message to Congress urging action to lower the voting age to 18 deserves our prompt consideration and attention.

We are faced today with a politically active and politically responsible group of 18- to 21-year-olds that is being denied the right to influence events about which they have concern and interest at least equal to our own.

This group of more than 10 million young adults is comprised largely of high school graduates and college students who have reached a higher level of education than has ever before been attained by Americans of their age bracket. The education in history, political science, and civics to which these young people have been exposed has encouraged their unprecedented involvement in political affairs and in other activities of national significance.

Thus, we find young people volunteering for military duty, participating in the Peace Corps, serving in VISTA, and working in Headstart centers.

These young adults are active because they feel a sense of responsibility to their country. They are interested because they have recently learned about the dynamics of their Government.

Indeed, it is an anomaly that they cannot vote and thereby fully participate in the political process. Voting has often been called a privilege, rather than a right. But if any group has ever shown that they are worthy of this privilege, it is today's young adults.

Some may say that 18-year-olds are not wise enough to vote intelligently. I must agree with President Franklin Roosevelt, who once said:

> We know that wisdom does not come necessarily with years, that old men may be foolish and young men wise.

We should act now to provide our young people the opportunity to participate in the affairs of their Nation at a time when their interest in politics and social affairs is at its peak.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has proposed a constitutional amendment that will serve to strengthen our society's most fundamental machinergy for a democratic life—the right to vote.

I strongly support this proposal because on January 10, 1967, the first day of the 90th Congress, I introduced House Joint Resolution 18, to accomplish this very thing.

The President has proposed lowering the voting age to 18.

This proposal is urgently needed to correct long years of injustice against young Americans who have been excluded from the most important aspect of our political process.

The fact is that our courts treat 18-year-olds as adults. And our schools treat 18-year-olds as adults. We accept their tax money and their participation in our Armed Forces. If we accept from them this evidence of their maturity and involvement in our Nation's life, can we continue to deny them their right to vote?

I think the answer is obvious. And as the President noted in his message to Congress on this matter, the time has come to act with wisdom and compassion in broadening the base of our political life by including 10 million young Americans who are now excluded.

I think the American people strongly endorse President Johnson's proposal. And I think the President deserves the highest commendation for submitting this legislation at this time. There can be no excuse for delay or retreat on this matter. We have waited far too long to do what is right.

I believe the 90th Congress has a unique opportunity to be remembered as the Congress which brought new vigor and participation into the Nation's political bloodstream. I am proud to support this constitutional amendment. And I urge my colleagues to join in promptly enacting it into law.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am for the proposed amendment to the Constitution which would extend the right to vote to citizens between the ages of 18 and 21 in all elections. The amendment is patterned after the 15th amendment, which secured the right to vote for our black American citizens, and the 19th amendment, which secured the right to vote for our women citizens.

Some people believe that the question of voting age should be left up to the States to decide. I do not agree. When we deal with an issue involving such a fundamental human right as the right of citizens to vote, a Federal constitutional amendment is an appropriate vehicle to secure this right.

It is important that our young people be able to participate in the decision-making processes of our society, the most basic of which is the voting process. Our young people are prepared by education, a greater sense of maturity, and by their large stake in laws which affect them—military service, the payment of taxes, and other matters—to exercise this responsibility. If we deny them the right to vote, they must seek other channels for expressing their views and influencing decisions of Government, including various forms of protest. Some of these forms of protest, we have seen, are destructive to our social order. Guaranteeing the right to vote for citizens between 18 and 21 may well help to direct the energies and ideals of our young people into more constructive channels.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to the proposed constitutional amendment which would give the 18-year-olds the right to vote. The lowering of the voting age is in line with modern trends. Although only two of our States, Georgia and Kentucky, at the present time permit voting at age 18, our two newest States, Alaska and Hawaii, permit voting at age 19 and 20, respectively. Recently, a special parliamentary committee in Great Britain made a study of the legal age of majority for various purposes and recommended that the age for voting be lowered to 20, and for certain other purposes to age 18. The committee gave as reasons the "better education of the young, their greater affluence and sophistication, and earlier physical maturity." Eighteen-year-olds can vote in the Soviet Union and in several of the South American countries. On April 26, 1968, the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, which was created by an Executive order in 1963, approved the following recommendations based on a special task force study:

> In view of the downward trend in the age boys and girls mature, * * * all disabilities of minority [should] be removed at least by age 18.

The study included consideration of age for purposes of voting.

A Gallup poll last year showed that 64 percent of the people favor lowering the voting age. It is apparent that a large majority of our people will want Congress to approve this proposed amendment for submission to the States. It is my hope that it will be ratified at least in time to permit 18- to 21-year-olds to vote in the next presidential election in 1972. These younger Americans are prepared for this responsibility today. We must provide the means by which they can fulfill this responsibility of citizenship.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has submitted an historical proposal to the 90th Congress. His request for a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18 must be considered landmark legislation that will long be remembered by the American people.

The President deserves the warm support not only of all Americans, but of all Members of this Congress for his awareness of the strong desire on the part of our young people to participate in our democratic processes through voting.

Today's youth have proven themselves to be responsible and dedicated citizens. Many of them are being called upon to defend freedom in Vietnam and do so with unprecedented bravery and valor. Others are serving their country in the ghettos of our cities as members of the VISTA program, and in the remote areas of the world in the Peace Corps. We can be proud of this generation of young Americans. And it seems to me we have an obligation to them to insure that they participate fully in the democratic process.

American youth are deeply involved in our country. They are concerned about what is happening in our cities and across the Nation and they want to express their point of view and be part of finding solutions to the problems. And they want to vote.

Last year when I introduced House Joint Resolution 348, to lower the voting age to 18, I said that American youth is "well-informed, well-versed in the American political process, and eminently qualified to participate in that process

through voting." In my congressional district, they have even formed "Make It 18" clubs.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to enact promptly President Johnson's proposal for a constitutional amendment. By so doing, we will strengthen our democratic system and provide a real voice to millions of young Americans who want their convictions to be heard by their votes.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, during World War II, the State of Georgia set the minimum voting age at 18. The slogan which was popularly used to support this legislative action at the time was "Old Enough to Fight, Old Enough to Vote."

Since that time not a few logicians among us have pointed out that a person old enough to fight is not, in fact, necessarily old enough to vote. After all, we can all readily agree that the qualifications for good soldiers and good voters are hardly identical.

Nevertheless, this catchy, perhaps oversimplified slogan has a certain real validity.

Of course, persons lacking the qualifications to be voters should not be granted this important responsibility—but if, in fact, Americans 18 to 21 are informed and responsible enough to vote intelligently, then the fact that they are fighting and dying for their country certainly is relevant to the issue of whether they should be permitted to vote.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the maturity and responsibility of our young people is beyond serious question. Thus, the real question becomes: "Should those who fight and die for their Nation share in the making of decisions which affect their lives and property?"

I think the answer to that question requires that we all support the President's proposal to amend the Constitution to lower the voting age.

POINT OF ORDER WITHDRAWN

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his point of order.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18038) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 18038, with Mr. MURPHY of New York in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is the usual annual bill for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1969, which begins July 1. It thus provides for one of the three branches of Government.

Conforming to the long practice, it provides for all activities except the appropriations for the other body; it is the custom to leave those for the decision of the Senate. It includes the House of Representatives, the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, the Architect of the Capitol, the Government Printing Office, the General Accounting Office, and a number of items of a joint character between the two Houses such as joint committees, and so forth.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE BILL

The bill as reported for 1969—again, excluding items for the Senate—totals $247,497,349 in new budget—obligational—authority.

The bill as reported for 1969—again, above comparable budget—obligational—authority for the current fiscal year 1968 to date of $228,260,330, which does not count some $4,874,875 pending in the House version of the second supplemental bill for fiscal 1968 for these same items.

The bill as reported is $9,665,182 below the budget estimates of new budget—obligational—authority for fiscal 1969—$257,162,531—considered by the committee. It is $16,113,182 below the requests including the House Office building remodeling item which is classified as liquidation cash rather than new budget authority. Amounts relating solely to the Senate are, of course, not encompassed in the comparisons.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the committee has made a grand total cut of $16.1 million from the requests.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take much time of the Committee but there are a few highlight items that I might touch on. The printed committee hearings are available and the committee report elaborates in detail. I might just say that the explanation for a good many of the line-item increases above last year's appropriation, or portions of them as the case may be, represent the effects of mandatory-type costs such as wage board and within-grade salary increases; annualization of the civilian pay increase effective last October; and specific resolutions of the House, or laws, authorizing additional allowances of one kind or another. Perhaps the largest single increases over last year relate to the general pay bill and congressional printing and binding costs.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has tried to adopt an austere approach to the items in which we had some discretion, but at the same time tried to make reasonable provision for the operating needs. In view of the general pay raise legislation; the rising costs and volume of printing; the specific enactments of the House granting additional allowances for official expenses of one kind or another; in view of these and similar facts, the committee was not able to avoid some increases over last year.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have nonetheless made a lot of reductions.

Mr. Chairman, there are no major remodeling or construction projects in the bill. The committee has deferred funds requested for projects that involve costs in the range of $132 million.

There are no funds in the bill for the Madison Memorial Library Building; nothing for a new Government printing plant; nothing for general remodeling of the Longworth House Office Building into three-room Member suites, and certain related items. Nor were funds sought or allowed to extend the west-central front of the Capitol.

Mr. Chairman, the committee is also recommending continuation of the restriction against any special allowance for congressional summer interns in Members' offices. But this, of course, does not preclude a Member from employing one or more summer interns on the regular office clerk-hire roll within the statutory limits otherwise applicable.

Another item that came in for considerable attention in the committee was the matter of the skyrocketing deficit in the operation of the restaurant and other dining facilities on the House side. The latest estimate is that the deficit for fiscal 1969 could reach $536,000. In the current year, 1968, it will approximate $375,000.

The loss in fiscal 1967 was $243,597; in 1966, $219,257; in 1965, before the Rayburn facilities were opened, $144,091; in 1964, $111,372; in 1963, $140,190; in 1962, $43,034; and so on.

There has been some loss in every year, but, as the figures show, it is now skyrocketing. A number of factors have always combined to bring about a loss, one major reason being the fact that most of the business is concentrated on the noonday meal. In the last few years, the payroll cost has more than doubled—more employees, partly because of more facilities, and general pay increases for both overhead and management-type personnel as well as for foodworkers.

The committee felt that something had to be done to sharply reduce and contain the deficit. The committee felt that a loss of over half a million dollars is wholly unacceptable. So, what we have done is to allow $175,000 as an interim amount; asked the Architect to take whatever reasonable steps he can now take to effect economies in the cost of

operations; and we have called on the General Accounting Office to launch a full-scale study of all phases of the operation. The study and recommendations will encompass any and all matters pertinent to a possible private concession arrangement, if such is found feasible without a direct subsidy, and recommendations for any improvements if the operation is continued under direct management.

I might say right here, Mr. Chairman, that the committee made some preliminary exploration of the possibilities of putting all dining facilities out on private concession so as to avoid, if possible, any direct subsidy. Several proposals were received. Two or three tentative proposals in particular were interesting enough to lead the committee to conclude that an in-depth study should be made.

We have not lost sight of the fact that basic to the proposition—is the need for satisfactory service to Members, Hill employees, and others who use the facilities, and the welfare of the employees in the various dining facilities.

GROWTH OF THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. Chairman, as with the national budget generally, the budget for the legislative branch has also grown over the years. The committee report, on pages 4 and 5, illuminates some of the general reasons for this growth.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, much of the work of Congress is done in its committees. Their staffs and their expenses have grown. Not counting substantial items such as printing funded separately in a lump sum, House committees are spending about $9,500,000 a year and employing approximately 525 people. This does not include joint committees.

But the work of Members is everywhere—in their offices; in their districts; in their committee rooms; and on the floor of the House. The average House Member now serves in excess of 450,000 people; there are currently 96 congressional districts with more than 500,000 constituents.

When the second House Office building for Members was completed in 1933, our national population was about 125 million. The average congressional district had about 287,000 constituents. Today the national population is just over 200 million, or an average of over 450,000 per district. The country is much bigger and growing. Thirty-five years ago, Members of the House had one room for themselves and their office help. Even today, not all Members have a three-room office suite.

When the second office building was completed in 1933, the Federal budget was about $4.6 billion. Today, on the new budget basis, the appropriations requested for 1969 exceed $200,000,000,000. As the National Government has enlarged, national legislative responsibilities have increased many times over.

When the second office building was completed in 1933, each Member of the House was limited by law to two office clerks. Today, because of constantly increasing burdens, much longer sessions of Congress, and the vastly changed situation otherwise, the law allows Members from the larger districts up to six times as many clerks, subject however to an overriding salary ceiling that as a practical matter precludes hiring that many by all but a few Members.

Committees and Members wrestle with an ever-increasing volume of complex problems encompassing all manner of legislation with impact of one or another kind on the people.

If Members will turn to pages 5, 6, and 7 of the committee report, they can see just on those three pages, a simple capsule listing of the principal increases and decreases from the current year appropriations, and the cuts from the budget requests, and what they are for. I will not repeat all of them here; they are readily listed in the report.

But taking the bill by its major subdivisions as we show on page 2 of the report of the committee, there is a total of $85,039,420 for the House of Representatives; $12,311,229 for various items of a joint character involving both Houses; $12,442,900 for the Architect of the Capitol; $565,000 for the Botanic Garden; $40,638,800 under the Library of Congress; $39,000,000 under the Government Printing Office; and $57,500,000 for the General Accounting Office.

HOUSE ITEMS

As to items under the "House of Representatives" heading, there is nothing in the way of services that have not previously been authorized. There has been a gradual growth in the recurring charges, however—including some in the 90th Congress, as shown on page 438 of the hearings—which accounts for much of the substantial increase allowed over fiscal 1968.

JOINT ITEMS

As to the various items falling under the joint section of the bill, beginning on page 9, there is nothing much to be added to what the report says.

Certain expenses of the Capitol Police are in the joint section of the bill. There are now 292 authorized police positions on the House side. There are 201 currently authorized on the Senate side, making a currently authorized strength for the Hill of 493 police. To this would be added 45 or so men generally on detail from the Metropolitan Police during the sessions.

The Capitol Police are moving toward a professional-type, trained force, under a career police officer. In view of the rioters and demonstrators who keep making trouble here on the Hill, I think this a decided step in the right direction.

THE ARCHITECT

As to the section of the bill beginning on page 15, for the Architect of the Capitol, as I noted earlier, there is nothing in the bill in the way of major remodeling or construction. There are, however, as there have been for some years, a number of minor repair and improvement items necessary to keep the physical plant on Capitol Hill in reasonably good order.

I might say that we have allowed funds for certain police and disbursing office facilities; for improved lighting and electric clocks and legislative call systems in the Longworth Building; and a couple of other items, all shown in the list on page 11 of the report.

We have not allowed any funds to remodel the Congressional Hotel, or for a tunnel from the hotel to the Cannon Building. That was a part of the general Longworth remodeling proposal, which we have deferred—without prejudice, I might add.

A very unsatisfactory situation of many years standing has been, and continues to be the lack of adequate restrooms for the visting public in the Capitol Building. We have asked the Architect to explore for any nooks and crannies in which more restrooms could be installed, and to make a complete sketch of present facilities that might be opened for general use.

THE LIBRARY

Mr. Chairman, in the Library of Congress, a great national institution, which begins on page 19 of the bill, the work situation is fairly characteristic and not entirely unpredictable. Established in 1800, the Library is the Nation's largest research library. In the nature of the case, a library has only one way to go—to get bigger all the time.

Some budgetary increase is necessary just to maintain current levels. About $1.5 million of the increase over 1968 is for mandatory-type increases that are not subject to administrative discretion.

It has been said that the Library needs roughly 44,000 additional square feet of space each year. Money is in the bill for more rental space as a stopgap solution. But the housing, the servicing, and the managing of an ever-growing collection of the magnitude of what this one is apt to be, say, 25 years from now compels the need of finding ways to automate. Otherwise, there is cause to wonder whether it would be practical to supply space enough to house the collections and employees enough to service them.

So we have enlarged the funds for the automation study program. It is a complex undertaking and it will be expensive. But it is expected to provide information on techniques and procedures that will be of value to other libraries as well.

Some of the increases allowed for the Library relate to growing workloads in the Copyright Office and in the catalog card sales work. Both of these activities turn a profit for the Government.

We have tried to make reasonable provision for the valuable services rendered by the Legislative Reference Service, which says it continues to be swamped with congressional requests.

We provided the full budget request for the wonderful program of books for the blind, which, as Members will recall, was enlarged 2 years ago to extend to others so physically handicapped that they cannot enjoy normal reading.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Mr. Chairman, for the section of the bill covering the Government Printing Office, which is on pages 24 and 25 of the bill, there is little to add to what the report says. It includes printing and binding for Congress. There is an increase recommended. Congress is talking more; holding more hearings; printing more bills, and so on. And wages

are up. Much of congressional work is overnight printing—or short deadline in any event—and that costs money. But it is a vital item of expense. And quick service is important.

This section of the bill includes the Superintendent of Documents activity, which turns a profit. In other words, they recover more to the Treasury through sales of publications. Recently, their costs have been creeping up on income; they have a survey underway on repricing of publications.

The Public Printer has been saying for several years that his present physical plant is inefficient, and that he could save millions of dollars if he had a new, modern plant. We have not, however, allowed the funds for plans and specifications. For one thing, the Joint Committee on Printing has not approved selection of the proposed new site which the law requires as a condition precedent to appropriations for the project.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Mr. Chairman, the final section of the bill, on page 26, provides for the General Accounting Office, a highly essential instrumentality of legislative oversight in checking the efficiency of Government operations and procedures and the propriety of Goverment expenditures and in assistance to Congress and its committees otherwise.

Some increase was allowed. The expenditures of Government are growing, and as they grow, and more new and enlarged programs are adopted, a greater load is put on the General Accounting Office.

There is considerable discussion in the hearings about the nature and scope of the very extensive—and expensive—review and evaluation study ordered in the basic antipoverty legislation last year. There is also something in the report of the committee, in which we raise the question, as a general proposition, whether the Congress ought to follow the precedent established in the OEO amendments of placing, by statute, specific responsibilities on the Comptroller General for evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of entire major programs with statutory reporting deadlines. Of course, we are not against—we are for—adequate audits of the expenditures, but such statutory directives might tend to diminish the flexibility of the Office in examining all the programs and expenditures of the Government. And if carried too far, it would in substance considerably duplicate the expense of oversight staffs and special "investigative" committee expenditures.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, there are many details to this bill even though it is a relatively small bill. I will be glad to try to answer any questions. I might say in closing that so far as I am aware, the committee is either unanimous, or perhaps I should say, about as unanimous as it is reasonable to expect in a bill dealing with a multiplicity of items.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, for yielding, to ask how we stand financially with respect to the Rayburn Building. Have all the claims or suits that have been filed in connection with the construction of the Rayburn Building been settled?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Are you referring to the garages?

Mr. GROSS. No, I am referring to the building itself.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. My information is that all the money that is needed has been appropriated. There may be a few items still in dispute between the architect and the contractor. I do not think the one big claim has been finally disposed of.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope there is a dispute with respect to the new tunnel between the Rayburn Building and the Capitol. Apparently the rain of last night, as usual, flooded the tunnel for one of the cars was not operating this morning.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I do not have any details on that.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The information we have is that there is a claim pending, and has been pending for some time, with the contractor for the Rayburn Building. It has not yet been finally settled. It was settled in favor of the Government but has since been appealed to the U.S. Court of Claims where it is still pending.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, has this happened several times—water coming into the new tunnel between the two buildings.

Mr. YATES. That was not called to the attention of the committee. But in view of the interest of the gentleman from Iowa, we will look into it and try to ascertain the facts for the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Did McCloskey, the general contractor, build that tunnel, does the gentleman know?

Mr. YATES. I do not believe so; it was as I recall a separate contract and a different contractor.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I should like to ask about the telephone appropriation on page 7 of the bill. Does that include new telephones such as I hear are being installed across the way with blue buttons on them?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I do not know anything about blue buttons on telephones across the way. There is money in this bill to take care of the telephones needed on the House side. We do not go beyond the center of the Capitol in our examination of the expenditures.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that the other body will add to the bill whatever they want to put in it. I do not like that procedure, but that is the way it is done. What I am trying to get at is, whether this bill provides for the installation in the House office buildings of the so-called panic buttons that are reportedly being installed in the Senate offices.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I have said to the gentleman that I know nothing about a blue button or a panic button on the Senate side. We do not have hearings on the Senate housekeeping projects.

Mr. GROSS. Then this does not provide, as far as the gentleman knows, for a panic button for each Member of the House?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. A panic or blue button was not mentioned to our committee. Like the gentleman, I would like to know what they are.

Mr. Chairman, the Architect supplied me with a copy of a letter which he sent to the Speaker, outlining the steps he proposes, effective next Monday, in relation to House dining facilities as a result of the action of the committee on the budget for dining facility operations.

Under leave granted, I am including it in the RECORD for the information of Members and others.

The letter follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D.C., June 25, 1968.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: You will recall that the Committee on Appropriations, Legislative Subcommittee, has recently conducted some study into the possibilities of reducing the annual operating deficits of the House Restaurant facilities.

Our estimate of the deficit for the coming fiscal year is $536,000. This figure was increased from $400,000 to give effect to increased wage rates ordered by the District Government for their wage board foodworkers effective in July, 1968 (which rates, as you know, are used in establishing rates for our restaurant employees) and a further increase in rates in October, 1968 when restaurant employees are scheduled to come under the Coordinated Federal Wage System developed by the Civil Service Commission at the request of the President.

In their report on the Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill, 1969, the Committee outlined the following primary conclusions and actions:

1. The Committee felt that something must be done to sharply reduce and contain the deficit, stating that a "loss of over half a million dollars is wholly unacceptable".

2. Made preliminary explorations into the possibility of the restaurants being run by outside concessionaire.

3. Requested the General Accounting Office to launch a full scale study of all phases of the operation as soon as the House passes the Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill, expressing the desire that the study move along expeditiously so that if a concession arrangement is eventually decided upon, it would be available well in advance of consideration of the necessary legislation early in next session.

4. Allowed $175,000 which, in the meantime, in combination with whatever reasonable steps the Architect can now take to effect economies, "should be adequate for the necessities."

5. Directed the Architect to effect such economies.

In order to attempt operation within the $175,000 allowance during the next 6 or 7 months, we propose taking the following actions, *effective July 1, 1968*, to effect economies in operations (all these measures, except closing the third line in the Longworth cafeteria, were presented to the Appropriations Committee during their consideration of this matter):

Estimated savings on annual basis

Menu price increases:	
20-percent average on table service; 10-percent average on cafeteria and carryout service	$165,000
Closing all units on Saturdays, except main dining room in Capitol, the Longworth cafeteria, and the Longworth carryout	26,000
Closing Longworth and Rayburn cafeterias one-half hour earlier:	
2:30 p.m. instead of 3 p.m. weekdays, 1:30 p.m. instead of 2 p.m. Saturdays	25,000
Closing the Main dining rooms in the Capitol at 3:30 p.m. instead of 4 p.m. each day, Monday through Thursday	9,000
Closing all carryouts at 4 p.m. instead of 5 p.m. weekdays	6,800
Closing Members' private dining room in Capitol on Fridays (it is now closed on Saturdays and there is little demand for its use on Fridays)	2,500
Discontinue Members' private dining room in Rayburn Building and use that room for special functions (it is now used sparingly by Members)	20,000
Closing third line in Longworth cafeteria (short order line)—It is now closed September 1 to January 3 each year	$15,700
Total estimated annual savings	270,000

By using the $536,000 estimated deficiency figure for the next fiscal year and applying the loss ratios which prevailed in the current fiscal year, it is estimated that $325,000 of the $536,000 would be required for the period July 1, 1968 to February 8, 1969. The $325,000 required for this period, less the $175,000 allowed by the Appropriations Committee, leaves a balance of $150,000 which must be saved by effecting economies in operation.

The measures outlined are estimated to save $270,000 as indicated on an *annual* basis. On the part-year basis, July–February, savings are estimated to amount to about $160,000. This amount compares favorably with the $150,000 required to be saved.

We also intend making other savings where possible and the Manager has been so instructed.

Unless you have objections to these changes or some counter suggestions, I will order the Manager of the Restaurants to proceed promptly with them effective July 1st.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. GEORGE STEWART,
Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], has already very eloquently and explicitly expressed to you the contents of the bill before us. In view of the detailed and impressive manner that he has gone over the subject, there seems little purpose in my taking a lot of time to further elaborate on the moneys provided in this bill.

Possibly it might be said that there is no bill that will come before the House this year that relates as directly to the functional necessities of the Congress to operate effectively and efficiently.

Your chairman has very diligently directed the subcommittee hearings, followed by preparation of the report and the bill, in compliance with the objective of adequately providing for the needs and functional operations of the House and the Congress. Every Member of this House should be grateful to him, and to the other members of the subcommittee, who have all kept your best interest, as well as that of the Nation, in mind at all times.

I can heartily endorse the contents of the bill to you. It does provide adequate funding of the essential activities and, at the same time, is in compliance with the budgetary problems which require that this Congress must do its best to curtail expenditures to the very minimum in order that inflation may be stopped, and economic security established. Therefore the committee has very carefully reviewed all expenditures, making reductions wherever possible and providing increases where necessary. All of these actions are specifically identified on pages 5, 6, and 7 of the committee report.

May I suggest that you review carefully each of the selected items listed. The net results of these actions are expenditure reductions amounting to approximately $9,833,000, with a grand total reduction in the new budget obligational authority of $16,113,182.

It should be emphasized that the appropriations in this bill provide for a substantial amount of public and Government services that are not confined entirely to the operation of the House or the Congress.

The Library of Congress, as an example, provides innumerable supplies of library material to depository libraries throughout the country, with sales of library catalogs, cards, and Government publications. The Library also provides copyright services, aid and assistance to the blind. It is significant to note that there accrues to the Treasury of the United States, through the various sales of material, about $17,800,000 in profits over and above the administrative expenditures.

The General Accounting Office performs highly essential services in checking the efficiency of Government operations and procedures. They are most productive in saving taxpayer dollars, as well as accomplishing more proficient operation of the varied departments and agencies. It has been estimated that the General Accounting Office, by virtue of its work and recommendations, has accomplished expenditure savings that approached $200 million during the past year. These services are truly in the best interest of the general public in providing proficiency to the administration of the vast field of Government services and activities.

I would recommend to my colleagues that they direct some attention to the item beginning on page 4 of the committee report entitled "Growth of the Legislative Budget." It identifies the extent to which Government has grown—as exemplified by a total Federal budget of $4.6 billion in 1933 which now, on the new budget basis, has a total request for 1969 in excess of $200 billion.

This growth, of course, requires additional work on the part of each Member, and their staffs, as well as the staff requirements of the respective committees. The budget increases contained in this bill reflect very realistically the effects of numerous House actions and the inflation that has been prevalent throughout the country in recent months and years. It becomes very clearly evident what the effects of salary increases, together with any new positions, are on the total budget requirements.

This House could do well by carefully reviewing these effects on the cost of our own operations, for they are identical with the problems that confront every individual, business enterprise, and Government agency throughout the country as they are called upon to meet these continuing increases in costs of their livelihood and operating expenses.

In compliance with the nationally recognized budget problem and the resolution passed by the Congress last week, your committee has not included any moneys for major remodeling or construction projects. It is most unfortunate that our country should find itself in such fiscal distress these days that it becomes necessary to not consider funding worthy and needed projects such as the Madison Memorial Library Building, general remodeling of the Longworth House Office Building, reconstruction of the west front of the Capitol, and the intern program. The need for these construction projects is obvious, but it did seem to the committee that this is not the appropriate time to consider such expenditures.

This further serves to identify the need for establishing a fiscal policy that will accommodate the pertinent needs of the day in compliance with the growth and progress of the country. Moneys have been provided for the most essential repair projects that will serve the present needs and will not need to be redone in the event of a major remodeling project in the Longworth Building at a later date. They are listed in the chart at the bottom of page 11 of the report.

In this connection let me briefly refer to the recent experience with regard to claims filed by the Baltimore Contractors, Inc., in connection with the construction of the underground garages. These claims, at the time of the hearings, totaled $5,021,000 in addition to the amount of the original contract as amended, which anyone will recognize as being an excessive amount in connection with a contract which totaled only a little over $12 million in the first instance.

Therefore, the committee has included language in the report which reads that it "expects the Architect to spare no reasonable engineering, architectural, or legal effort to make sure that the Government's interest is fully protected, and will request progress reports from the Architect as significant decisions are taken."

One of the main concerns of the subcommittee, as your chairman has properly stated, was that of the continuing growth in the deficits as applied to the operation of the House dining facilities. I should express my agreement with the action taken, and will expect that the

recommended study should provide a solution which would substantially diminish and, hopefully, eliminate entirely this deficit problem. The subcommittee consisting of the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman YATES, and the gentleman from North Dakota, Congressman ANDREWS, did an excellent job in exploring the problem.

The operations of the Library of Congress have been adequately funded with an increase of over a half-million dollars to provide services, in the form of talking books and other reading material, for the blind and physically handicapped.

The Government Printing Office and all of its activities, including the Superintendent of Documents, has been funded adequately to meet the needs and the requirements of the Congress and the other agencies which depend on the Government Printing Office for printing. There is no money provided for plans or specifications for a new Government printing plant.

It might be said that we have been generous with the General Accounting Office in our response to their request for moneys. It appeared to the committee, however, that with the many additional assignments that are directed to the General Accounting Office in connection with new programs and new Government activities, as well as the war in Vietnam, that it was most essential that the General Accounting Office be adequately funded. I have previously mentioned that their investigations result in substantial savings in expenditures and so serve the taxpayer well.

Many of the new programs have required substantial auditing and investigation in order that the intent of Congress be carried out and the expenditure of moneys be properly accounted for. A recent additional workload directed to them has given cause to the committee to question whether the Congress in the future should direct to this agency assignments which require an evaluation of the efficiency and the effectiveness of entire major programs. This is the case with the recent assignment given to them by legislation in connection with the Office of Economic Opportunity programs and, if carried further, could diminish their effectiveness in examining the program and expenditures of the many other Government agencies. It would seem to me, in view of the substantial savings they have accomplished in their respective activities, that their regular workload not be diminished in order to accomplish these assignments—which might better be done by oversight staffs and investigative committees.

I also found occasion to make note of and state, during the hearings, that where these new major programs require extensive auditing to effect efficiency operation, that such expenditures should be charged to the moneys appropriated to the program itself. To not do so, leaves a deficient accounting of the total administrative expenses for the program, which can only serve to mislead both the public and the Congress.

It should be noted that the war in Vietnam, with the many reports that there is a great volume of corruption and black market activities, has placed a substantial additional burden on the General Accounting Office. This is another field which surely should not be neglected, in view of the criticisms that have indicated substantial volumes of U.S. supplies reaching enemy hands. Your committee spent considerable time exploring this subject with the General Accounting Office, and it is my opinion that there is yet much to be done by way of correcting these most undesirable practices.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this briefly covers the essentials of the Government expenditures contained in this bill, and I heartily recommend its approval by the House.

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

Mr. LANGEN. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman and the committee for the interest they apparently are taking in the deficits in the House eating establishments. This situation has reached the point it must be cured. I simply want to commend the gentleman and the committee for the interest they are presently taking, as evidenced by the remarks made by the gentleman from Alabama and by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank the gentleman for those comments. I am glad to know he finds the committee efforts to be worthwhile. I believe we have set up a process whereby we are going to be able to get a very accurate evaluation of the operation of the restaurant, together with recommendations for the future which, as I stated earlier, I hope will completely eliminate the deficit and still provide the service needed for the membership.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I am curious to know whether the provision on page 9 of the bill, the administrative provision, means there is any change in the procedure for paying salaries, or whether this is language necessary to the bill for the continuation of what is already being done?

Mr. LANGEN. I do not have a copy of the bill before me, but as I recall there is no change in the method of paying salaries.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, this is the traditional language that the committee used year in and year out for the purpose of providing for this payment.

Mr. GROSS. Somehow I have missed it in years gone by. On page 7 of the bill there is $560 for postage for the Postmaster. I am curious to know why a Postmaster needs $560 for postage.

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

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps that is a question to which the gentleman can supply the answer at another time.

Mr. LANGEN. I am just locating it now that I have a copy of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. The item is on page 7 of the bill at the bottom of the page.

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

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. This is usual, also, just as the language I previously spoke to the gentleman about and about which he raised a question. This is the type of appropriation for postage stamp allowance which is made annually. It is nothing unique and is not higher or in an unusual degree than in other years.

Mr. LANGEN. May I say in more specific response to the gentleman from Iowa that this amount of money is equivalent to the postage or stamp allowance made to each Member. This is so that in the event an airmail or special delivery stamp is needed or that kind of letter is necessary they will have the money for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I can understand postage for other officials of the House, but I still find it difficult to see why the Postmaster needs $560 worth of stamps.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to make another little comment with regard to the point the gentleman from Iowa properly has raised. Generally folks wonder why there are any postal allowances at all in a bill of this kind, because they assume that we send all of our mail out under a frank and consequently it does not cost us anything to mail these letters. The fact is that the House has to reimburse the Post Office Department for every last letter that is sent out. Of course, the allowance or the use of the frank covers only regular mail. In view of that, that is why these other little figures are in there. It is in order to take care of airmail and special delivery when that is needed.

Mr. ANDERSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

AIDS TO THE POOR—NEED FOR A BETTER PERSPECTIVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, men and institutions owe a duty to the public commensurate with the power which they possess. The press of the country has tremendous power and has a great responsibility. In the realm of public opinion it is preeminent.

The newspapers of Washington and the press of this city, in view of the great power which they have, owe a great responsibility to the people of this city, to the rich and to the poor alike. I have no doubt but that they are undertaking to fulfill that responsibility. I am not a newspaperman and if I were I doubt that I could tell the press how to run its business. People in the publication business, like the rest of us, no doubt have their problems.

So the remarks which I make are made in great humility.

It does concern me that the press of Washington may not to the fullest extent be exercising its great power to influence this city for good.

Mr. Chairman, I was looking over three Washington papers today. One of them has on its front page a series of pictures of destruction and chaos.

Mr. Chairman, anyone from afar seeing these pictures—and I am sure they reflect the correct situation at a given point in the city—would probably be dissuaded from coming to Washington with a school group or with one's family. The pictures are correct but somehow it

would be good if we could put the whole situation in good focus so that the beauty and virtue and grandeur could show through along with the evidences of chaos.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that all of us have the responsibility for trying to put things into proper focus, so that people outside the city of Washington would not be unaware of the true situaiton. Somehow all should be reminded that there is some good along with the bad.

The poor people who run business establishments and those not so poor have been badly hurt by a situation which has been possibly a bit overplayed—by a situation which has frightened the local residents and a situation which has frightened people into changing their plans about coming to Washington.

Mr. Chairman, the tourist trade here, I believe, formerly ran into the sum of about $400 million a year. I do not know what it will run this year. But I know that the loss of the tourist trade hurts and will hurt the small people of Washington, including the poor.

Now, I have before me another Washington paper and one of the headlines—which is not so big—is "House Cuts School Education for the Poor." The headline is not in error but the impact of the headline will tend to be misleading to the reader, especially the poor.

Mr. Chairman, this kind of thing is what we hear repeatedly. And it is not necessarily incorrect even though it can be very misleading at times.

Then, here is another headline on the front page of another Washington paper saying, "The Poor People Sue Freeman To Buy Food." I assume they did and this is news and must be printed. The headline inevitably suggests that this cruel Government is being sued by the poor. Yes, this is news. But somehow it would be good if an image could be reflected of the Secretary of Agriculture in his true role as one who has helped and is helping in providing hundreds of millions of dollars in milk and food and assistance to great numbers of poor people at home and abroad.

I am not being critical of the press. I do not know how to run the press; in fact, I often wonder if we know how to run such an organization as the Congress. We have many deficiencies. I am speaking in all humility. We must keep the press free and unfettered. What we need is a way to put the whole picture in better perspective.

Then, another headline of another paper says, "School Aid for Educating the Poor Is Slashed." This tends, in my opinion, to make the casual reader think, and especially the poor, that Congress is heartless, that Congress is thoughtless, unconcerned and unaware of the needs of the poor of our country.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that the press would want to do all it could to engender, not a spirit of degradation in the city, but a spirit of hope. I doubt that the poor are able to find on frequent occasions explanations of what is being done in their behalf, reasons for hope and respect for their government and their institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The taxpayers of this country are digging down into their pockets every year and paying increasingly large sums in taxes with which to help the poor.

People who pay the taxes to help the poor ought to be given some recognition. Those who receive the benefits from the taxpayers and from the Government and from the Congress and from the executive and legislative branches, those who receive these benefits should not unwittingly be led to believe, that they should despise their Government.

One great literary man had one of his characters say:

> I hate ingratitude more in a man than lying, vainness, babbling drunkenness, or any taint of vice whose strong corruption inhabits our frail blood.

Let us do what we can to engender in our country a spirit of gratitude for what the Government—the most generous Government in the world—is doing for the poor and all citizens generally. No doubt many efforts are misguided but the generous spirit is bona fide.

If Congress cuts the budget some on requests made for the poor, it is not because the Congress despises the poor, it is because the Congress wants to try to help the poor by maintaining the stability of the Government upon whom the rich and poor alike must rely.

It would be well, of course, to point out when we talk about some cut that is made that usually the cut is made in the budget for the current year, and usually the figure—not always—is above the figure for the prior year. Huge increases which are slightly pruned often may appear to those who are unfamiliar with the situation as irresponsible slashes.

One would believe, if he were not somewhat aware of the facts, that yesterday Congress took out the dagger from its sheath and stabbed the poor in the back. How bad, how dangerous to have that sort of sentiment prevail, especially when we had nearly $3 billion more in the bill yesterday than we had last year. This figure to be strictly accurate needs some adjustment downward but I am speaking in broad terms.

The bill provided the sum of about $17 billion. Great portions of that total are for benefits to the poor to one degree or another. There were some reductions in certain areas but in the overall there was a sizable increase.

I have often wished that there were some way to dramatize the amounts that remain after the cuts are made. This may be impossible but it would be worth a try.

Perhaps there should be some way for the poor people in Washington and elsewhere to get a better grasp of what is being done in their behalf so that they could better evaluate what is not being done.

I have said repeatedly on the floor, but I do not know that I have seen a headline to the effect, that the President's budget proposes aid and benefits in a general way to the poor for the fiscal year which begins on July 1 in the estimated total sum of $27 billion. I believe that our citizens need to be aware of this. Some of the efforts are ill-advised but they are being sincerely made. We are dealing in large figures and they are increasing rapidly—too rapidly.

Now, of course, just doles to the poor are not what we seek because the greatest thing that we can do for the poor is to help them help themselves, and that is the thrust of much of what is now being undertaken by our Government.

So I would just hope that we could find a way to inform the poor of the country that they have a compassionate Congress, that the businessmen are compassionate, that the professional men are compassionate, that the poor people are compassionate, that the rich people are compassionate, and that we have a great people, and that we ought to take pride in our institutions, and try to build them up, not tear them down.

But if we do not nourish the things that are good and if we think only of the things that are bad we make a grave mistake. If we throw the spotlight on the bad without helping the people understand the true picture, we do them a great disservice.

So I rise, not to be critical of the press—I commend the press for the great job it is undertaking—but I would just hope that the press can find a way to put our problems and our actions in better perspective.

It seems that a better atmosphere could be generated—and among the people who have the power to generate that better atmosphere are the people who publish newspapers.

I remember a high school oration in which the words were spoken—"The press is mightier than the sword."

Yes, the press is mightier than the sword. It is mightier than a gun.

It is mightier than the demonstrators.

It is mightier than the Poor People's March.

It is mightier than the Congress.

I would hope that the Congress and the press would do their best to create a better image of what we are trying to do for all our people and let everybody know of the sincere and generous efforts which are being made at all levels to improve the stability and quality of American life.

That will be a glad day, a day when we can hold our chin a little higher and say, "Thank God I am an American."

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

Mr. Chairman I want to associate myself with the remarks of our great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. Certainly, he has performed a great service to the House of Representatives and a great service to the country by the very eloquent manner in which he has expressed the attitude of the Congress toward the public needs and the extent to which this is a generous country to all of its citizenry.

I do not think it could have been done better with any other choice of words, which serves to indicate the effectiveness of his services as chairman of the

Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives with regard for the poor, the problems of the Nation, and the problems of all its citizens.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect and the highest regard for the good chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas. I know the heavy burdens he carries as chairman of the committee, I appreciate his worries, his concerns and his heavy responsibilities. I would not want to add to them, but I feel I must speak in reply to some of the things he said. The gentleman stated he is not critical of the press. He said he is not critical of the rich. He said he is not critical of the poor. I can only assume that it was I of whom he was critical because it was I who criticized the committee yesterday for not providing the funds for the poor children of this Nation.

While I have not read the stories in the newspapers to which the gentleman refers, I did read a couple of stories in the paper this morning, and I, too, am critical of the press, but for a different reason. I do not think the press told the story of what happened on the floor of this House yesterday as fully as it should have.

No, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe we can expect the people of this country to be pleased with everything this Congress does, and to be grateful for whatever appropriation is made, no matter how meager. Public education is the foundation of this democracy. I repeat what I said on the floor yesterday, that in cutting $135 million—I think ultimately it was $127 million after the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]—but in cutting $127 million from the appropriation of title I of ESEA, that a body blow was struck by this House against the children who live in the underprivilege areas of the cities and of the rural areas. I would have preferred to see a much stronger story than appeared in the press in this city yesterday, because education is so essential to carrying on the responsibilities of our citizenry, for carrying on the traditions of this country, for continuing to make this country the greatest Nation in the world. All children should share equally in the opportunity this Nation offers to a good education, and that is one of the aims of title I of ESEA.

I am as proud and as pleased of the United States and of its traditions, its rights, and its freedoms as is the distinguished gentleman from Texas. I believe that if the United States is to continue to progress, to move forward, it must be made up of citizens who can assume the responsibilities of this Nation. And that goal can be reached only with a well-educated citizenry.

Yesterday I pointed out in my speech that this House must choose priorities. It had under consideration two education bills. One was title I, ESEA, from which this committee, the Appropriations Committee, had slashed $135 million. The other was Public Law 874, which this committee had granted, I think it was, something like 87 percent of entitlement, and which later this House raised to 100 percent of entitlement.

Compare the two types of education bills: In one case you have education funds made available to the underprivileged kids of this country. The other bill makes funds available for areas which are well to do, generally, areas which have Federal stations, bases, or some other Federal installation. In the areas where money is directed under title I of ESEA unemployment is as high as 50 or 75 percent. In the 874 areas employment is full.

Where should the education money go? What are our priorities? Of course, it should go to underpriviliged areas in the same proportion, at least, as the other bill, and I think that a press that is critical of the action this House took yesterday is justified.

I have had my experiences with the press, too. Like the gentleman from Texas, I have run for office many times. I, too, bear scars from press reports I considered unfair and I bear many of the blows that the press has given to me from time to time. And, of course, which of us would not want a favorable story occasionally. But I still insist that a free press, telling the truth as it is, relating the true facts and not intermixing its reporting with editorial policy is essential in a free democracy and is one of the glories of this country. Yes, we ought to point out the areas in which the press is wrong if we can do so. As the chairman stated, the press being free, has responsibilities. But if it tells the truth, the press has a right to be critical. It is our privilege to criticize the press when we believe it to be wrong. I say the press should continue to tell the truth as it sees it about what goes on in this Congress.

And I think it deserves to be critical of what happened here in the House yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of my good friend from Illinois I think very graphically illustrate the very point which the distinguished Chairman of the full committee [Mr. MAHON] of Texas, was making.

The gentleman stands up here and complains about something that was not put in the bill, but he never said one word about what was added over last year to continue this progress in education. Two billion dollars was added to education alone. The gentleman knows that. He knows the bill is not through. The gentleman knows the other body is going to work on this bill, and I have never seen them send one back with less than what we sent over.

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

Mr. CASEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman knows of the great affection I have for him. We have worked together on several subcommittees for several years and have always enjoyed each other's fellowship even though we have not always shared each other's views. Apparently this is one of the issues on which we differ. I was not aware that the cut had been purposefully made in the expectation that the Senate would restore the full amount of the budget, but even if that be true, we in the House have our own responsibility and we must address ourselves to the question of whether this vital educational program has been adequately funded. It is obvious that a recommendation by the administration of 53 percent of entitlement is woefully inadequate. Rather than cutting this bare-bones budget recommendation, the committee should have increased it. This is not the usual educational program but one that requires particular attention. But what did the committee do?

I recommended that title I of ESEA be brought to the House with $127 million less than was in the program for fiscal year 1968, a drastic reduction.

Mr. CASEY. I know that. I do not deny that.

Mr. YATES. I think that ought to be made clear.

Mr. CASEY. I know that, but the gentleman never said a word about the other $2 billion that was added to education this year in this bill. The same newspapers—perhaps not the same people, but the same newspapers, and they have columnists who have these philosophies and different philosophies—will next fall, when I am running and when the gentleman is running, will be screaming about how much money we spent over the amount last year. That was illustrated yesterday or the day before when we were debating this bill on health, education, and labor.

People do not realize how much a billion dollars is.

A stack of one-thousand-dollar bills of not quite 8 inches is $1 million. A billion-dollar stack of those one-thousand-dollar bills would be as high as the Washington Monument. We had a bill before us yesterday with 17 of those stacks, and three of those stacks were new ones over last year. That is coming out of the pocket of every man, woman and child in this country. We have to be reasonable. I am with the gentleman. I want to see this country have the best education in the world. But we have to do it within our resources.

I cannot send my kids to some of the best colleges. I have too many of them to send there, as the gentleman well knows. I resent it when some of our bachelor colleagues here try to tell us, who have a little more experience in that line, about the children's welfare and how much more interested they are in the welfare of our children than many of us. I assure the gentleman when we get back to a point where we have plenty of money and do not have this type fiscal difficulty, the gentleman will see me, as he is, urging all the programs that our school system and schoolchildren can absorb.

But let us take credit for what we have done under these conditions. That bill had in it aid for the halt, for the lame,

for the blind, the stricken, the old, the poor, the illiterate, and even some for the highly brilliant to keep this country growing and to keep it going. That bill has jumped, as the gentleman knows, and it should, and it should be one of our prime responsibilities. It has grown tremendously. As the chairman recited during general debate, it has leaped, and probably before long it will amount to $40 billion. That is fine. That is what makes this country great. That is developing our human resources. But, by the same token, let us not just throw only bricks. We should give ourselves a little credit for what we did.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield. I give the gentleman a little credit for what he did.

Mr. CASEY. As little as possible; yes.

Mr. YATES. I am willing to give credit when it is due. But as the gentleman well knows, the Congress must weigh priorities. In the civil rights debates in the past and particularly from our good friends——

Mr. CASEY. It has nothing to do with civil rights. Every child in this country, regardless of color, deserves the best education he can absorb.

Mr. YATES. Of course. The gentleman is making my argument for me.

Mr. CASEY. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. And that is why I say we should have put the money in the bill yesterday for title I, and that is why I say the press is justified in criticizing our failure to do so.

Mr. CASEY. They may be justified in criticizing that point, but the point the chairman was making is they should give use credit for what we have done.

Mr. Chairman, no criticism of the gentleman from Illinois is intended. On the contrary he is to be commended on the vigor with which he advocates greater effort in the field of education and welfare for the people of this country

It is true that the bill of yesterday does not please all, but I restate that it does mark further progress for our Nation in the field of health, education, and welfare.

Mr. YATES. I think that we can agree on that proposition, that Congress should be commended when it acts wisely and should be criticized when it acts unwisely. But is it not the right of the press to make that decision?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE].

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, all I know is what I read in the newspapers. I have appreciated this discussion. I think the critical comments of our press certainly serve a useful function. We all realize the great value it has. The Members recall that I had a survey made at the time we were considering the congressional ethics, a survey of possible ethical questions that might involve the press, and civil rights have been brought into this discussion, too.

I would hope that the Supreme Court, which tends to consider more problems today than it did previously, and now finds it can reach discrimination whether it is being done by a public body, a Government, or done by private bodies, private individuals, in housing, may someday want to consider the whole question of the very valuable free press we need and the problems of censorship, which can be just as onerous, whether done by the Government, a public body, or by a private individual.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that funds were not included in the legislative branch appropriations bill for the congressional summer intern program.

I realize that it is possible to compensate congressional interns from existing appropriations for clerk-hire.

However, in a busy office, handling the volume of legislative business, correspondence, casework and other activities, there is no possible way to fulfill the objectives of the congressional intern program as authorized by House Resolution 416, of the 89th Congress from existing funds. My experiences with the congressional intern program have demonstrated to me conclusively that this is one of the most worthwhile activities available to the young people of America. The congressional intern program provided an excellent training ground and gave to these young people a fuller understanding of our representative republican form of government.

In addition to the benefits which redounded to the young people, who had the privilege of serving in our congressional offices, I also was able to gain the benefit of important research and other assistance which my own college interns provided.

In my opinion, the value of the summer intern program is both immediate and far reaching. It benefits those who are here today, as well as the citizens of tomorrow who are to follow in our places. It seems to me quite shortsighted and poor economy on our part to withhold funds which the congressional summer intern program requires.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the contingent fund herein appropriated shall be available for the purposes of House Resolution 416 of the Eighty-ninth Congress relating to the hire of student congressional interns.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REES

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: On page 6, strike lines 17 through 20.

(Mr. REES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment would do is to strike the restrictive language under miscellaneous items which states that no part of the contingent fund can be spent for the legislative internship program for this coming fiscal year.

What this amendment would do is to strike that restrictive language so that those Members of Congress who believe the congressional internship program is a good program can utilize the $750 and can have congressional interns work in their offices.

As Members know, this program was created by House Resolution 416 in the year 1965.

As a result of the program, I think that some of the most brilliant college students in this country have had an opportunity to come to Washington and work in the offices of the Members of this Congress. I found as a Member of Congress that my interns were very capable. I found that after just a few weeks they were able adequately to draft legislation. I found after their 10 weeks of internship that they certainly had a far better concept of what we are doing or trying to do here and what the legislative process was in the United States. I know that looking at their careers since then this experience has been good for them because these youngsters that we bring here tend to be leaders. They are leaders in their universities, and when they graduate that they will tend to be leaders in their communities.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this is also a good program for us here because we become very insular as Members of Congress sitting here on this Hill. It is good for us to have some bright young minds coming in from our universities and working with us. It gives an opportunity for an exchange of dialog about what we think and about what they think and what might be happening in our universities. Under the student internship program, if you do not want an intern, you do not have to take one. A lot of us who believe in this program and believe it serves a good purpose would like to have the ability to have that $750 and have that one slot filled. We are not saying that with this amendment anyone here has to have an intern; what we are saying is those of us who want and believe in an internship program should be able to have a college intern.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think this item ties in with the budget crisis. I do not think that $750 spent in my office for an intern is going to make or break the U.S. Government. I do think that today when we talk about the alienation of youth and the older people of this country and we talk about the problems of our country and the problems of our universities, the best thing that could ever happen to this Congress would be to have the availability of a viable internship program. For that reason I have introduced an amendment which would strike out the restrictive language so that we can continue the internship program, which is a part of the law of this House, restored for this summer.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to include in my remarks my newsletter "Congressman REES Reports," of April 1, 1968:

WHERE HAVE ALL THE INTERNS GONE?

The soft patter of young feet will be muffled around the halls of Congress this year—the men who run the establishment just don't like college summer interns.

For the past several years, in a rare burst of enlightenment, Congress has allowed $750 to be spent by each member to add a student

intern to his Washington office staff for ten weeks of the summer college recess. There will be no $750 this year. Those of us who liked the enthusiastic, probing, fresh and invigorating presence of one or two college students around our offices doing routine chores, opening mail, researching issues, chasing down bills, asking questions, and learning about our political processes, will be sadder. Life will be duller. A lot of us wonder how intellectually-aware and curious college students threatened and freaked out the old establishment to such an extent that the funds for the program were cut off.

The establishment is not known for being particularly frugal on its physical monuments—witness the $100 million-plus new monstrosity, the Rayburn House Office Building; the spending of close to $6 million to remodel the Cannon House Office Building; or the proposal to remodel my own office building, Longworth, to the tune of $6.9 million. But when it came to spending $750 per Congressman for a student intern, the stern facts of fiscal life, the grim necessity to cut the Federal budget to help our massive $30 billion effort in Vietnam, were evoked.

But why the intern program? I felt the intern program was one of the finest programs we had. In these days when alienation between youth and their elders is so widely discussed, isn't it an absolute necessity to have bright students, leaders in their universities, and in a few years, leaders in this nation, spend ten weeks of a summer absorbing the kaleidescope of American government in Washington? What is more important to us, a few massive marble blocks stuck onto the Capitol and the House office buildings, or the possibility of motivating an inquiring, alert young mind? I believe that the future of this country lies in brains and not bricks.

Young, inquisitive minds, perhaps more attuned to the brutally-realistic problems of 1968 than we, are not tranquil minds. They do not take for gospel all that is fed to them by their elders. Their orientation is today, not ten, twenty, thirty or forty years ago. And this is the real reason the internship program was terminated. Some interns had the audacity to make waves.

Last summer a group of interns concerned by our government's policy in the Vietnam war decided to circulate a petition in opposition to the policy. They planned to present this petition to the President when he met with the students participating in intern programs throughout the legislative and executive branches, as he did annually. Another group of interns who supported this Nation's Vietnam policy started their own petition. The White House, disturbed, canceled the meeting with the President. The congressional establishment were furious, probably thinking the place for the interns was silently listening to briefing sessions and addressing letters in their congressmen's offices—to be seen and not heard.

The final supplemental appropriation bill passed last December 22, the final week of the session, struck out funds available for the congressional student intern program. An irritant had been erased. Washington summers on the Hill would be peaceful and the disturbing element of the student interns would be a phenomena of the past.

There is still a ray of hope, though. Some universities have made funds available to sustain their own interns in congressional offices for the summer. If any members still have salary not already committed to their regular staff operations, they may use this to pay an intern. So, hopefully, there will still be some youthful exuberance wafting through the Halls of Congress, asking embarrassing questions, constantly probing and perhaps, quietly protesting what they feel may be wrong with our country, by signing petitions.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment raises a question that has been discussed for several years. The committee does not think that this is the proper time to spend up to $327,000 a year for a summer intern program. We are trying to economize in every way possible.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing to prohibit a Member from putting a young man or a young lady on his payroll at any salary he sees fit, within the limits of the law, and calling him an intern, or a clerk, or whatever he wants to call him. Congress, I think, has been very generous with the Members. Each Member is entitled to 11 employees in his office or, if his district has more than 500,000 population, he can have 12 employees.

Here is a good place to save $327,000. Our committee is almost unanimous in opposition to this program.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I want to say to the gentleman from Alabama that I congratulate the Committee on Appropriations for including in this legislation a prohibition against the use of funds for the so-called college intern program. In my 12 years in this body I believe that if I were asked to cast a vote on the biggest waste of money ever engaged in by this body, it would be the expenditure of money in this so-called college intern program. And, we are talking about the financial condition of our country. I, for one, would express the hope that some day we should attain more reasonableness in the appropriation of funds for use by Members of this body. I cannot conceive the necessity for having all of the clerk hire which we now have to use and to expend these funds on college students who are here for a period of only 2 weeks and who, some of them, during the period of 10 weeks may have learned their way around the Capitol at the expense of $300,000 or $400,000. I think this is unconscionable and I commend the gentleman from Alabama and the committee for taking the action which they have taken and I hope the amendment is voted down.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Is it not true that the effect of this amendment if it is adopted is merely to increase the clerk hire of the Members of Congress because the chairman of this subcommittee has already indicated that every Member of Congress can put a person on his payroll and call him an intern or any other appropriate title if he so desires?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The Member could give him any title he wants to.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a good thing to eliminate this program, because these boys are so smart and know so much that if we had not terminated this program the Speaker's job would have been in jeopardy.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. So I say, Mr. Chairman, I think we can save $327,000 here, without jeopardizing the activities on Capitol Hill at all.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I support my chairman in opposition to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. REES]. Actually, this does not rule out the intern program. There are, in fact, a great many of them here already. They are working in offices on the regular congressional payroll, as my colleague has previously pointed out. To continue this program merely adds to the office expense of each congressional Member.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the time element involved, in my opinion, it is too late to reinstitute the full intent of the intern program. We are requesting all other departments and agencies of the Government to reduce their expenditures and have, in fact, cut back on their personnel. Certainly, in view of those circumstances, it behooves this House of Representatives and Members of Congress to also apply the same criteria which we are imposing upon the various agencies and departments of the Government. This would indeed be undercutting the $6 billion expenditure reduction which we just recently voted. Certainly we should abide by the same criteria that we are demanding of the rest of the Federal Government to follow.

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

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this observation to the gentleman from California, that the addition of another person to the payroll without an increase in the amount allowed to each Member cannot be a function of this committee in the handling of this bill. It is beyond our capability and beyond the jurisdiction of our particular subcommittee to authorize an additional position. Such an authorization is the function of the legislative committee and requires separate legislation.

I hope the gentleman from California understands this.

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

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I share the views of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], and the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN], but I would like to contribute one addition. As a Member in the Congress representing more than one-half million people I do receive clerk hire for the employment of 12 people. However, I have only one room in which to put them. Therefore, even if the amendment of the gentleman from California should be adopted I would

have no space to put the extra person. In my opinion space is a crucial problem for the Members of this body and especially for those of us without a three-room suite provided those with additional seniority.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his pertinent remarks and I think there are a great many more Members who have had this same experience.

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

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the full committee.

Mr. MAHON. I want to concur, Mr. Chairman, with the sentiments of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota on the matter of the special congressional intern allowance. Congress is undertaking to impose some degree of budgetary restraint on the various departments and agencies of the Government, and we certainly ought to defeat this amendment in order to demonstrate that we are willing to sacrifice something ourselves in the effort to bring some stability to our fiscal affairs.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the full committee for those very significant remarks. The bill is only in compliance with the demands that the committee has been making on other departments.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is it not true that under this program only Members of Congress who wish to have an intern for the summer months would take an intern, and if they did not like the internship program and if they did not have room for them in their offices because their offices are too crowded, that they do not have to do so?

But there are some of us who believe in the fact that there is a gap between, say, the Members of the Congress and the college and university students, that this is a way to bridge that gap, and because of that we ought to be able to have college interns in our offices during the summer months.

Mr. LANGEN. I would say in reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. REES], it is already possible to do that. If you budget the money for your staff correctly, you can add an intern. I might add that I have one on my staff right now, mostly because I have managed my allowance so that I have money allowance to pay him.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I will make it 15 minutes.

Mr. MOSS. If the gentleman will yield, will he give us 20 minutes, so that we have enough time to speak? The gentleman has spoken twice on the subject.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I do object, in view of the increased number of people who are on their feet now. I do object indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I further make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WHITENER yielded his time to Mr. Moss.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment without the slightest illusion that it will be adopted.

But I point out that this type of action is a demonstration of cynicism by this House.

If there were any interns here in the last year who in any way brought discredit upon the House that was the responsibility of the Member who selected them.

But the need for a better dialog between our young men and women in the universities with our generation who represent them has never been greater.

I happen to have an intern in my office and I carefully programed to provide for it because I feel it is a valuable addition. I have interns on both of my subcommittees and I intend to continue to seek to accommodate fellowships and interns whenever and wherever possible.

The plea here that we are doing this cutting to save money is specious. It is being done to punish a group of people because their conduct did not accord with the views of some Members of this body who just are not in touch with reality, as they regard the generation which tomorrow will start taking over this Government of ours.

I think it is time that you face the facts that that is what you are really doing.

The $375,000 can be wasted away in a thousand different avenues here in Washington, so that was not the prime effort against which the language in the appropriation was directed. It was a vote of no confidence in the young men and young women of America. I think we ought to recognize that it was also a vote of no confidence in the judgment of the Members of this House who selected those who served as their interns.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE].

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the very difficult job that faces the Committee on Appropriations in making cuts where necessary. However, I cannot go along with any criticism of this program.

The young man who is the administrative assistant in my office now originally came as an intern. This program has been most helpful to me and helps to bridge the generation gap that has been referred to before.

I think it is a very worthwhile program and I regret that the need to economize forces us to cut it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not prevail, even though I want to take this opportunity to join with the gentleman from California in commending the work that the interns have done.

I believe I have as large an intern program as there is on the Hill. I had 10 interns last year and I have seven this year. I would have a lot more if I could get the additional space for them; space which time and time again I have pleaded with the Speaker for.

The only reason I am opposing the amendment is because of the economic crisis and the tight financial condition that we find ourselves in. Although I realize this is a small amount of money, I think we have to set an example here in the Congress. I hope that not only will this amendment be defeated, but that other amendments will be offered here and passed to cut down and pare down on this legislative appropriation. Everyone seems to be for economy until it comes up in their own backyard. We should be putting our own house in order first.

As I have said, but for the economic crisis, I would be strongly backing the intern program. I agree with the gentleman from California that, in general, the interns on Capitol Hill have done an outstanding job. I have had an intern program ever since I first came to Congress. It has proved exceptionally beneficial to me, and I feel it has been of great value to these young boys and girls. I have never, in my 10 years in Congress, experienced any trouble with my interns, and, on the contrary, have found them industrious, hardworking, and responsible. I have been able to give them meaningful tasks which they have consistently carried out in a manner demonstrating both their abilities and their interest in having an opportunity to play a role in the governmental process. I believe that this program is as valuable an educational experience as any young student can obtain today, and look forward to the time when our financial conditions allow for a resumption of this important program.

I understand that there is an item in here for 78 additional policemen. It has become a hazard to come to work here at the Capitol every day because there are so many policemen around that you trip all over them.

My statement is not made as a criticism of the abilities of our Capitol Police force. Rather it is directed to the fact that we already have too many Capitol Hill policemen and we do not need 78 more.

Furthermore, these policemen, I believe, should be taken out of the patronage system and put on a civil service system, like any other police force in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN].

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to oppose the able leadership of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS]. We have been over this ground many times. I would like to say that we have had a wonderful experience with our interns. We have had our industries support us with private money for groups of high school teachers that we have had down here for the summer as interns. I believe it was very worthwhile, and I would urge a similar program to be continued.

At the present time, I have four college people in my office this minute for the summer. One was editor of the school magazine at Smith. One was the editor of the school paper at Rutgers. One goes to Columbia Law School. You have to be able to become involved with this young generation. They are wonderful. They are invigorating. I think it is good for the whole country to continue the intern program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment, not because I am opposed to interns—I have had them in my office and they were very satisfactory—but I am opposed to it because this is not the time to increase Members' clerk hire. If the gentlemen from California, either one of them, want interns they have a perfect right to put the interns on their payroll and pay them out of the regular allowance that all Members have.

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

Mr. JONAS. I have only a minute and a half.

Mr. MOSS. If you had listened, you would have heard me say that——

Mr. JONAS. I do not yield any further to the gentleman. I heard what he said. I am saying to the Members of the Committee and the gentleman from California that he can have as many interns as he desires to pay out of his clerk hire.

If this amendment is approved it means, in effect, that the House is adding or increasing the Members' clerk hire. This is not the time to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] that this is not really a question of economy. If it is, it is false economy. Rather, it is really a question of attitude. The student congressional intern program is an investment in the youth of this country. Used constructively, the talent of young men and young women from our colleges and universities can make a valuable contribution to the work of the Congress. At the same time the program will give to those young students an insight into the workings of government.

We face a serious alienation of young people today from our Government. It is essential that this bridge exist.

Let us look at the background against which the summer intern program was cut out last December. If I recall correctly—and I am sorry we do not have before us the report on that supplemental appropriation—the words were blocked out in the committee print, but beneath the ink, the language certainly indicated dissatisfaction with the fact that some interns had expressed views which some Members regarded as unpopular or as perhaps not consistent with their own ideas about Vietnam. Last summer interns organized forums and roundrobin letters which disturbed some Members. That was the crux of the matter and the real reason why the intern program was eliminated in a fit of petulance on the part of the House in reaction to the fact that so many interns, like young people all over the country, and like 80 percent of the voters in the recent Democratic primaries, expressed doubts about the Vietnam policy.

I urge that we restore the funds for this program. The amount of money, $327,000, is a worthwhile investment in the future leadership of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield briefly to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the largest congressional district in this country as far as population—about 700,000 people. I have two interns in my office this summer. They are doing a good job. I put them on the regular payroll. I see no reason to add the additional internship program.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I would make this additional point. This on-again off-again situation with respect to the intern program because of the shortage of funds may have had one salutary effect. As the gentleman from New Jersey suggested, it has been my experience also that various private groups and the universities have been attempting to find funds to continue this program because they feel is very important. I share this feeling. I have had interns in my office since my election in 1963. I have an intern this year under the general clerk hire allowance.

I believe it is a useful program and good for the country, but it has been my experience that the universities and the private groups have been making an additional effort this year to raise the funds to bring college students to Washington, because they were aware there would not be sufficient funds through the Congress for this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN].

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. As one of the originators of the intern program that was adopted, I hae been very much in favor of it. As has been said here earlier, I think it is a shame for the House of Representatives to go on record as gagging, and using this as a gag, the sum of $327,000—gagging our young people because of the actions of a few interns last year.

I have an intern program I use within my own allowance. We tried to get a change in the rules so we could have an extra intern within our own allowance. I never use all my own allowance. We could not get that done. So, regardless of the committee action, it is because of the actions of a few that we are serving notice to the young people of the country that we cannot afford dissent and we want complete control over the people we bring in to see the Government in operation.

We have set up an intern program in every branch of the Government. They have to take a competitive examination. They come from all over the country. Now we say we, the House, cannot have this type program. I just wish there were a way we could get every Member to have to stand up and be recorded on this indictment of youth coming to Washington, all for the sum of $327,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, let me call to the attention of this House that the action taken by the committee is certainly not one in opposition to the intern program. It is merely in compliance with the rest of the actions the committee has taken. There were a great many items requested of the committee that we could not accommodate because it was the decision of the committee that the budget at this moment would not accommodate those expenditures.

I can refer to the addition to the Library of Congress, which is certainly one that serves the entire Nation, but it was the best judgment of the committee that here was an expenditure that would not be appropriate at this time.

The same thing applies to the remodeling of the Longworth Building. Some say they do not have space enough for interns. They might have had that additional space if the expenditure had been made, but again it was the judgment of the committee that this was not the time to make that expenditure.

So this decision on the part of the committee is only in compliance with the general attitude of the committee in trying to respond to the needs of the country, in attempting to curb inflation, be responsive to the resolution that we ourselves adopted just the other day. It would be a shame and a disgrace if, after the action of this House recommending a $6 billion limitation in expenditures, we, were not to make any contribution to that expenditure reduction.

I would suggest it is in our own best interests that this amendment should not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] to close debate.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I believe the issues are clear. We have discussed this question of interns for several months and years.

I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES) there were—ayes 14, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: On page 6, line 20, strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: *"Provided,* That each Member's clerk-hire roll may be increased by one employee for the purposes and to the extent authorized in House Resolution 416, 89th Congress."

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will state his point of order.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman stating that he would reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to make it possible for Members to place on their staffs during the summer one intern in addition to the regular office clerk-hire roll limitation.

In other words, there are many of us who, because our staff is completely filled, are not able to adjust our clerk-hire allowance in order to compensate a summer intern. This would make it possible for one additional staff member to be added to the staff of a House Member during the period for which the original resolution (H. Res. 416) of the 89th Congress, applied. It would give us an opportunity to adjust our payrolls in order to accommodate an intern during the months of June, July, and August.

It would cost absolutely nothing. Therefore, it is not subject to the objections, which were raised during consideration of the previous amendment, to the effect that a matter of economy is involved. If the last amendment was defeated because of the economy argument, and if that was a sincere argument, there really ought to be no objection to this amendment as a means of solving this problem.

A vote on my amendment will give Members who opposed the last amendment an opportunity to demonstrate whether or not they are willing to encourage young people to learn about government by working in the legislative branch.

In view of the many statements on the floor this afternoon from many Members that they have no objection to the intern program but are only interested in saving money, I hope the chairman will not press a point of order but will accept this amendment as a solution to the problem about which many of us feel very keenly. At the same time this amendment maintains the position of the committee on not spending additional funds.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be accepted.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RYAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I would argue that the amendment is in order because the amendment relates to the purposes of House Resolution 416, which is referred to in the bill, and clearly, if lines 17 to 20 were in order and were included in the bill, then the proviso which my amendment adds to those lines is equally in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair has had the opportunity to study the amendment of the gentleman from New York and the Chair finds the question of one additional employee is, under the subject of clerk hire, within the jurisdiction of the Committee on House Administration. The amendment of the gentleman from New York would add legislation to an appropriation measure and therefore in violation of clause 2, rule XXI, of the House of Representatives. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS OF ALABAMA

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by by Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama: On page 27, strike out all of the proviso in lines 3 through 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following: *"Provided further,* That the provisions relating to a position and salary thereof carried in House Resolution 905 of the Ninetieth Congress shall be the permanent law with respect thereto."

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer this as a committee amendment to remove a conflict that would otherwise exist with respect to the rates of compensation of the positions listed in House Resolution 1015.

The amendment simply restates the proviso on page 27 to omit all reference to House Resolution 1015. In accord with long practice, the proviso would have made permanent law of the provisions in House Resolution 1015 which the House agreed to on January 15 of this year. That is the usual procedure in such matters.

But on June 11, under authority of the so-called comparability pay provisions of Public Law 90–206, the Speaker issued a determination with respect to salaries of employees of the House, and in section 8 of that determination, made certain determinations with respect to the rate of compensation of the positions covered by House Resolution 1015. And I am advised that those determinations have the force and effect of law, and thus supersede the pertinent provisions of House Resolution 1015.

Thus, it is no longer necessary, or appropriate, to make the provisions of House Resolution 1015 permanent law. This amendment would remove the conflict.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I am in complete agreement with the statement which has just been made by the chairman of the subcommittee and recommend the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 18038) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CONTE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONTE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 18038 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 361, nays 22, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

YEAS—361

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Colmer
Conable
Conyers
Corbett
Cowger
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyros
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McClory
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Matsunaga
May
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Podell
Poff
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—22

Buchanan
Cahill
Collier
Conte
Cunningham
Curtis
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Hall
Hutchinson
Kyl
McEwen
Miller, Ohio
Pollock
Pool
Rumsfeld
Scherle
Springer

NOT VOTING—49

Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Baring
Bevill
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Burton, Utah
Carey
Celler
Corman
Cramer
Dent
Dow
Edwards, La.
Evins, Tenn.
Fino
Ford, William D.
Gardner
Hansen, Idaho
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Holland
Irwin
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kornegay
Laird
McCarthy
Mathias, Md.
Mayne
Morse, Mass.
Nedzi
O'Hara, Mich.
Reinecke
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Scheuer
Schweiker
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Thompson, N.J.
Vanik
Watkins

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Laird.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Schweiker.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Gardner.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.

Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Mayne.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Vanik with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Karsten.

Mr. Bevill with Mr. Irwin.

Mr. Dow with Mr. Corman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 17734, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 17734) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, WHITTEN, SIKES, NATCHER, FLOOD, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, JONAS, LAIRD, LIPSCOMB, and MICHEL.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 17734, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tomorrow, June 28, 1968, to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 17734 making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. HALL, Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the distinguished gentleman from Texas tell us whether or not the conferees have, in fact, met with the Members of the other body? Is the report prepared and ready for filing?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Missouri will yield, the conferees have not met. They have just been appointed. We plan to meet tomorrow morning. However, it was thought that if agreement could be achieved tomorrow, that the report and statement of the managers on the part of the House could be made more readily available to the Members of the House by being filed tomorrow night.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, when will the papers and the statement of the managers on the part of the House be available to Members with relation to the time that the conference report might be called up under this unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAHON. If the conferees are able to agree, it would be printed in the next issue of the RECORD.

Mr. HALL. It would also be eligible to call it up on Monday, would it not?

Mr. MAHON. It could not be called up until after printing except by unanimous consent.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If the other body is in session tomorrow, it could be printed in their version of the RECORD tomorrow, so that there would be that possibility. But with the House not meeting on tomorrow it would not be in our RECORD. However, it would be in the RECORD for Monday. However, I do not know at this moment whether the other body is meeting.

Mr. HALL. The other body is not in session today and we will not be in session tomorrow.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, according to the statements heard, and our rights as individually elected Representatives, but full well knowing fiscal year 1968 ends next week, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 163

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H.R. 163) to prevent vessels built or rebuilt outside the United States or documented under foreign registry from carrying cargoes restricted to vessels of the United States.

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

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE ACT OF AUGUST 1, 1958—INJURY TO FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 15979) to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That section 2 of the Act of August 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 479), as amended (16 U.S.C. 742d–1 note), is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. In order to carry out the provisions of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for each of the two fiscal years immediately following such year. Such sums shall remain available until expended.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend section 2 of the Act of August 1, 1958, as amended, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides."

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Michigan whether the Senate amendments are germane to the bill?

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will yield, I would say that all amendments are germane.

Mr. GROSS. How did the House come out financially?

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will yield further, I will be most pleased to answer the gentleman from Iowa.

The House bill provided $5 million over a period of 3 fiscal years. The Senate bill provided $3.5 million over the same 3 fiscal years, which was a cut of $1.5 million per fiscal year.

The Senate struck out the labeling requirements that had been inserted in the House. So that all that remains is the authorization to spend $3.5 million a year for each of three fiscal years in extension of an existing program which passed this House in years past unanimously, without the labeling requirements which had been in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his explanation, and withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow, June 28, 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 S. 1166, NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1215 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1215

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 (S. 1166) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipeline, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, 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, and such substitute shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. 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 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 California [Mr. SISK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the rule for the consideration of the bill, S. 1166, the National Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1215 provides an open rule with 3 hours of general debate for consideration of S. 1166. The resolution also provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

Authority to improve the public safety now exists in the Department of Transportation. The Department now exercises safety regulation over flammable and other hazardous gases moving other than by pipeline, and safety regulation over pipeline movements of many other commodities including petroleum, but not of natural gas.

There are now over 800,000 miles of gas pipeline in the United States including approximately 63,000 miles of gathering lines, 224,000 miles of transmission lines, and 536,000 miles of distribution lines. These lines range in diameter from less than 1 inch to 42 inches with 48-inch lines under consideration. They vary in condition from old, unprotected lines to new, well-protected lines. They differ in function from low-pressure

transmission lines operated at 1,300 pounds per square inch, which is equivalent to a force of over 93 tons pushing against the pipeline wall over every square foot.

In 1945 natural gas supplied something like one-eighth of the Nation's total consumption of the energy fuels and energy; today it supplies one-third. This tremendous increase in the use of natural gas and the concurrent increase in the number of miles of gaslines makes consideration of the industry's safety record and standards most important.

The purpose of S. 1166 is to provide for the prescription and enforcement of minimum Federal safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipeline and for pipeline facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1215 in order that S. 1166 may be considered.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I have always been impressed by the corporate concern for safety which the gas companies display for the consumer.

Let there be but one unexplained whiff of gas in a home, and a company crew is dispatched. Obviously, they would not want a neighborhood gas explosion and its predictable effects on future gas hookups.

But when it comes to gas pipeline safety, the gas companies and the transmission companies, which own the long interstate gas lines, are very shortsighted. They have succeeded in diluting the gas pipeline safety bill, which we consider today. Yet these companies will suffer greatly if this crippled bill passes and allows more gas explosions.

The issue before the House is quite simple. It is whether effective legislation for the safety of 800,000 miles of gas pipelines and distribution mains is to prevail or whether a facade legislation, riddled with loopholes, exemptions and obstructionist provisos, is to secure acceptance.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has conducted hearings which revealed grave dangers in our pipeline system and virtually no meaningful safety regulation by the States. The bill reported out by the committee does not reflect this evidence. It needs strengthening. It needs stronger sanctions.

Violators should not, as they do under the present bill, have an endless opportunity to violate the law with the only discomfort being the requirement to meet a compliance deadline after being notified by a Government official.

What conceivable reason could there be for requiring the Government to notify in advance, and give time for compliance before any penalty is imposed, a pipeline company that is violating the law for the first or the hundredth time? This proviso has been described by my distinguished colleague from Michigan, Congressman JOHN DINGELL, as the "Mad Dog Provision." It is worse than that. The "dog" is not just given one bite, but can bite again and again and he has to be warned, and given time for compliance before he is penalized. This is so whether the violator is an executive, an official of the company or a foreman.

Further, I believe that the democratic process is enhanced within an administrative agency if consumers, or in this case, landowners, propertyowners or tenants, have just as much legal standing before the agency as do pipeline companies. Only in this manner will an administrator be given reason to respect the submission in the docket for proposed safety standards that is sent by people to be protected. Their comments deserve the same standing, with right of judicial appeal, as those of industry.

I do not believe that there can be any moral justification for exempting gathering lines from this safety legislation merely because these lines in most, but not all, cases go through rural areas.

Whether 1,000 people or five people are to be protected, the standards for pipe should be the same. Also, what is a rural area today may be a suburban area tomorrow.

There is no use in giving the Secretary of Transportation a mandate for safe pipelines and then hamstring him with onerous burdens vis-a-vis State action and authority. The burden of proof should be on the States to show they can have equal or better safety standards, enforced, before the Federal Government relinquishes its responsibility.

The massive reduction in authorized funds, almost 95 percent in fiscal year 1969 alone, from the bill passed by the other body is a severe undermining. One can observe economies without going to this extreme.

People in this country are more aware of the discrepancy between what is in the law's preamble and what its provisions and administration reveal. We do not need laws that are form instead of substance. To so weaken this pipeline bill, to strip it of meaningful sanctions, without which law has no meaning, and to starve it from a funding viewpoint, is to perpetrate a deception upon the public.

The danger from gas pipeline explosions can be catastrophic, dwarfing most other manmade disasters by comparison. In Queens, New York, in January 1967, a gas leak led to a rampaging fire that destroyed many homes and could have taken hundreds of lives were it not for alert police and firemen action to evacuate the residents.

On March 28 of this year, a ruptured gas main spewed a heavy concentration of gas into the air on the upper East Side of New York City forcing the police to seal off a nine-block area to avoid a disastrous inferno. First Avenue from 92d Street to 100th Street.

Peoples lives are at stake here. We need a strong, just law; one that is workable and allows the job to be done. There must be adequate authority, adequate sanctions and adequate funds. Pipelines are a massive transport system, going into every State of the Union, under residential and business areas, into the hearts of our towns and cities. Not only must they be as safe as possible, inspected, repaired and, where necessary replaced with newer pipe, but they must not be exposed to become secondary disasters to land shifts—of concern in the West—surface construction and pounding, and so forth.

I was extremely gratified by the gas safety bill. S. 1166, passed by the Senate last September. Not only was that bill a strong one, but it was passed on a rollcall vote of 78–0. For once it seemed that the long-neglected interests of the consumer had been served.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce succeeded in emasculating the bill beyond recognition. So feeble was the committee's amended version of S. 1166 that Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd called it "worse than an empty gesture."

Clearly, we have witnessed what the New York Times called "capitulation to the industry" and "deference to gas company profits." The major, indeed the only, strong opponents of this bill are the gas companies, with offices and facilities in the West.

Yet it is the people in the East, where the underground pipes are oldest, in poorest condition, and most used, who pay dearly, in both property and lives, for our inaction. Gas explosions in recent years have rocked such cities as Reading, Dayton, New York City, St. Paul, Allentown, Evansville, Pensacola, Passaic, Yonkers, and my own borough of Queens.

This bill, if passed in its present weakened form, will be regretted by every responsible gas company official in this country.

Although I am disinclined to take the role of the defender of the utilities, I think we should save the gas companies from their own folly today by rejecting the committee's bill and passing S. 1166.

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

Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution, House Resolution 1215, provides an open rule with 3 hours of debate on the bill, S. 1166.

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the establishment and enforcement of minimum Federal safety standards for natural gas pipeline facilities and for the transportation and storage of such gases.

The Department of Transportation and other agencies currently have authority to regulate all other modes of transportation. Pipeline facilities are the only transportation facilities not regulated. There are over 800,000 miles of gas pipelines in the United States, some 224,000 miles of transmission lines, and 536,000 miles of distribution lines. They vary from old, poorly protected lines to new, well protected ones. Natural gas now supplies about one-third of the Nation's energy. While the safety record has been good—in the last 17 years only 67 people have been killed by explosions—it is also true that operational failures occur regularly. In almost all cases the leak is repaired before any explosion takes place, but the potential for serious injury and destruction is clearly present.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to establish minimum safety standards by the gathering, transmission, and distribution of natural gas by pipelines used in interstate commerce. Some standards will be retroactive in nature; the Secretary is empowered to inspect pipeline facilities and order the removal or repair of all hazards. These standards are to be promulgated within two years. During this interim temporary standards will be promulgated by the Secretary.

All owners and operators of any pipeline facilities have a number of obligations placed upon them by the bill. They are required to—

First, comply with the safety standards promulgated;

Second, file with the inspection authority, and comply with a plan of inspection and maintenance; and

Third, make available to inspection their records and permit entry for inspection.

Promulgated standards and duties created by the bill will be enforced as follows:

First, the Secretary of Transportation will have jurisdiction over all pipeline facilities subject to the Federal Power Commission; and

Second, for all other pipelines facilities enforcement will be either by the Secretary or by a State agency under either a written agreement between the State and the Secretary, or under a certification of competence to inspect and enforce executed by the State and agreed to by the Secretary.

A number of States have moved to regulate gas pipeline facilities in recent years. Most use as their standard a revised industry-prepared code—but uniformity does not exist. The bill seeks uniformity of standards and enforcement on all pipelines which cross State lines. States will retain the primary role of enforcement of local pipeline safety standards. Within a State, Federal standards may be superseded by State standards and enforcement of them in either of two ways: either by the submission to the Secretary of a annual certification by the State detailing its enforcement activity of its standard, which must at least equal Federal standards, or where a State cannot submit such a certification, through a written agreement with the Secretary for the State to carry out for the Secretary the administration of the Federal standards.

Civil penalties are provided. Injunctive relief may be obtained if a pipeline owner or operator, after notice of a defect in his facilities, has not removed the dangerous condition within a reasonable time. The Secretary may also impose a civil penalty if the condition has not been remedied after notice of its existence. A fine of $500 per day may be levied; the maximum penalty for a related series of violations may not exceed $100,000.

The bill creates the Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee. Its purpose is to advise the Secretary on technical matters concerning pipeline operations. The Secretary is required to obtain its views before formally proposing any safety standard. Membership is 15, composed of those from the State inspection agencies, members of the industry, and the general public. All must be experts in the field.

Any persons affected by an order issued by the Secretary may, within 60 days, file a petition for judicial review with the circuit court.

The Secretary is required to report annually on the operation of the program, the safety record, and any recommendations he may have to improve the operation of the program.

Funds authorized for fiscal 1969 are $500,000; for 1970, $2,000,000; for 1971, $3,000,000. The funds will be used for the most part in grants to States, paying up to 50 percent of their increased inspection activities.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to use this time to inquire of the chairman of our committee if it is his intention to finish general debate on this particular bill at this late hour or is it his intention to reserve some of the time for general debate at such time as the bill might be called up the first of the coming week or whenever it is to be reconsidered.

Mr. STAGGERS. In reply to the gentleman, I would say, the intention is to go on to about 5:30 or 6 o'clock and stop for the evening. That certainly would leave some time for next Tuesday.

Mr. PICKLE. I certainly thank the chairman for that statement.

I know that some of the Members are out of town, members of the subcommittee that has considered this bill. The schedule which the gentleman mentioned would reserve time for Members to enter comments during the general debate, and that is certainly satisfactory. I thank the chairman for this consideration.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled at what has been done to S. 1166 by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In the words of Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd, they have made a regulatory bill into a measure which is "worse than no bill at all."

Mr. Speaker, the most serious defect in the bill which we are considering today is that it would exempt the State from Federal regulation. The committee amendments give the States the power to certify their compliance with Federal standards which is a sharp departure from the version adopted in the other body. The version which they approved gave the Secretary of Transportation the power to decide whether a State's regulation was adequate.

I also have serious reservations about the provisions which exempts gathering lines in rural sections. Thus, if this section remains unchanged, an important segment of the Nation's pipelines will be unregulated.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed at the fact that the committee has cut the amount of money authorized by the other body from $38 million to an inadequate figure of $5.5 million.

Mr. Speaker, each of us is aware of the threat of pipeline explosions and many of our constituents share our sense of concern. I do not think it is good policy to reassure these people by saying that we have passed a bill regulating this industry when in fact we have given our approval to a bill which does not go to the heart of the problem.

Every Member of this House has heard at one time the old slogan "If you are going to do a job, do it right." Unfortunately, this bill is a good example of exactly the opposite philosophy. I cannot too strongly suggest that this bill be sent back to committee with instructions that a bill along the line of the one passed by the other body be approved.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the efforts to strengthen the House committee version of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act. I speak as one whose district has suffered directly from a gas pipeline explosion.

Last December, a residential dwelling in the Riverdale section of the Bronx was wracked by an explosion. A young mother, her 20-month-old son and six others were injured by the blast, the ensuing collapse of the house, and a fire which broke out and which spread to two adjoining houses. What happened in this case could too easily occur elsewhere in my district—or in any Member's district.

This Congress has done much to advance the safety and welfare of consumers. To weaken the Senate bill designed to protect the public from the lurking catastrophe beneath their streets, houses, and businesses would be to reverse a salutary trend. The meat inspection bill was strengthened, not weakened, as it went through the legislative mill. The same was true of truth in lending.

I urge my colleagues to resist the pressures to weaken the pipeline safety bill and to support the amendments being offered to strengthen it.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act, as reported with amendments by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in my opinion falls far short of providing what is so badly needed in this field—strong Federal regulation.

The potential danger from natural gas pipeline explosions is huge, since there are now over 800,000 miles of such pipelines in the Nation, ranging in size from less than 1 inch to 42 inches in diameter. Strong Federal regulation is needed to control this simmering danger beneath our feet.

In South Milwaukee last year, two gas explosions, which came within minutes of each other, wrecked a new $450,000 addition to St. Adalbert's Catholic School and injured 13 persons, including several children. Only the fact that more than 300 persons had been evacuated from the building a half-hour before the blasts saved the community from a terrible tragedy.

The gas company blamed the explosion on gas escaping from a break in an 8-inch pipe that apparently had been weakened by heavy frost.

Basically, both the bill passed by the other body, S. 1166, and the amended measure reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, would direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish minimum safety standards

for gas pipelines, to set up procedures for enforcing these standards, and to provide for penalties for violations. But it is in the application of these provisions that the two measures differ—and the committee's version is much weaker than S. 1166.

To cite one example, S. 1166 provides that the Secretary of Transportation may exempt pipeline already in the ground from Federal safety standards unless he finds that a "potentially hazardous situation exists, in which case he may require compliance." In other words, if a Transportation Department study were to show that 8-inch pipe of a certain age was susceptible to deterioration under heavy frost conditions, then the Secretary would be empowered to order a complete inspection of all such pipe. If such a law were in force last year, it might have prevented the explosion at St. Adalbert's.

Under the committee's version of the bill, however, the Secretary must find "a particular facility to be hazardous to life or property" before he can order action on it; that is, he must pinpoint the trouble before he can direct that it be eliminated. This would seem to require, in effect, that the Secretary monitor the 800,000 miles of existing pipeline in order to find specific hazards—and generally, when he finds these specific hazards, it will probably already be too late.

In addition, S. 1166 provides for fines of $1,000 per day for each violation of pipeline safety standards up to a total of $400,000 for any series of violations. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reduced these civil penalties by half, however, and provided that no penalty could be imposed until the violator was given notice and an opportunity to correct his violation.

Certainly the penalties in the committee's bill are not only inadequate but ineffective. They would permit a company to violate the law with impunity, since once caught it would have a chance to correct the violation before any penalty was imposed.

For these reasons, I urge that the House reject the weak language of the committee's bill and, instead, support the amendments offered to restore the strong provisions of S. 1166.

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.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE BILL ON JULY 2 OR JULY 3

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the House to consider the District of Columbia revenue bill next Tuesday or Wednesday.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia if it is anticipated that committee action will be forthcoming either Friday of this week or Monday of next.

Mr. McMILLAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And the bill will be programed for next week, either Tuesday or Wednesday?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes; at the convenience of the leadership.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the report and hearings on the bill be available?

Mr. McMILLAN. We hope to have the report filed at the latest next Monday.

Mr. GROSS. And the bill would be called up on Tuesday?

Mr. McMILLAN. I hope it will not be called until Wednesday. We will take it up when it is convenient.

Mr. GROSS. When will the hearings be available?

Mr. McMILLAN. We will try our best to have them available by that time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is my understanding that the hearings have already been held.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, the hearings have been held.

Mr. GROSS. The hearings may have been held, but will they be printed and available, and will the reports be printed and available so that we may have a little time to look at them?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I should think we could get the hearings printed. As I look at the schedule, it is at least tentatively agreed upon for next week. It seems to me that it is most unlikely the bill will be reached before Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 16024 AND H.R. 16824 UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have until midnight tomorrow night to file reports on H.R. 16024, the high speed ground transportation bill, and H.R. 16824, the extension of the State Technical Services Act.

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

There was no objection.

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SAFETY ACT OF 1968

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1166) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipeline, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1166, with Mr. GALLAGHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill as reported is to provide the Secretary of Transportation with the authority to prescribe and enforce minimum Federal safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipeline and for pipeline facilities.

At the present time the Secretary of Transportation has authority to improve public safety as it is affected by transportation by private auto, bus, truck, airplane, ship, oil pipelines, and to some degree by railroad. The only significant mode of transportation over which he has no authority whatever is the transportation of gases by pipeline.

There are now over 800,000 miles of gas pipeline in the United States including approximately 63,000 miles of gathering lines, 224,000 miles of transmission lines, and 536,000 miles of distribution lines. These lines range in diameter from less than 1 inch to 42 inches with 48-inch lines under consideration. They vary in condition from old, unprotected lines to new, well-protected lines. They differ in function from low-pressure distribution lines operated at one-fourth pound per square inch to high-pressure transmission lines operated at 1,300 pounds per square inch, which is equivalent to a force of over 93 tons pushing against the pipeline wall over every square foot. Most of this pipeline system is of recent development.

The testimony of the Secretary of Transportation and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission is that the safety record of the transmission industry has been a relatively good one.

While the number of deaths has been low in relation to other industries, the recital of this fact alone, however, does not indicate adequately the seriousness of transmission systems failures. Over this period there has been an operational failure about every 5 days and a large number of failures during testing. In most cases the gas which escaped as a result of those failures did not ignite. In addition, the danger of injury and death has not been as great in the case of transmission lines which have been located away from areas of population density. When a transmission line failure occurs in a populated locale and ignition follows, the resulting explosion can be highly destructive. For example, the rupture and explosion at Natchitoches, La.,

in March 1965, gutted a 13-acre area, killed 17 people, burned five houses, and melted cars and rocks in the vicinity.

The safety record of distribution systems is far from as good. Secretary Boyd testified that most of the systems have been in existence for many years and much of the original pipe is still in use even though it is now 30 or 40 years old and, in some instances, twice that. He said there is no readily available information concerning accidents and distribution systems as there is in those in transmission pipelines. He pointed out, however, a number of major accidents which have occurred since the first of the year and stated the need for safety jurisdiction over the distribution lines was most necessary.

This bill accordingly proposes to close this gap in legislative jurisdiction and to provide for minimum Federal safety standards. The bill as reported:

First. Directs—section 3—the Secretary of Transportation within 24 months to establish minimum safety standards for the gathering, transmission, and distribution of gas by pipeline or its storage, and for pipeline facilities used in the transportaton or treatment of gas. Provision is made for interim standards. Certain standards apply retroactively and the Secretary otherwise is empowered to order removal of hazards to life or property.

Second. Places a duty—section 8—upon each person engaging in the transportation of gas or who owns or operates pipeline facilities to: First, comply with these safety standards; second, file and comply with a plan of inspection and maintenance required by section 11; and third, permit access to records, make report and permit entry or inspection as required by section 12.

Third. Provides—section 5—for the enforcement of these standards: First, as to pipeline facilities and the transportation of gas, subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, by the Secretary; and second, as to all other pipeline facilities and transportation of gas either by the Secretary or by delegation to a State agency through either: First, an effective certification by the State agency to the Secretary; or, second, an effective written agreement between the State agency and the Secretary. As here used a State agency may mean a municipality.

Fourth. In addition, the bill provides—section 4—for the establishment of a technical pipeline safety standards committee: section 6—for the judicial review of orders; section 7—for cooperation with the Federal Power Commission; section 9—for civil penalties; section 10—for injunctions and jurisdiction; section 13—for research; section 14—for reports to the Congress; and section 15—for the authorization of the sums of $500,000, $2 million, and $3 million for the next 3 fiscal years.

Just how the standards are to be set up and how they are to be enforced is clearly set out in the committee report and I commend it to the Members for a complete understanding of what is here involved.

The committee made some changes in the bill as it passed the Senate. Those are fully discussed in the committee report and I shall not go into that here inasmuch as I understand that some members of the committee intend to offer amendments bringing the bill as reported more in line with the bill as it passed the Senate.

At the appropriate time I shall offer one committee amendment to the bill which is solely for the purpose of clarifying a cross-reference which is now contained in section 5.

The bill has had quite a hearing in the newspapers in the country. I am sure it is not as bad a bill as has been portrayed in many ways, but in many respects many things could be done to better the bill.

With these words before the committee in the debate, it is hoped it will not run too long today, because I know many Members do want to get home. With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD], the able chairman of the subcommittee who held the hearings and conducted the markup on the bill in the subcommittee.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman and his committee for bringing forth this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 1166, but ask my colleagues to also support the amendments to be offered to the pending bill to make it similar to the Senate bill, the stronger and truer safety bill.

I commend the chairman and his committee for bringing this much-needed legislation to the floor. In November 1967 I introduced legislation, H.R. 13936, which incorporated features of the administration's request and which would provide for needed safety in the transmission lines of natural gas. The greatest danger exists from existing lines—lines which run under nearly every major metropolitan center—these for all effective purposes are excluded from the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support the amendments to be offered, amendments that will give to the country effective gasline safety and protection. In the bill, as reported, the Secretary of Transportation must find an "actual" hazard before he may act—I believe that he must be given authority to remove a potential hazard. If he is required to find that a particular facility is actually hazardous, then it is probably too late.

The people of my district have very vivid memories of the explosion which occurred in my congressional district in Queens County, N.Y., on January 13, 1967, and they want assurances that we are doing everything possible to insure that there will not be a recurrence of that tragedy. I know that this is true throughout the country.

It is said that a picture is worth a thousand words—here, my colleagues, are actual photographs of the inferno caused by the gasline explosion in my district. Also, we have all received a release by the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union setting forth news clips of similar disasters throughout the country. This can and may happen at any time in any one of our districts. If these were pictures of riots there would be great reaction. For too often the Congress is accused of "reacting" to situations rather than taking the initiative to protect the people before the crisis has occurred. My first bill having to do with gas pipeline safety was introduced early in 1967, after the explosion in Jamaica, and this may be considered a form of "reacting," but there have been numerous explosions since the one in my district, and we are still debating.

This legislation before us today with the correcting amendments must be passed into law now.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the full committee for his kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, as has been said by the chairman of the full committee, this bill as reported by the House has received some criticism from certain sources of the news media, which I do not think it deserves. As a matter of fact, there is considerable reference to the fact that the other body passed a stronger and better bill. Actually, this is not the case. I support the bill on the floor here, just as I did in the subcommittee and in the full committee, on the basis that I would have an amendment or try to attach an amendment to the bill, which is found, if Members have the bill before them on page 30, line 11.

This deals with the nub, in my judgment, of the entire bill—the entire idea and thrust of the bill. The idea of the bill was that because the various States of our 50 United States had not taken sufficient care of the dangers that are inherent in the carrying of this high-pressure and lethal gas, which can be exploded at any moment and can destroy property and destroy lives, set up by lack of action by the various State regulatory bodies, it is time that the Federal Government enter the void and set up Federal regulations which the 50 States could agree to.

I must say that in the Senate bill, I believe the language they had in section 5 is superior to the language which was adopted both by our subcommittee and by our full committee. I am now talking about the fact that under the bill before you the authorization is given to any State which has a clerk who can type merely to set forth the fact, whether it is a fact or not a fact, that the State, whatever State it is, is in compliance with this bill. Obviously this changed the thrust of the bill.

There is a need in our country to have safe transportation of this natural gas. And by transportation of natural gas I am not just talking about the pipelines. I do not believe that the pipelines have perhaps had as many accidents, and certainly they do not have the opportunity to injure as many people as the distribution lines, which also, within the terms of this bill, transport natural gas, from the

so-called long lines to the homes of the users of natural gas.

I have no quarrel with the pipelines or the distribution companies. I merely point out to the Members of the Committee that if we are to have Federal regulation we must have some way of enticing the States to enter into agreements with the Federal Government. We must give them some incentive to join together in coming under the blanket of Federal supervision.

In the Senate language the enticement or the encouragement for the States to come under the blanket of Federal enforcement and Federal standards as set up by the Secretary of the Department of Transportation is that if they live up to and comply with the Federal standards the Federal Government will provide matching funds up to 50 percent of the funds needed by any one of the various 50 States to come up to the Federal standards that will be promulgated.

Unfortunately, in my judgment, our subcommittee and our committee did not see fit to follow this pattern. Instead, the members of the committee who voted for this section, section 5, stated that any commission or group within a State could merely make out a statement that the State had complied, and the burden of proof that they had not complied would then shift automatically to the Secretary of Transportation.

The language which the Senate sent over, and which I will offer at the proper time as a substitute for section 5, states that the State agency would qualify if they adopted the Federal safety standards. That is No. 1.

No. 2, if they undertook a program satisfactory to the Secretary which was designed to achieve compliance with these standards and with the plans of inspection and maintenance requirements of the company.

No. 3, that the agency agreed to cooperate in a system of Federal compliance with the program.

However, there is one section, Mr. Chairman, which has not had enough emphasis and which I hope to develop, as I say, at the proper time, which has not been emphasized. This is that there was a condition precedent; namely, that before the Secretary of Transportation could enter into an agreement with any State agency he had to be satisfied that they did comply with the Federal standards and that they would thereby be eligible to participate in the Federal grants, that is, the matching 50 percent grants, which would thereby follow in order to induce the States to comply.

If section 5 is not changed, there is no longer any inducement for a State to improve its law in this regard, because it does not have to in order to get certification and to get its share of Federal money. It will get its share of Federal money whether it complies or not.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues who are not as familiar with the bill as the members of the subcommittee or the committee to take a close look at this section, because I think in the vernacular of the Down Easter, we either have to fish or cut bait, and unless we are going to have regulation which is meaningful, we might as well have no Federal regulation at all.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues who are here on the floor to take a look at this section and, as I repeat, at the proper time I will introduce an amendment to try to correct this situation.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to say I feel the House version of this gas pipeline safety bill is superior in many ways to that of the other body and has been subjected to some unfair criticism. There are amendments, I am sure, that will be offered, because they were offered in the full committee, but I think the full thrust of the bill will be lost unless we do amend section 5.

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

The industry which brings natural gas from the fields to the homes and industrial users of this Nation has been the subject of phenomenal growth since the end of World War II. Gathering lines which carry the gas from the producing field to the larger, higher pressure lines have doubled and now approximate 63,000 miles. Transmission lines which carry the gas across the country to the local distributors have tripled to reach a present total of 224,000 miles, and lines which distribute the gas to the final customers have increased five times and there are now 536,000 miles of such lines.

In the course of all this expansion the safety record of the natural gas interstate pipelines has been outstanding. It varies somewhat according to the type of line we are talking about, but even the worst critics of the industry are forced to admit that this industry has been diligent in its safety practices and has in fact compiled an impressive record for safety.

Gathering lines have had so little trouble in the past because of their nature and their remote locations that the committee has seen fit to exclude from regulation under this bill all such lines which are found to be in rural areas. The Secretary of the Department of Transportation can make this determination and thus include any gathering line which comes near concentrations of people, or in urban areas.

The last category, distribution lines, is much harder to analyze. There is no doubt that the bulk of the danger lies at this point, where the flow of natural gas must be fanned out widely and piped into the individual home or factory. Determining what causes accidents when so many people and possible causes are involved becomes most difficult. It is also clear enough that here is the place where the most attention to safety must be paid. Certainly we should try in any legislation we pass to help eliminate those situations which endanger citizens because of either weak standards of construction, faulty maintenance, and hazardous situations which develop.

Uniformity of practice in an industry so widespread is desirable. The code which the industry itself devised as early as 1935 and upgraded many times through the years has been adopted for enforcement purposes by 26 States. That is good but obviously not complete. The code itself does not cover everything which should be included in a comprehensive code. So this bill does try to provide for uniformity of standards and uniformity of enforcement. Here is how it goes about it:

First. The Secretary of Transportation will establish minimum standards for the various kinds of pipelines, for storage facilities and some treatment facilities. In addition, the Secretary may move preemptorily to remove specific hazards;

Second. Those engaged in the business must meet these standards, must show a plan for inspection and maintenance, and keep records which are open to inspection;

Third. Enforcement will be by the Secretary for interstate lines. Those within a State can be handled by the State if it certifies to the satisfaction of the Secretary that it has all necessary authority to do what he wants and will actually so enforce. If this does not work, an agreement for part of the job can be made with the State. If the Secretary is not satisfied that the State can or will really do the job, he may step in and take over.

Fourth. There will be a Technical Pipeline Standards Committee, judicial review, civil penalties, injunctions and reports to Congress.

These are the principal features of the bill. I trust you will read this bill carefully. It is an important piece of legislation.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. As a matter of fact, does not the report present the statement that there have been no accidents for 6 years in the gathering lines segment of the industry?

Mr. SPRINGER. And that is true. I would say that before 6 years the accidents were very few, if any, before that time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel it is necessary to change section 5 to give a Federal tinge to this bill? Do you think it is correct just to have a State clerk making out a certificate that says the State is an accomplice when, indeed it may not be?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think if that wording can be improved; yes. I would want to see the wording of that first.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PICKLE. I would like to inquire about this same point. Because, if, in truth and in fact, what the gentleman has said, that all that would be required would be for some clerk in a State office to fill out a report that the State has met by way of certification the standards required, then I think the committee as a whole would not be for the measure

and would want to see it strengthened. Surely, that should not be the case. I do not understand it that way. I am not a member of the subcommittee, but I understand from reading the report on pages 25, 26, and 27, it talks in terms of sections 5(a) and 5 (b).

Page 26 states that a "State agency which submits annually to the Secretary of Transportation a certification that such State agency—" and it lists the provisions. They are as follows:

(1) has regulatory jurisdiction over safety standards and practices of such facilities and transportation;

(2) has adopted each Federal safety standard applicable to such facilities and transportation as of the date of the certification;

(3) is enforcing each such standard; and

(4) has authority to require record maintenance, reporting, and inspection substantially the same as provided under section 12 and filing for approval of plans of inspection and maintenance described in section 11.

It seems to me that this is a rather detailed certification that a State must make to show that they are actually meeting these standards.

A great deal has been said about whether there ought to be an agreement as opposed to a certification. I do not know that it makes a great deal of difference, really. If there is, I would like for this record to show it, or for someone to point it out to me. I assume that when Members later offer amendments, they will lay that information before the House.

As I understand it, whether it is by way of certification or by way of an agreement, if the Secretary of Transportation signed the agreement, he would then be satisfied about the operations of the standards. If he was not, he would then reject the agreement or the certification and he could call for hearings. It would automatically go to a determination as to whether they were meeting these standards or not. There is a great deal of difference.

A great deal has been said which would leave the impression that this is a very weak approach. If indeed the point was so made that all that would be required would be a clerk to fill out a piece of paper, it would impute to each State that it did not have the good, legitimate, bona fide, safe interest of its citizens at heart. I do not think the gentleman intends to leave that impression, that a State would treat it that cavalierly.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield, I would say that any State is not going to try to fool the Federal Government by saying that they are in compliance with the Federal standards when they are not. But the gentleman is a lawyer. He understands very well the burden of proof. When they enter into an agreement under the Senate language with the Secretary of Transportation, they sit down and go over the matter, and then the Secretary says, "Well, yes, this State is in compliance." But under the language of our bill, the House bill, there is no need for that approach.

The State merely certifies that they are in compliance, and then the burden of proof shifts to the Secretary to show that they are not in compliance.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. I hasten to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am not an attorney. But I have checked with members of our legal staff, and they have indicated to me that it would not make a great deal of difference whether it was by way of agreement or certification. For that reason I have been for the language of the report and the bill. It would not make that big a difference.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. In answer to the gentleman from Texas, I agree completely with the subcommittee chairman that this tilts the bill 180 degrees. We can have one of two types of regulations: either Federal regulations with the States coming in and complying with the Federal regulations and carrying them out by inspection, by maintenance, and by the other things that are required in this bill, which is what is required under an agreement system; the States must comply, and the States must show that they are complying, and anything that goes wrong at that point is then the responsibility of the person operating and the State.

When you tilt this bill 180 degrees, what happens is this: You are saying that the Federal Secretary, with almost no money, as shown in this bill, and with a penalty provision that applies only after an explosion has occurred, must go out and look at yay thousand miles of pipeline and say to the State, "You are not carrying out your duty at that point," and to shape up. To us, that is one of the key points of this bill.

I agree with the subcommittee chairman when he says section 5 is the key section that we must deal with and that our other amendments work up to and are part of.

What we are pointing out to the gentleman is that under this bill as written—and I agree completely with the ranking minority Member when he stated one of the great problems is in the distribution lines in these cities—if in the city of Baltimore or Boston or any other major city, there is a dangerous situation, either valves, or as happened in Georgia, the line is not deep enough under the ground, or, as in California, where they did not have cutoffs in the right places, and if the States have had this in existence and the States say, all right, we have adopted the standards and we say everything is all right, unless the Secretary goes out and catches them, and gets a specific order against a specific company, we just wait until something happens.

That is entirely different from a Federal regulatory system that says, here are the standards, here are the penalties, and if you do not comply and have not met the standards and brought yourselves up, then when there is an explosion or complaint from somebody, we will apply the penalty against you.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I will yield for a brief question from my distinguished colleague, but I do not think I can take too much time for that.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the statement of the gentleman from Texas, the major problems are in the cities where the pipelines were laid many years ago and where explosions have been occurring with quite some frequency, where conditions have been allowed to obtain and where we have really seriously dangerous pipeline conditions largely because the State public service commissions or public utilities commissions for one reason or another have not demanded the kind of standards, have not demanded the kind of maintenance, have not demanded the kind of inspection required to overcome this dangerous situation.

If we have State certification where the State already is delinquent in doing the job the public expects should be done, this is somewhat ludicrous. The idea here is to have the States come in to the Secretary, according to language in the Senate bill, and have them demonstrate they have adequate systems of maintenance and adequate systems of standards and adequate systems of inspection.

The Secretary can demand they do this or that or the other thing. He would not have that kind of opportunity under the certification provision. The State would not have to come to him and justify that their procedures are adequate. That is a major difference why we prefer this kind of language.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 1166, the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968.

This is a strong bill. This legislation gives new and greatly expanded authority to the Secretary of Transportation in the field of natural gas pipeline safety.

What does the bill do?

First. Directs the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe, within the next 24 months, minimum safety standards for the gathering, transportation, and distribution of gas. Until that time, the Secretary is directed to provide for "interim" safety standards. Both the "interim" standards and the "permanent" standards will apply throughout the Nation. The entire industry in every State will be bound by law to follow these safety standards. Everyone must comply under penalty of fines spelled out in the bill.

Second. Each person—who engages in the transportation of gas, or operates gas facilities, must file certain reports, plans, or records. The industry must permit inspection—not only of plant, equipment, and lines, but also of all files, records, and reports.

Third. Provides for enforcement of these standards and Federal requirements by a joint Federal-State effort. The individual States—those who can

show that an effective enforcement program is being carried out, can by certification or agreement maintain that enforcement program. If the States do not choose to cooperate in this joint enforcement program, then the Secretary of Transportation asserts complete Federal jurisdiction. In either case, the full weight, power, and authority of the Department is behind—not only the safety regulations—but the enforcement program.

Fourth. In addition, the bill provides for the establishment of a Technical Pipeline Safety Standards Committee, judical review of orders, civil penalties, research, and authorization of funds to operate the program.

Others today, have cited the growth of the overall gas industry. The safety record of the industry is also well documented in the hearings as well as the committee report. The entire record shows that this industry has a safety record which is low in relation to other industries.

While we must agree that this safety record is good, this does not indicate to me that we should do nothing. We can take some positive steps because we all recognize the serious potential of danger.

The basic tool in this bill, is the authority given the Secretary of Transportation to set minimum safety standards. This authority is clearly spelled out in the legislation. Every one engaged in the transportation and distribution of gas, must abide by these regulations.

In the enforcement area, this bill recognizes a Federal-State relationship. The hearing record shows that the Department of Transportation has no enforcement agency, expertise or staff. A number of the States have longstanding enforcement programs in effect.

Thus, under this bill, the States are given a role in the enforcement of the safety standards. I find it difficult to understand why there would be those opposed to section 5(a) of the bill. This section provides an arrangement where the safety standards—of the Secretary—will be enforced by a State agency—if that agency certifies among other things, that:

First. It has regulatory jurisdiction by law;

Second. Has adopted each Federal Safety standard;

Third. Is enforcing each such standard;

Fourth. Has legal authority to require the record maintenance, reporting, and inspection provided for in the bill; and

Fifth. Submission of various reports including "such other information as the Secretary may require."

This certificate is not the weak instrument that so many imply. The Secretary may reject it, take such other action as he deems appropriate, including the "assertion of Federal jurisdiction."

I feel that the States should properly be given a role in this safety program. Why should we write a bill that establishes a Federal program with no State participation. We have been moving in that direction too frequently and too far in recent years. It is time that the principle of a Federal-State partnership be restored. Section 5(a) as reported by the large majority of our committee recognizes this principle.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true, after the States certify, the States also under this bill have the right then to waive compliance with any Federal statutes?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. The Secretary does not have to accept that certificate.

Mr. ADAMS. We come back to the original point again, which is that the Secretary then must go out and catch them, if he feels it is happening and he can find out about it. We have not given him money here to do it. When the States have waived compliance in these areas, he would find that waiver is really in the public interest. Under the agreement procedure the burden is upon the State to come in and show, and to continue to show, it is carrying out these standards, and is not waiving them.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, it is clearly stated in this legislation that the Secretary does not have to accept these certificates.

So far as the waiver is concerned, the individual States will have to apply to the Secretary for the waiver. If he does not want to grant it, he can stay the order. There is plenty of protection for the public interest.

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

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I should like to ask the gentleman from Washington the meaning of some of the language in the proposed legislation, in view of his comments. I refer to page 30, lines 24 and 25, item (3). Can the gentleman interpret that for me, with reference to the State enforcement of compliance with Federal standards?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly. It simply says that the State has to certify it is enforcing such standards. Who is going to find out?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is the gentleman suggesting that the States would certify they are enforcing such standards when in fact they are not enforcing such standards?

Mr. ADAMS. I would say to the gentleman, that is the whole point. If they were enforcing the standards now and were maintaining the standards which they say are excellent in these States, we would not be having the accidents. The whole purpose is to set up standards and to require the States to come up to that level.

I do not say that these are bad men. I do not say that to the gentleman at all. I say they operate under an antiquated system, and this system is what we are trying to correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the point is that we do not now have Federal standards, so each State can enforce such standards as it has or does not have on its own.

Under the language of this proposed legislation I believe it is perfectly clear that the Federal standards will be set by the Secretary of Transportation and the State must certify that it is enforcing those Federal standards. If the State certifies this, then the gentleman's comment does not seem to be appropriate.

Mr. ADAMS. I would say to the gentleman, we remain exactly where the status quo is now, other than having the Secretary say, "You ought to be doing these things."

If the States maintain the same sorts of systems they have now, in inspection and all these other areas, we will not get compliance.

This is coupled with section 9, of which the gentleman is aware, the penalty provision, which says one cannot require any person to do anything until he has been given an opportunity to comply first. So we would not put any pressure on the industry to come up to State standards, and in effect, do not allow the States to enforce them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I should like to pursue this further.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It seems to me that item 2 on page 30 states clearly the individual States must adopt Federal standards; otherwise they will not be certified by the Secretary of Transportation.

Then item 3 says that they must certify that they are enforcing such standards.

The gentleman is either suggesting that either the States will certify they are enforcing the standards when they are not doing so or that the Secretary of Transportation will certify the States when he knows they are not enforcing his standards. Either the State public utilities commissions are assumed to be irresponsible or the Secretary of Transportation is a man of bad character or both. I am not sure I understand who the guilty party is assumed to be in this case.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield for an observation about that?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. My comments were directed to the gentleman from Washington, but I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Washington did not hear all of the testimony, since he is not a member of the subcommittee, but I know the gentleman did a thorough research of the problem.

I know the gentleman who is speaking, a very distinguished and able member of our subcommittee, heard the testimony in which the gas companies of the various States told the story. The one which comes to mind most readily is the one from St. Louis, Mo., which stated they lost x number of CC's of gas and could not account for that gas.

If their reports were to be given to the State, the State could easily take their report in good faith and still be in error. So nobody is saying anyone is out to

trick anybody else. It is just a fact of life that these explosions have occurred, and unless there was some reason for these explosions the Federal Government has no business trying to regulate them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman if it would not be appropriate for the Secretary of Transportation to set in his standards a standard which would prohibit any loss of gas of the nature he describes so that such a loss would be reported and the Secretary's standard would require the State to require the utility company to correct the reason for gas loss so as to meet the Secretary's standard.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Right. If the gentleman will yield further, however, the State can certify itself out by a waiver of certification. It merely certifies itself it is doing a good job when indeed they might think they are doing a good job but in actuality they might be not complying with the full standards.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then, under this legislation the Secretary of Transportation can accept that State's certification or not, and if he does not accept it, then he is saying that the State is not meeting his requirements and the utilities are not meeting the requirements.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield further, I will point out that the burden of proof, as I said, shifts, and I will say again that the burden of proof shifts from the State, when the State says yes, they are complying and shows how they are under the Senate language, to the burden being on the Secretary of Transportation under our language, showing that the State is not in compliance. That is why I think this is a very important section of the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would say in response to the gentleman, before I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina who was kind enough to yield to me, that there seems to be a basic question here as to whether you trust more the Secretary of Transportation, who has no expertise in this field, admittedly, from his testimony, or some State officials who do have some expertise, because they have been involved in this industry regulation for some time.

Now I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Is it not true on page 32 of the bill the language says that the Secretary may reject the certification?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right. He can reject it.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Does it not also say in the language that the Secretary of Transportation may take "such other action as he deems appropriate to achieve adequate enforcement, including the assertion of Federal jurisdiction"?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right. And he can, as I understand it, under these provisions, go on and close down the distribution system of an entire community.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman asked me originally to reply—and I appreciate the comment of the chairman of the subcommittee—I would like to reply further.

As a simple and practical matter, if you say that the State can certify and then after they certify that the Secretary of Transportation must overturn that, then you have also written in with regard to the existing lines you cannot put in the standards on inspection and on installation and all the key points with regard to existing lines that are in the ground and with regard to the design.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, guns killed 6,000 last year, cars killed 50,000, aviation killed 1,300 last year, tornadoes killed 72 in less hours in May this year, industrial accidents kill 55 a day.

High pressure pipelines have killed 67 people in 18 years, and all but 17 were the result of such occurrences as trucks slamming into pumping stations and other such events having no relationship to standards or enforcement. That entire figure is equivalent to half a commercial planeload.

Statistics on casualties from failures of distribution lines are not available and causes would be difficult to determine in any event. Even proponents label the record very good. All this adds up to some but certainly not unreasonable hazard to life from the system that recovers and delivers natural gas to the consumers of the United States. It makes the odds of being blasted by gas from transmission lines even less than being hit by lightning, and in the city your chances are greater to be hit by a truck.

The fact that the industry has had an exceptional safety record does not argue against concentrating the responsibility for pipeline standards in one place. The Department of Transportation is that place because of its now comprehensive safety function. A scheme to keep standards up to date is worth having. A system of enforcement is desirable. But to make noises as though anyone against any particular arrangement to accomplish this is against motherhood and out to kill off the American public is nonsense, and I denounce it as such whether from Members of Congress or the Cabinet.

The plan devised by the referred Senate bill was workable, and I have no great quarrel with it. But it certainly was not perfect. The bill devised by the subcommittee and accepted by the overwhelming majority of the full Commerce Committee is in my judgment more workable and more adequate to the problem. I am not greatly impressed with the overall performance of State commissioners in this field. Experience gives me less reason, however, to think that I would be overly impressed with the way the Department of Transportation would perform. But I am basically in favor of leaving enforcement responsibility and such other functions of this kind with the States where possible. This is a place it appears to be possible. To suggest that doing so is selling out is unworthy of Members of this House.

It has been forgotten in the splurge of press releases, speeches, and letters to the editor that under both the system provided by S. 1166 and that in the committee bill the ultimate job of enforcement would be done by the States. The only difference is that under S. 1166 the Secretary would make agreements and pay for performance, and under our bill the States would first satisfy the Secretary that they would do everything as he wanted it, and then go ahead. If they will not or do not, he takes over either way.

All of the implications of the high-powered public relations program which has emanated from my colleagues and downtown are that certification by a State that it will do all the things found necessary and desirable by the Federal Government in this field is a capitulation of authority. It is interesting to note that the witness for the Department of Transportation did not view it that way when testifying before our committee. In fact, he went much further than the committee approach and indicated that the Federal Government might be willing to accept a certificate from a pipeline company itself that it had complied with the standards. Here is my exchange with witness Caldwell who accompanied Secretary Boyd at that hearing, as reported on page 25 of the record:

Mr. HARVEY. How many inspectors are you talking about?

Mr. CALDWELL. We did not figure it by the number of inspectors.

Mr. HARVEY. Well, did you just pull the $23 million out of the air?

Mr. CALDWELL. No, we didn't.

Mr. HARVEY. Where did it come from? This is what I want to know. In the letter from Secretary Boyd to Senator Magnuson he set forth all of this information you have given me so far. What I want to know is a breakdown. What sort of inspection are you going to plan? What do you intend to spend the $23 million for?

Mr. CALDWELL. Well now, you put the handle of inspecting on this $23 million.

Mr. HARVEY. I said inspection and enforcement, that is how you labeled it in the letter.

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir. Actually there would be varying degrees of inspection and enforcement by various people and I cannot tell you the exact number of people that we will have inspecting. This was based——

Mr. HARVEY. All right. How many enforcers, if you can't tell me the number of inspectors, how many enforcers, do you plan hiring for $23 million?

Mr. CALDWELL. It was not figured on the basis of the number of people. It was figured on the miles of pipe and based on a ratio of new construction compared to pipe that is already in the ground.

Mr. HARVEY. Just one more——

Secretary BOYD. Mr. Harvey, if you would let him go on through——

Mr. HARVEY. Just one final question because my time is up here. But did you consider, at all, any sort of a certificate approach to the problem of having these companies who have been uninspected for years signing some sort of a certificate under oath they have complied with the standards and so forth and then making spot inspections instead of hiring all these inspectors?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, sir; this has been taken into consideration and this is one of the strong possibilities.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that whether a certificate of compliance is used, as provided in the House version of this bill, or the agreement method in the Senate version, the ultimate job of enforcement will be done by the States. Section 5(a) should be left as it is in the House version of the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield

5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL].

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, it seems we have arrived at another one of our cases here where a great deal of extra intelligence dwells and in some cases omnipotence seems to flow over the line into the District of Columbia when someone becomes a secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I do not happen to agree with this premise, that all the expertise in this great land lies here in the District of Columbia. In fact during the time that I listened to the testimony from downtown the less I think the expertise and intelligence lies here.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out first one of the dangers we face when we come to the consideration of this type of legislation.

After having listened to one Betty Furness and lectures from certain columnists and listening to attempts to create hysteria, I wonder if we have not become victims of legislation by hysteria.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things that this committee is being charged with is abandonment of our duty because we have chosen to say that 63,000 miles of gathering lines outside populated areas may be released from regulation by the Secretary, if he so desires.

Mr. Chairman, there has been no lost-time accidents in gathering lines in this Nation in the last 6 years—no lost-time accidents. I do not know of many activities of this Nation that has that good safety record, including walking down the front steps of the Nation's Capitol. I doubt if they have that good a safety record.

Let me point to this matter of gathering lines—and this is one of the areas that the committee bill has come under attack—the Secretary may designate any area that he wishes as a populated area, without recourse. It states very clearly that any populated area that the Secretary so designates and so defines comes under his regulation.

Now, let us go a step further about the gathering lines in the rural areas of our Nation. Mr. Chairman, the word "lines" means just what it says. Let us remember one thing. We are not talking about highways; we are not talking about canals, we are talking about privately owned pipelines on privately owned lands. Therefore, there is no law of eminent or public domain. In other words, there has to be a contract signed with the farmer or rancher before these gathering lines can be put on his land. The general rule is, among existing companies in this country, that a 2-inch pipeline may not be placed any closer than 200 feet from a farmhouse where they are located in rural areas.

It is true that in a great many instances the farmers do reach agreement with the pipeline companies to locate closer because they get free gas as a result thereof; that is from the gathering line that goes through his property. I do not know of any instance in the rural areas of this country where you would find a pipeline coming closer to a rural dwelling than this distance, particularly with reference to the gas transmission lines.

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

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. In most cases with respect to the gathering lines, the subject matter to which I intend to offer an amendment to bring them back into the bill, the gentleman does not feel that a person in a rural area deserves any less protection than a person living in a populated area.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. The question which the gentleman from New York has propounded to me is similar to the question which is often asked, when did you quit beating your wife?

At this point I will repeat to the gentleman a little story about the fellow who had over his doorway a prayer which read as follows:

God protect my home from tigers.

Someone said to him, is not that a rather strange prayer?

He said:

Well, I have not been bothered with tigers at all; it works.

There have been no accidents, I will say to the gentleman from New York, no accidents.

Mr. OTTINGER. If the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate that, but supposing the Secretary finds there is a dangerous situation? Should we really have to wait until somebody is blown up before he takes action?

I particularly believe this becomes pertinent since so many of our rural areas are becoming urbanized at a very fast rate, and the provisions of this bill will require——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL].

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Let me point out here that I believe the overall philosophy that this particular incident best represents—and you can find a great many potential injury situations in this Nation, so that if you wanted to waste the taxpayers' money or the consumers' money you could cover them—but I believe we have learned something here in this Congress in the last couple of years; that when you waste the taxpayers' money indiscriminately you get into a fiscal problem and therefore get into the problem of maybe having to raise taxes as we are doing.

And when you start adding regulation after regulation after regulation, that is entirely unnecessary on the private sector, you are going to end up making the consumer pay the bill for nothing.

There have been no accidents. Certainly there are cases where you can build up subdivisions and immediately—immediately—present a request to the Secretary.

I would say to the gentleman from New York that it is a funny thing that this all-omnipotent Secretary of Transportation is all-wise when it comes to dealing with the States, but now the gentleman from New York has lost faith with him entirely when it comes to designating populated areas.

Mr. OTTINGER. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say no, I want the States to have to come to him, because I believe that will make for more efficient regulation. I believe in those States it is unreasonable to expect the Secretary to know about developing rural areas all over this country, and to include them within the coverage of this act.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. I would believe a person buying a home in a new subdivision might well be concerned about this, or a group of persons would be concerned about it, and I believe the State would be concerned about it in its approach to any populated community, and that the Secretary of Transportation is sensible enough to designate what areas are populated, and I happen to think that they would be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I understand that we are going to go over until Tuesday, and that therefore we will be addressing ourselves in regard to this matter at that time.

But I do not want there to be any confusion among the opponents or proponents, majority or minority, as to the amendments to be offered. Therefore when we go back into the House, Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent that I may insert into the RECORD at this point the five specific amendments that will be offered to this bill on Tuesday.

The first will be by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER], the second by the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS], the third by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the fourth by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD], and the fifth by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ADAMS]—although they may not be offered in that particular order on Tuesday.

The amendments referred to follows:

AMENDMENT TO S. 1166, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. OTTINGER

On page 23, line 14 to line 21, strike "except that it shall not include the gathering of gas in those rural locations which lie outside the limits of any incorporated or unincorporated city, town, village, or any other designated residential or commercial area such as a subdivision, a business or shopping center, a community development, or any similar populated area which the Secretary may define as a nonrural area;".

AMENDMENT TO S. 1166, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. MOSS

On page 25, line 24, strike out "adopted. Whenever the Secretary shall find a particular facility to be hazardous to life or property, he shall be empowered to require the person operating such facility to take such steps necessary to remove such hazards." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "adopted, unless the Secretary finds that a potentially hazardous situation exists, in which case he may by order require compliance with any such standards."

AMENDMENT TO S. 1166, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

On page 28, line 16 to line 22, strike: "each of whom shall be experienced in the safety regulation of the transportation of gas and of pipeline facilities or technically qualified by training and experience in one or more

fields of engineering applied in the transportation of gas or the operation of pipeline facilities to evaluate gas pipeline safety standards,".

AMENDMENTS TO S. 1166, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. MACDONALD

On page 30, strike out line 11 and all that follows down through page 32, line 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"AGREEMENTS WITH STATE AGENCIES

"SEC. 5. (a) Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary is authorized by written agreement with an appropriate State agency to exempt from the Federal safety standards pipeline facilities and the transportation of gas not subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act, under which agreement such State agency—

"(1) adopts each Federal safety standard applicable to such transportation of gas and pipeline facilities and any amendment to each such standard, established under this Act;

"(2) undertakes a program satisfactory to the Secretary, designed to achieve adequate compliance with such standards and with the plans of inspection and maintenance required by section 11; and

"(3) agrees to cooperate fully in a system of Federal monitoring of such compliance program and reporting under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

No such agreement may be concluded with any State agency which does not have the authority (i) to impose sanctions substantially the same as are provided under sections 9 and 10, (ii) to require record maintenance, reporting, and inspection responsibilities substantially the same as are provided under section 12, and (iii) to require the filing for approval of plans of inspection and maintenance described in section 11.

"(b) With respect to any State agency with which the Secretary determines that he cannot enter into an agreement under subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary is authorized by agreement to authorize such agency to assume responsibility for, and carry out on behalf of the Secretary as it relates to pipeline facilities and the transportation of gas not subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act the necessary actions to—".

On page 33, beginning in line 12, strike out "safety program under a certification under subsection (a) or an agreement under subsection (b) of this section" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "such agreement".

On page 33, line 18, strike out "safety program" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "an agreement".

On page 34, strike out lines 7 through 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) Where an exemption from Federal standards for pipeline facilities or the transportation of gas is in effect under subsection (a) of this section the provisions of sections 8(a)(1), 8(a)(2), 9, and 10 of this Act, shall not apply. Any such exemption shall remain in effect until a new or amended Federal safety standard for pipeline facilities or the transportation of gas not subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act is established pursuant to this Act, and such exemption shall not apply to any such new standard or amendment until the State agency has adopted such new standard or amendment pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section. The provisions of this Act shall apply to such standard until such adoption has become effective."

AMENDMENT BY MR. ADAMS TO S. 1166

On page 37 strike out line 15 and all that follows down through and including line 2 on page 38, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. (a) Any person who violates any provision of section 8(a), or any regulation issued under this Act, shall be subject to a civil penalty of not to exceed $1,000 for each such violation for each day that such violation persist, except that the maximum civil penalty shall not exceed $400,000 for any related series of violations."

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a motion in just a moment to rise, but I would like to state before I do that there has been an understanding between the ranking Member on the minority side, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], and myself that when we resume the debate on this bill next Tuesday that there will be 30 minutes of debate left to be consumed at that time.

I would like to put that in the RECORD.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I concede that we have entered into that argreement voluntarily with the understanding that 15 minutes of the 30 minutes will be reserved for the minority.

Mr. STAGGERS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 1166, the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968.

The tremendous growth of the natural gas industry over recent years has created a need for uniform safety standards regulating the transportation of natural gases. Today there are over 800,000 miles of gas pipeline in the United States, varying in sizes, functions, and condition.

Many of our States have prescribed their own pipeline safety regulations in recent years, but all too often a marked difference is shown from State to State in effectiveness and enforcement of the particular standards. S. 1166 would provide the authority for the Federal Government to insure the public safety by establishing minimum uniform standards. At the same time, however, the bill gives the States an important role in enforcement and in amplifying distribution standards.

The gas transmission industry has maintained a relatively good safety record over the years. However, with the tremendous increase in the use of natural gas, especially in our cities, we cannot afford to subject the public to even the slightest risk of danger that can be prevented.

Mr. Chairman, S. 1166 embodies a very reasonable and practical approach to the problem of safety standards for gas pipelines. Of course, standards by themselves cannot provide absolute protection—there must be a working partnership and atmosphere of cooperation between the Federal Government, the States, and industry in order to attain our goal of insuring the public's safety. S. 1166 would provide the framework for such a program. I strongly urge its passage as recommended by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GALLAGHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1166) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipeline, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill, S. 1166.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TIME FOR GENERAL DEBATE ON S. 1166

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the Committee of the Whole continues the consideration of the bill (S. 1166) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety standards for the transportation of natural and other gas by pipeline, and for other purposes, that the time for general debate be limited to 30 minutes with 15 minutes for the minority and 15 minutes for the majority site.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the majority leader what the legislative program is for the remainder of this week and what is scheduled for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the minority leader and in accordance with our announcement of yesterday, the House will not meet tomorrow and, therefore, we will not take up the remaining bills that were listed on the program for this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday, the Consent Calendar, with five suspensions:

H.R. 17872, to amend the National School Lunch Act;

H.R. 17873, to amend the National School Lunch Act;

S. 2837, to establish the Cradle of Forestry in America, Pisgah National Forest, North Carolina;

H.R. 15714, to extend operating life of certain inland vessels; and

H.R. 13844, Federal employees leave for funerals of certain relatives and for National Guard duty.

Also H.R. 17134, Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968—open rule, 3 hours of debate; waiving points of order.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week:

The Private Calendar;

Department of Transportation appropriation bill, fiscal year 1969;

S. 1166, Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968—continue consideration;

H.R. 16361, District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1968—under general rules of the House;

H.R. 14096, penalties for unlawful acts involving LSD and other drugs—open rule, 1 hour of debate; and

H.R. 10564, marketing orders on pears for canning or freezing—open rule, 1 hour of debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

Of course, pursuant to the previous announcement, there will be no legislative business from the close of business on Wednesday, July 3, until noon Monday, July 8.

I would like to advise Members that we may have to request permission to come in early and work late if, after a long day on Monday, we are not able to finish or see that we shall not be able to finish all the business by Wednesday evening. I realize the distinguished gentleman from Missouri has some comments on that matter. I would like to advise that we will only make such request in the event it is obvious we need to do so in order to finish the program by Wednesday evening.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I am glad to comment further. There will be no unanimous consent granted for that purpose if we adjourn in the early hours on Monday.

Mr. ALBERT. That was the reason for my comment. The gentleman had advised me of that and I think we can expect a long day on Monday and, as I said, there is the possibility that we may request permission to come in early on Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that all Members fully realize that we are to have a fairly full schedule on Wednesday, and should anticipate such a schedule in their planning for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

PRIVATE CALENDAR BILL H.R. 16187 TO BE PASSED OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H.R. 16187 be passed over and not considered when the Private Calendar is called on July 2, 1968.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, JULY 1, 1968

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today that it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the majority leader shed any light whatever on the situation that will obtain about the first of August when a very vital Republican Convention is due to get started? Do you have anything to offer so the Members can make plans?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, at the most recent meeting of the leadership of this side with the corresponding leaders of the other body, everyone was in agreement that we should try to adjourn the Congress by that time. But the gentleman knows, of course, that we will adjourn in due time for the Republican Convention to convene and to hold its sessions in Miami, where the delegates might engage in other pleasant activities to their taste.

Mr. GROSS. But we have no way of knowing at this time whether there would be a convening of the House between the Republican Convention and the Democrat Convention.

Mr. ALBERT. We hope that will be a moot question.

Mr. GROSS. With all my heart I hope the gentleman is correct, that it is a moot question.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

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

There was no objection.

HON. ABE FORTAS AND HOMER THORNBERRY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Abe Fortas as Chief Justice elevates to this highest judicial position in America one of our most brilliant men.

I congratulate Justice Fortas. This was an outstanding appointment. I am sure Mr. Justice Fortas will perform his new duties in the finest and highest traditions of the office.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time primarily to congratulate my dear friend, our former colleague in the House of Representatives, Homer Thornberry, on his appointment to the Supreme Court and to commend the President for selecting him for this most important position.

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Homer Thornberry will give to the Supreme Court the character and service of one of the finest men I have ever known.

As a colleague, Homer Thornberry was, in my judgment, an ideal legislator. He approached his work with rare dedication and insight. He demonstrated here in this Chamber those qualities which will make him an outstanding member of the Nation's highest court. Homer is one of the most judicious persons I have ever known. He is cast in the mold of that other great Texan, the late Sam Rayburn. His commonsense, his judicial temperment, and his good judgment were qualities that our great Speaker recognized in him when he first came to the House of Representatives.

After Mr. Rayburn's death, our late President John F. Kennedy, our great and distinguished Speaker, John McCormack, and I and others in the leadership of the House of Representatives never had a more devoted and able friend and assistant in the House of Representatives and on the Committee on Rules.

Homer was always there when needed, always stanch, steadfast, and courageous.

During the first private conversation I had with President Kennedy after his inauguration, a Federal judgeship for Homer Thornberry was one of the topics of our discussion. President Kennedy later told me he had decided to offer Homer Thornberry a judgeship at the earliest opportunity here in the District of Columbia if a vacancy did not develop in his own State of Texas.

It was indeed fortunate that shortly thereafter an opening did become available on the Federal district bench in the State of Texas. President Kennedy appointed him to that position. Of course, he had strong backing both from then Vice President Johnson and Senator Yarborough.

President Johnson long ago recognized Homer Thornberry's qualities. He was the President's Congressman and one of the President's most intimate friends. While the President was still in the Senate, he and I often talked about Homer

Thornberry and how ideally suited he was for a Federal judgeship.

Later on President Johnson elevated him to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and he has now been able to appoint him to the position on the Supreme Court.

I know Homer Thornberry. I know his fiber. I know his character. I have never had a finer friend. I have never known a better man. In my opinion, no more outstanding appointment to the Supreme Court could possibly have been made.

Mrs. Albert and I join in congratulating both President Johnson and Judge Thornberry. We share in the joy that Homer Thornberry's family, his lovely wife, Eloise and his three children, are experiencing on this day. They are among God's chosen people. May He bless them in the years ahead.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. I shall ask permission to file opposing and slightly diverse views on the same subject, including with my remarks pertinent material.

CRONIES ON THE COURT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Yesterday the President announced his appointment of Associate Justice "Abe" Fortas as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. This appointment is an outrage to all reasonable thinking citizens.

Among others, I had hoped that since the President had taken himself out of the arena of partisan politics, he would forego the appointment and let the new and upcoming administration make the selection. This new administration would represent the new thinking of the country. However, the President chose to revert to his old ways and methods, and showed callous disregard for changing public opinion, the theory of judicial restraint, and perhaps more important qualifications for the bench. By reverting to his old croneyism, Lyndon Baines Johnson may bequeath a legacy of Supreme Court decisions unworthy of any nation's highest tribunal for the next 20 years. This legacy will consist of total disregard of judicial restraint, further eroding of the checks and balances of three co-equal branches of Government, greater destruction of the rights of society against the criminal element, and more indifference to the rights of property.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Abe Fortas as Chief Justice will do just that. The appointment of old croney Homer Thronberry will merely aggravate the situation. One need but refer to the Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory for qualifications—or lack thereof—in this instance.

The blemishes on Abe Fortas' record still remain. They are no different today than they were in 1965 when he was first appointed to the Court. He is still the same old Abe Fortas that was associated with Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, Owen Lattimore, Bobby Baker, and Walter Jenkins.

I certainly hope that the other body long deliberates on these two fantastic appointments. I hope that they will refuse confirmation and this blatant croneyism, so that the interests of the American people are protected. We cannot afford "Court by Croney".

Articles from the Chicago Tribune and Esquire magazine follow:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, July 29, 1965]

FIXER ON THE BENCH

Abe Fortas, the man President Johnson has appointed to the seat vacated by Arthur J. Goldberg on the Supreme court, has been a political fixer around Washington since the earliest days of the New Deal more than 30 years ago. He has run some important errands for Mr. Johnson and has had a somewhat dizzying record defending loyalty and security risks.

When, last October, at the height of the Presidential campaign, Lyndon Johnson found himself deeply embarrassed, he turned instinctively to Fortas. The embarrassment was occasioned by the disclosure that Walter Jenkins, Mr. Johnson's most trusted White House assistant, had been arrested for a second time by Washington police on a morals charge.

Jenkins, aware of Fortas' close relationship with Johnson, anticipated the President by telephoning Fortas with the word, "I'm in terrible trouble." Fortas arranged for Jenkins to meet him at the Fortas home in Georgetown, where he poured out his story. The newspapers had got hold of the facts.

Fortas immediately called Clark Clifford, another lawyer with clout, an intimate of Presidents Truman and Johnson, and together they made the rounds of the Washington newspapers, seeking to get the story suppressed. But Mr. Johnson, in New York, learned that the story would shortly move on the wire services. He called Fortas at once and assigned him to go to the hospital where Jenkins had been put in storage and get his resignation. Fortas was able shortly to report that the mission has been accomplished, and Mr. Johnson was able to wash his hands of a scandal.

In previous time Fortas helped Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White, soviet agents, to draft the United Nations charter. He appeared as counsel for Owen Lattimore when that "expert" on the orient had to rush home from Afghanistan to face charges by the late Sen. Joseph R. McCarthy that he had been promoting communist objectives in Asia.

Lattimore termed Fortas a "solid rock" in helping him thru his "ordeal." Fortas' services did not, however, save Lattimore from being indicted on seven charges of perjury arising from his testimony before the Senate internal security subcommittee, nor did it prevent the committee from pronouncing that from around 1930 Lattimore had been "a conscious, articulate instrument of the soviet conspiracy."

"Liberals," however, know their way around Washington, and a federal judge of that persuasion was easily induced to get Lattimore off the hook by finding that the indictment lacked "clarity." The department of justice had suggested that the judge disqualify himself for reasons of manifest bias, but the suggestion was spurned and the case never went to a jury to be heard on its merits. Fortas and his associates represented Lattimore.

The appointment of Fortas has two advantages in the eyes of the administration. It provides the White House with an astute and trusted agent with a sharp instinct for the political angles on the highest court in the land, and it perpetuates the "liberal" majority which holds forth under Chief Justice Earl Warren. If it also pays off a few political debts, who, among friends, is to cavil about that?

[From Esquire, June, 1965]

ABE, HELP!—L. B. J.

(By Charles B. Seib and Alan L. Otten)

Politically, the law firm of Arnold, Fortas and Porter is the most powerful in Washington, D.C. The number-one partner, Thurman Arnold, was a famous New Deal trustbuster and is now recognized as one of the wiliest old lawyers in the Capital. The third partner, Paul Porter, was in charge of price controls during most of World War II and is on a first-name basis with everybody who matters. And the man in the middle, Abe Fortas, an Undersecretary of the Interior in the Roosevelt era, is confidant, adviser, good friend and behind-the-scenes handyman to the President of the United States.

Arnold is a presence. Porter is a hail fellow. Fortas is a dry, quiet, violin-playing legal craftsman. And today, in Johnsonian Washington, the greatest of these is Fortas. Any White House insider, when asked to name the men on whom President Johnson most relies for unofficial help and advice, will almost certainly put Fortas on the list, very likely at the top. But ask just what he does for the President and you'll get a mystifying variety of answers: he's a fixer, the man who takes on jobs too delicate to be done by anyone with official status; he's always close at hand, either actually or at the other end of the phone line, suggesting, reacting, developing; his contacts with the President are only occasional but consequential—a discussion of an important speech or message, a hashing over of candidates for a top appointment, the dissection of a proposed Great Society project.

The President and Fortas are on the telephone together at least once a day and often as many as three or four times. One top White House aide says, "He's as close to Johnson as Bobby Kennedy was to Jack" (an analogy Fortas rejects out of hand). According to another White House staff member, "There is very little of importance that affects Lyndon Johnson that he won't at some point talk over with Abe Fortas." Fortas himself maintains that the relationship has been greatly exaggerated, but members of his own firm report that he is constantly being called out of conferences to take White House calls. Neighbors say the President is a frequent evening guest at the Fortas home.

The "mystery" surrounding Johnson vis-à-vis Fortas is unreal, for there must always be a good deal that is secret or at least never revealed concerning the President and the men who do his personal bidding.

Assigning all the unreliable rumors and obfuscations to their proper place, the following emerges as a fair picture of the Johnson-Fortas relationship:

Fortas is respected by Johnson as an extremely intelligent man who is as knowledgeable as anyone in Washington in the technicalities of government and the law. He has the advantage both of a thirty-year friendship with the President and the independence that his refusal to accept an official position gives him; he owes the President nothing and the President knows it. In this context, his advice is sought on important appointments; on administration policies, particularly in the domestic field; on the content and phrasing of speeches and messages. He is sought out in times of stress, as in the days immediately after the Kennedy assassination and when there is a ticklish job to be done (as when the President needed a trust agreement that would disconnect the family television holdings from high office).

This dependency extends beyond the President. It is clear that when an emergency arises in the Johnson official family, it's Fortas who is called first.

Nothing is more illustrative of this than the Walter Jenkins case. The sequence of events on the day it all came out is revealing.

That morning—Wednesday, October 14, 1964—The Washington *Star*, acting on a tip, sent a reporter to the records of the Metropolitan Police morals squad. There he found that a Walter Jenkins, on the basis of identifying data clearly the one in the White House, had been arrested once in 1959 and again just the week before in the men's room of the Washington YMCA, a notorious hangout for homosexuals. In both cases he had posted collateral, later forfeited, and been released. A *Star* editor called Mrs. Elizabeth Carpenter, Mrs. Johnson's press secretary (George Reedy, the President's press secretary, was out of the city with Mr. Johnson), told her the facts and asked if the White House knew about the arrests and had any comment. Choking down her shock, Mrs. Carpenter said the whole thing was ridiculous but she would look into it. A few minutes later she called back and said that she had talked to Jenkins and that he would be calling The *Star* to deny the story as a case of mistaken identity.

Jenkins never called. But within fifteen minutes Abe Fortas was on the telephone to say that he was coming down to The *Star* at once.

The first edition was about to go to press, but The *Star* decided to hold out the story of the arrest until Fortas could have his say. And within minutes he appeared with Clark Clifford, another Washington lawyer and friend of the President. Jenkins, it developed, had rushed to Fortas' Georgetown home as soon as he had learned from Mrs. Carpenter that The *Star* knew of the arrests. He was distraught, Fortas said, in a state of emotional collapse, and asking for help.

Fortas himself was deeply shocked. He examined The *Star*'s information and conceded that it appeared to be true. In a low, exhausted voice he urged compassion—saying that this was a sick man, a man who had been working day and night ever since Johnson assumed the presidency, a man so devoted to his boss and his job that his wife had to bring his dinner to his desk because he wouldn't take time out for meals. The night of the most recent arrest, Fortas said, Jenkins had gone to a cocktail party after a day of hard work and had a few drinks; he couldn't remember what had happened to him after that. (According to the police records, he went to the YMCA, a few blocks from where the party was held, and was there arrested by morals-squad officers in the men's room in the company of another man.)

Fortas urged The *Star's* editors to think carefully and humanely before they printed the story. He reminded them of Jenkins' wife and six children. He assured them Walter Jenkins would be hospitalized and stated flatly that his days as a White House aide were over.

The *Star* decided not to print the story—a decision consistent with the paper's policy in such morals cases—and Fortas and Clifford went on to present their case before Washington's other papers. As it turned out, United Press International finally broke the story of the arrests that evening, but by then Jenkins was a patient in a Washington hospital and the President, in New York, was about to "accept" his resignation.

The incident illustrates several things about Fortas. First, his role in the official family: when beset by the blackest trouble man can imagine, Jenkins literally ran to him. Second, his high status; although he had not been in touch with the President, he was able to say confidently in the conference with The *Star* editors that Jenkins was finished at the White House—and they knew his word had the stamp of authority.

A top-level White House staff member, thinking back over the Jenkins case recently, said it was easy to understand why the distraught man turned to Fortas when he found himself in deep trouble. "Walter had been with Lyndon Johnson for many, many years," he explained. "And he naturally thought of Fortas just the way the President thinks of him—as the ablest, wisest counselor around." Johnson had this in mind when he offered Fortas—even urged upon him—the job of Attorney General of the United States when Robert Kennedy resigned in the Summer of 1964. Fortas turned it down.

While he won't comment specifically on the offer of the attorney generalship, Fortas was willing in a recent interview to hold forth on the question of going back into the government as a general proposition.

"I have made it clear to the President," he said, "that I'm simply not interested in returning to government. I've been through all that. Now I'm fifty-four years old. I want to be able to give time to my music. I have a law firm with large interests. We've got a lot of fine young lawyers who marry fine young wives and have fine young babies I have my responsibilities here."

As he spoke his eyes swept contentedly over the modern art and comfortable furniture that adorn his office in the high-ceilinged old mansion his firms occupies in the fashionable DuPont Circle area. It was clear that he likes his life's present rewarding course and that it will take something very special—perhaps the Supreme Court appointment for which he is frequently mentioned—to tempt him to change it.

There may be another contributing reason for his decision to stay out of government. President Johnson is a notoriously difficult man to work for—insistent, demanding, hard-riding, sometimes brutal. By remaining with his law firm Fortas can avoid the rigors of a formal working relationship with Johnson and possibly, because of his independence, play an even more important role in national affairs than he could if he took a high administration position.

Although the Fortas-Johnson friendship began back in the Roosevelt days, it became considerably closer after President Kennedy's assassination. Johnson turned to Fortas for help almost immediately after his return from Dallas. On the plane to Washington, the President had considered the need for a blue-ribbon investigation of the assassination that would put to rest forever all questions and speculations. The next night at Les Ormes, his Washington home which he continued to use during the early days of his presidency, he asked Fortas to go to work on what was to become the Warren Commission. That was just one of the assignments Johnson gave his old friend during the period of transition. "You must remember," Fortas said recently, "that there was no functioning White House during that time directly after the assassination. President Kennedy's staff was in a state of shock. Ted Sorensen, who had been the key man on the Kennedy staff, was completely out of action. At the Justice Department, of course, it was somewhat the same thing."

Exactly what Fortas did for the President in that period is not known. But it is interesting to note that less than two weeks after Johnson took office the lawyer notified a Washington court that he was withdrawing as attorney for the President's one-time Senate aide, Bobby Baker, then under Senate investigation. The reason given: "In the crisis of transition, I have undertaken certain assignments" for the President. He expounded no further, but some of his later assignments are indeed known. For example, he took part in strategy conferences when the Democratic Convention in Atlantic City was thrown into a turmoil by the challenge of the Mississippi delegation by civil-rights groups. Also, he and Clark Clifford and White House assistants Bill Moyers and Douglass Cater had weekly strategy luncheons throughout the presidential campaign. In fact, he was in and out of the White House all through the fall, checking on the flood of new scandal rumors released by the Republicans. "We were running a damn vice squad over there the last few weeks of the campaign," an associate recalls. "And Abe was squad leader."

After the election, he and Clifford were asked to suggest ways of streamlining the White House staff and to keep their eyes open for talent to fill a huge backlog of vacancies in key government posts. One important job was filled, by the way, by a bright young lawyer from Arnold, Fortas and Porter—Sheldon Cohen, who became legal counsel and later Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service.

Through it all Fortas continued to function as the President's personal attorney. Soon after Johnson became President, Fortas presided at a meeting at Les Ormes at which an agreement was drafted to put the Johnson television properties into a trust, at least theoretically sealing them off from presidential influence.

The meeting took place in the elegant second-floor sitting room. Two trustees-to-be, A. W. Moursund and J. W. Bullion, Texas lawyers long involved in Johnson affairs, were present. So were Leonard Marks, the Johnson lawyer on television and radio matters, and tax specialists from the Fortas firm. Mrs. Johnson, active head of the television interests, was there throughout, and the President drifted in and out of the sitting room.

The choices facing the conference were clear: the President and his family could keep the stations and operate them, which, in view of the close Federal control of broadcasting, would mean a highly embarrassing conflict of interests; they could sell the properties outright, paying a tremendous capital-gains tax on the great increase in value since acquisition; or they could put them in a trust that would remove them from the family's control for as long as Mr. Johnson held public office. Practically all present favored the trust, and Fortas supervised its creation.

Today Fortas echoes the President's annoyance with criticism of the trust. He defends it as "the tightest, toughest trust arrangement ever drawn for a public official." To those who question the wisdom of appointing a close friend and associate of Johnson to head the trust he says snappishly, "Anyone who says anything like that just doesn't know Judge Moursund."

Despite this spirited defense, some influential voices have been raised against the agreement Fortas devised. The New York *Times*, for one, recently criticized the President because his assets are "in the hands of a trustee who is an old friend and business associate with whom he continues to maintain a close personal relationship," and because much of the fortune consists of television and radio stations, which depend on franchises issued by the Federal Communications Commission, whose members are appointed by the President.

Fortas is considered an expert on the Johnson financial position generally, although he is not inclined to talk about it. When The Washington *Star* was about to publish an exhaustive study of the family wealth, Press Secretary Reedy referred the newspaper to Fortas, who went over the proposed story, line by line, disclosing a tremendously detailed knowledge of Johnson's financial position. During the 1964 campaign, when news stories and Republican campaign speeches about his wealth began to get under Johnson's skin, the White House made public a formal accounting by the firm of Haskins and Sells. It was Fortas who made the arrangements with the accountants and gave them their instructions.

In January, 1964, Fortas stepped into another delicate situation. The Washington *Star* uncovered details of the gift of a stereo record player in 1959 to Johnson, then Sen-

ate Majority Leader, by Don Reynolds, who had written several large insurance policies on Johnson's life. It was a touchy matter because the Bobby Baker story had just broken, and Baker was alleged to have solicited the stereo for Johnson. A copy of The *Star's* proposed story on the gift was taken to the White House and Andrew Hatcher, the assistant press secretary on duty, was asked if the President would care to comment. Hatcher glanced at the story, left the room with it for ten or fifteen minutes, and then returned to say that there was no comment.

But by the time The *Star* executive handling the story got back to his office, Fortas was on the phone to the paper's editor, urging that publication be withheld. When the full facts came out, he said, they would give a different picture of the whole incident. In this case, after a few minor changes, the story was published and proved correct in every essential detail.

On the face of it, Johnson and Fortas are an oddly matched pair, a big, driving Texan and a slight, restrained Memphis Jew. Fortas says that originally it was admiration for Franklin D. Roosevelt that brought them together. They met some thirty years ago, when Johnson was an assistant to Congressman Richard Kleburg, the King Ranch cattle baron from Texas, and Fortas was a Yale assistant professor of law getting his feet wet in the Washington bureaucracy on weekends and vacations. As Fortas recalls it, they were introduced by Arthur Goldschmidt, a Texan and a mutual friend. They soon developed a warm friendship cemented by their commitment to F.D.R. and the New Deal. As each man moved ahead—Fortas through a number of government assignments and then into private law practice and Johnson up the political ladder—the relationship flourished.

One has to go below the surface to find the reasons for their similarities. Both are compulsive workers; Fortas puts in long days at the office, then works beside his phone evenings and weekends almost as feverishly as Johnson. And as with Johnson, his magnolia-tinted charm does not completely hide the tension and drive.

It would be foolish to deny that self-interest, too, has kept them together. Johnson, as an ambitious politician, needed—and needs—trustworthy counsel. Fortas, first as a rising bureaucrat and later as a practicing lawyer, has not suffered from this important friendship. Finally, just as the New Deal drew them together, they still see eye to eye in their political philosophy.

Fortas subscribes completely to Johnson's Great Society approach and sees it as an extension of the pattern set by Roosevelt. "It is New Deal to the extent that it manifests itself in concern for people and in a readiness to put the government to work where necessary to accomplish things for them," he says. "But there is a fundamental difference from the old New Deal philosophy, and it's most dramatically illustrated by the President's insistence on unity and consensus. This, I think, accurately reflects the fact that the country's posture today is such that it can and should move as a whole to do the things that need to be done. Back in the New Deal days some segments of society had lagged so far behind that it was necessary to take measures for them alone."

The first professional service Fortas remembers performing for Johnson was crucial to the Texan's political career. In 1948 Lyndon Johnson, then a member of the House of Representatives, was trying to move to the Senate and was engaged in a bitter primary fight with Coke Stevenson, a former Texas governor. The vote was close and was followed by charges and counter-charges of fraud and vote-stealing. The State Democratic Executive Committee finally decided—29 to 28—that Johnson had won the Democratic nomination, which was then tantamount to election, by eighty-seven votes out of almost one million cast. But the Stevenson forces went to court with charges of fraud in Jim Wells County and threatened to keep Johnson from being certified as the Democratic nominee. A Federal district judge enjoined the state from printing ballots so designating Johnson, pending an investigation.

As he was later to do repeatedly, Johnson turned to Fortas for help. "I was in Dallas taking depositions in an antitrust case," Fortas recalls, "and suddenly I got a call from Alvin Wirtz [a close mutual friend]. 'Lyndon's here in Fort Worth and he's in trouble,' Wirtz told me. 'Come over right away.'"

Fortas managed to extricate himself from his antitrust case and went to Fort Worth where he found a desperate situation. Johnson, at the end of his money and credit, was faced with the danger of having to go through another campaign. A strategy was devised by Fortas and the other lawyers that very night. An appeal from the district judge's ruling was filed in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and then Fortas brought the case to Washington, going before Justice Hugo Black, the Supreme Court Justice charged with hearing emergency appeals from that circuit. After Fortas presented Johnson's case, Black ruled that the district judge had overstepped himself, and stayed the injunction.

Although the eighty-seven-vote margin won him the nickname "Landslide Lyndon," which he hates, Johnson easily won the election and his rise to power and the presidency was advanced an important step.

Fortas continued to do chores for Johnson all through his career as Senate Majority Leader and Vice-President, but his role only rarely came to public notice. Senate aides say he was an influential adviser on the two civil-rights bills Johnson pushed through the Senate in 1957 and 1960—measures Johnson was to cite repeatedly as evidence that he had outgrown his Southern background. Fortas proudly states that he backed Johnson's attempt to win the Presidential nomination in 1960. "My liberal friends were startled," he says, "but I told them that I knew the man—that if he were to do only one-tenth of what he actually did but spend more time telling people about what he'd done and what he believed in, people would be falling all over themselves to get behind him. I had the advantage of knowing him and what he stood for."

When Johnson, as Vice-President was head of the government's Equal Employment Opportunity Committee, seeking to reduce discrimination in hiring, Fortas unofficially supervised the early work on policies and regulations. "Any problems we had we were told to 'check it with Abe.'" a staffer recalls.

Fortas refuses to discuss his present work for Johnson. He considers the President as his client, and no good lawyer discusses his client's business. The silence that he—and the White House—observe gives rise to all sorts of conjecture. Early this year, for example, one Washington writer noted that the President's health message had failed to support any campaign to discourage cigarette smoking and suggested darkly: "It may be merely a coincidence that the President's personal attorney and close confidant is Abe Fortas, whose law firm represents Philip Morris cigarettes."

This is recognition in the Washington manner, and it is a sort of backhanded realization of the American dream for the Memphis cabinet-maker's son who began making his living at the age of thirteen by playing the violin at dances and parties.

Fortas' family came to this country from England and went directly to Memphis, where his father's older brother lived. Abe was the last of five children, the second to be born in the United States. His childhood, he recalls, was "as poor as you could imagine," but with the help of his violin he put himself through Southwestern College in Memphis and Yale Law School.

Immediately on graduation from law school in 1933 he joined the Yale faculty, serving as an assistant professor under William O. Douglas, the present Supreme Court Justice. Before long, however, Douglas and other Yale colleagues were in Washington working for the New Deal. And soon they were calling on Fortas for special assignments on weekends and vacations at the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Securities and Exchange Commission and other alphabet agencies. By 1938 he was ready for full-time Washington work, and Douglas, then chairman of the S.E.C., installed him as assistant director of the Public Utilities Division.

Fortas' sharp legal mind and Southern charm moved him steadily up the bureaucratic ladder. He became general counsel of the Public Works Administration, head of the Interior Department's Coal and Power Division, and eventually Under Secretary of Interior under Harold Ickes.

Soon after the war ended he left the government to form a law partnership with Thurman Arnold and two other former government lawyers (Porter joined the firm a few years later). Today it is a high-powered operation of about forty lawyers, most of them former government officials or teachers, practically all chosen because of their intellectual capacity. Arnold, Fortas and Porter lawyers tend to throw themselves into cases with distinctive fervor. "We're the Avis of the law field," says one partner. "We try harder. We're the firm people come to when they are looking for a miracle."

The business is almost entirely oriented to the Federal Government—cases involving taxes, antitrust suits, savings-and-loan regulation cases, proceedings before the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the like.

The reporter's attempt to link the absence of an anti-cigarette statement in the President's health message with Fortas' representation of Philip Morris illustrates the delicate position he occupies as a man with the President's ear and a lawyer doing business with the government.

There are some who feel that Fortas could be a bit more like Caesar's wife when he gets into such activities as, for example, his work for the cigarette makers, who are wrestling with the government over warnings against smoking on labels and in advertising.

Fortas has described himself as a "meticulous legal craftsman." An associate calls him "one of the most able legal machines I have ever seen." He is rated an outstanding appellate arguer, and one of the best brief writers in the business.

But he is considered a difficult man to work for—demanding, exacting, always after perfection. "Take it back and put some poetry into it," he once told a junior lawyer who had worked up an important brief. He meant the legal work was fine, but the thing needed polish and style.

He is almost unfailingly serious and businesslike. He has no small-talk topic other than his longtime love, music. "I wish he'd laugh more," a long-standing associate says. And another comments, "I can't imagine any better professional opportunity than to practice law with him, but he's the last guy I'd want to spend a weekend with."

Fortas also was the hero in the 1963 Gideon case before the Supreme Court, recently described by The New York *Times* reporter Anthony Lewis in his book *Gideon's Trumpet*. Clarence Earl Gideon, who had been convicted of burgling a Florida poolroom, claimed in a handwritten petition to the Supreme Court that he had been convicted illegally. He couldn't afford a lawyer, he said, and the Florida court had refused to appoint one for him. This denied his constitutional right to "due process of law."

In a proud exercise of American justice, the

Supreme Court accepted Gideon's case and appointed Fortas to argue it. Characteristically, he threw himself into the assignment. "I want this to be a little jewel," he told the assistant working with him on the brief. The result was an historic decision that the "due-process" clause in the Fourteenth Amendment requires that each accused person be represented in state criminal trials by a lawyer whether he can afford one or not. For Gideon, it meant a new trial, with a lawyer, and acquittal.

Fortas has also been involved in a number of the early civil-liberties cases of the McCarthy era, defending government employees and others accused of disloyalty. One of these early cases involved Owen Lattimore, the State Department adviser, a prime McCarthy target. His experience with this case established for him the fact that association with a "cause" case does not necessarily scare away bread-and-butter clients.

The general counsel for Unilever, one of his firm's big accounts, arrived from Holland for a conference with Fortas just as Lattimore was called to testify on Capitol Hill. Fortas told the Unilever man that he wouldn't be able to meet with him since he had to go to the hearing. For lack of anything else to do with his time, the Dutch lawyer went along. There he became so enraged with the McCarthy technique and so impressed with the Fortas performance that he left more enthusiastic about the Fortas firm than ever. Some years later, when Fortas and Porter were on a European trip, they visited the Unilever man at his estate outside Amsterdam and while there noticed a trio of geese parading across the lawn. Their host and his wife informed them that the geese were named Arnold, Fortas and Porter. They hastened to explain, however, that this was a compliment, since geese traditionally have warned of barbaric invasion, and the law firm was doing the same thing in handling civil-liberties cases.

Perhaps the firm's victories in "cause" cases have convinced businessmen that Arnold, Fortas and Porter was an aggressive, sharp group of lawyers. Or perhaps the firm's deep roots in government service and impeccable political ties are its main selling points. Whatever the reasons, Arnold, Fortas and Porter has clearly prospered. The firm represents a number of giant companies, and Fortas himself sits on the board of Federated Department Stores, Greatamerica Corp. and several banks and insurance companies.

Fortas and his wife, a small, dynamic woman who smokes cigars and is recognized as one of Washington's leading tax lawyers, lead a quiet life in Georgetown. They met when he was alternating between Yale's law faculty and the Department of Agriculture's legal staff. She was an economist at the department. After they married in 1935, he encouraged her to go to law school—so, of course, she went to Yale and graduated number two in a class of a hundred twenty-five. For many years she resisted joining her husband's firm, working instead in the Washington office of Adlai Stevenson's firm But when that office closed in 1960 after President Kennedy siphoned off Stevenson and several of his partners for government assignments, most of the staff moved over to Arnold, Fortas and Porter and she went along. Today she heads the firm's tax division.

The Fortases have broad cultural interests. He is a director of the Casals Festival in Puerto Rico and a trustee in the Carnegie Hall Corporation, the Washington Gallery of Modern Art and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, the latter still in the planning stages. They generally shun the social circuit, however. Fortas explains that he developed a profound distaste for the standard Washington function back in his Interior Department days when he had to attend many as a stand-in for Secretary Ickes.

His greatest pleasure is his music. He plays the violin with near professional skill, and every week, without fail, he and three other musicians (two professionals and another amateur) devote an evening to playing string quartets. His cultural interests permit him to serve President Johnson as an occasional pipeline to the arts. Typically, he was chairman of the concert last inauguration eve which, with the help of his friend Isaac Stern, Van Cliburn and others, brought a touch of class to the somewhat garish inaugural festivities.

For a week or two each summer Fortas takes the other members of his string quartet to his summer home in Westport, Connecticut, where, he says, "I spend the mornings hauling manure for my wife's garden and the rest of the time playing chamber music." He and Mrs. Fortas usually manage at least one trip to Canada every winter for skiing and skating.

Fortas has a long-standing friendship with Pablo Casals, growing out of ties to Puerto Rico which began when he managed the island's affairs as part of his Interior Department job. He helped arrange the Casals Festivals and also engineered the cellist's White House appearance during the Kennedy administration.

As the first Casals Festival was about to open in San Juan in 1958, Fortas found himself entrusted with a mission as delicate as any he has performed for the President. A seam split in Casal's precious cello, and the maestro would not let anyone repair it but an expert in New York. Fortas was called in. He booked two first-class tickets on a plane for New York, took the window seat for himself and propped the cello in the other, holding it in place by the seat belt. A very moderate drinker, he recalls that he ordered two Martinis on that flight—one for himself and one for the cello—and drank both. "I was nervous," he explained. "Carrying a man's cello is like carrying his wife."

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. I commend the able leader for his remarks about Judge Thornberry. As the Representative in Congress of the district that he formerly represented, I am personally acquainted with this outstanding jurist. We do not have a finer man in America.

Judge Homer Thornberry has been a close personal friend for more than 30 years. I have known him as a young attorney, as a city council member in Austin, Tex., as a U.S. Representative, as a Federal judge, and as a steadfast friend.

During these years our families have been closely associated in many political, civic, and personal endeavors and I have always looked to Judge Thornberry with respect and admiration for the principles and actions he exemplifies.

With a spirit of self-confidence and diplomacy, Homer Thornberry served the people of the 10th Congressional District of Texas as their U.S. Representative for some 15 years. As a member of this body he gave bold and courageous leadership just as he has done in the Federal court system. He was an extraordinarily able lawmaker and during my freshman days as a Congressman I was often referred to as the man who took Homer Thornberry's place—a tribute to the dedication and devotion of former Representative Thornberry.

Judge Thornberry has been noted as a jurist who is able and impartial, and his decisions have been marked with commonsense and good judgment.

There is no man in America today more interested in principles of our democratic way of life than Homer Thornberry, who, I predict, will be a kindly knight for the public interest and a stern taskmaster of the law.

So far as I know, Judge Thornberry is the only person who served in this congressional body to be appointed to the Supreme Court since the appointment of Justice Hugo Black. And I believe he is the only Texan, except the distinguished and lovable Justice Tom Clark, to be appointed to this august body. Naturally, all Texans are extremely proud to have this public servant recognized by this appointment. The Federal judiciary will be in strong hands with the presence of this good and reasonable man on the Supreme Court. He and his beautiful, lovely wife, Eloise, and their children, Molly, David, and Kate, will be welcomed again in this city where they already have a large number of friends. Judge Thornberry has a world of friends here—and elsewhere—because he knows how to be a friend.

I am proud of the President's recommendation of Judge Thornberry and I commend him for his nomination.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I wish to associate myself with what the gentleman from Oklahoma said about Homer Thornberry. When he first came to Congress, we served on committees together and I know of his sterling work.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I have not been one who has always seen eye to eye with the Supreme Court decisions or been entirely satisfied with some of the appointments to the Supreme Court, but I think that with the appointment of Homer Thornberry to the Supreme Court we have established a splendid trend. It was a good appointment. I congratulate the President.

There is no better man than Homer Thornberry, and I am certain that he will make a great and outstanding judge. I wish him well and commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for bringing this appointment to the attention of the House.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentlemen in the well in their commendation of the recently announced nominations for the Supreme Court, but I must say that I do not share the views of the gentleman from Texas when he suggests that with the appointment of Homer Thornberry a splendid trend has been established in the Court. I hope that I am not misunderstanding the gentleman from Texas, but I do not believe that the appointment of Judge Thornberry to the Court will bring forth decisions that will turn back the clock. I

am sure that the Court will continue down its present road of protecting individual rights and will give full meaning to the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record in support of President Johnson's excellent nominations to the Court in the persons of Justice Abe Fortas to be Chief Justice, and Judge Homer Thornberry to be Associate Justice.

Justice Fortas has served the court with distinction. He is a brilliant and dedicated jurist—fair, compassionate, careful and committed to a rule of law in our democratic society.

Judge Thornberry is an experienced and wise jurist, who exemplifies the kind of wise, commonsense approach to law that is fundamental to our American tradition.

The Court has been ably served by these two nominations. I believe that all Americans who value strong courts and wise laws will applaud the President's nominations. The Court will be in good hands.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the nomination of Abe Fortas to fill the No. 1 spot of the Judicial oligarchy comes as a great disappointment.

For years now, the only satisfaction of a respectable Democrat was to remind the Republicans that Earl Warren was of their party.

L. B. J., in leaving, wanted to give us something to remember him by. And certainly Abe is qualified for that—he's been the illumination since the infamous box 13 "burn-out" which launched the Great Society into orbit. For sure, L. B. J. is obligated to Abe, but why take it out on the people?

Abe Fortas may be just the man for restoration of law and order. The only problem is we'll have to follow Abe's rules—militancy and in the streets. See my remarks, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 1, 1968, page 11380, "Abe Fortas Goes Militant."

Certainly, our brethren on the Senate side will not confirm a lame duck's political debt.

Mr. Speaker, an interesting fact sheet on Mr. Fortas appeared in Mr. Frank Capell's August 13, 1965, issue of Herald of Freedom, Box 3, Zarephath, N.J. I include the Herald of Freedom and account from the Evening Star for June 26, along with other pertinent articles, as follows:

[From the Herald of Freedom, Aug. 13, 1965]

ABE FORTAS

Selection of Abe Fortas as Supreme Court Justice caused a debate in Congress as to his fitness. Mr. Fortas's background follows.

Abe Fortas was born in Memphis, Tennessee, June 19, 1910, the son of William Fortas and the former Ray Berson. He graduated from Southwestern College, Memphis, receiving his A. B. in 1930; he received his L. L. B. from Yale in 1933. He married Carolyn Eugenia Agger on July 9, 1935 and they have no children. William Fortas, his father, came to the United States from England in the early 1900's. He was a cabinetmaker by trade. He and his wife had five children of whom Abe was the youngest.

Abe persuaded his wife to go to law school. She went to Yale and graduated with honors. For a number of years, up to 1960, Mrs. Fortas worked in the Washington, D.C. law firm of Adlai Stevenson. She now heads the Tax Division of her husband's law firm, Arnold, Fortas and Porter of Washington, D.C. The present Commissioner of Internal Revenue Sheldon Cohen, came from this same division of this same law firm.

Mrs. Fortas formerly worked for the National Labor Relations Board and the Department of Justice under the New Deal. She was described by the New York "Times" (7/29/65) as being a "tiny dynamic woman who has smoked cigars for years." The Social List of Washington, D.C. shows that Mr. and Mrs. Fortas reside at 3025 N. Street, Washington, D.C. and at Minuteman Hill, Westport, Conn. However, newspaper reports indicate that they have recently purchased a new home on R Street, Washington, D.C. for approximately $250,000.00.

In 1933–4 Abe Fortas was Assistant Chief of the Legal Division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (A.A.A.). Concerning this period we read in "The Coming of the New Deal," the second volume of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.'s trilogy on the New Deal, "'What we need,' he (Jerome Frank) told Peek, 'are brilliant young men with keen legal minds and imagination.' In a short time he brought together a remarkable group—among them, Thurman Arnold" (later to become Fortas's law partner) "and Abe Fortas from the Yale Law School; Adlai Stevenson of Chicago; and, from the Harvard Law School, Alger Hiss, Lee Pressman, John Abt, and Nathan Witt." The last four have been identified in sworn testimony before Congressional Committees as communists.

In the U.S. Government, in addition to the A.A.A., Mr. Fortas held the following posts: Assistant Director and consultant, Corporate Reorganization Study, Securities and Exchange Commission, 1934–38; General Counsel, Public Works Administration, 1939–40; Bituminous Coal Division, 1939–41; Director, Division of Power, Dept. of the Interior, 1941–42; Under Secretary of the Interior, 1942–46. He has also been Acting General Counsel of the National Power Policy Committee, a member of the Board of Legal Examiners of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, and a member of the President's Committee to Study Changes in Laws in Puerto Rico. In 1945 Abe Fortas was appointed as Adviser to the United States Delegation to the United Nations at San Francisco and in 1946 at London.

Frank L. Kluckhohn, a foreign, Washington and White House correspondent for the N.Y. "Times" for over twenty years, states on page 96 of his book, "Lyndon's Legacy," (Abe Fortas) "is a Washington attorney with a dizzying record of defending in court and at Congressional investigations, men who have been under attack as Communists. One of Abe Fortas' famous clients was Owen Lattimore, who was indicted by a Washington grand jury on six specific counts of perjury for lying about his espionage acts, while testifying under oath to the Senate Internal Security Sub-committee. Lattimore's attorney during these Senate hearings was none other than Abe Fortas. Other luminaries whom Abe Fortas has assisted are Soviet agents Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White, to name only two. Abe Fortas helped Hiss and White to draft the U.N. Charter."

The Chicago "Tribune" stated on July 30, 1965, "Abe Fortas Nominated to High Court. New Dealer Was Friend of Hiss." In an editorial they pointed out that Mr. Fortas had "helped Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White, Soviet agents, to draft the United Nations Charter."

In the academic field, Abe Fortas has been an Assistant Professor of Law at Yale Law School, 1933–34, and Visiting Lecturer on Law (with professor status) at Yale University, 1946–47. He has been an Associate Editor of the Journal of Psychiatry and a trustee in the William A. White Psychiatric Foundation, both of these asosciations resulting from his deep interest in mental health.

In the "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications" (Revised December 1, 1961), Page 88, is listed the International Juridical Association. Concerning it we read there, "1. Cited as 'a Communist front and an offshoot of the International Labor Defense.'" . . . "2. Cited as an organization which 'actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line.'"

In the report of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Appendix IX) 1944, P. 795, we find Abe Fortas listed among the officers and national committeemen of the International Juridical Association along with Walter Gellhorn, Robert W. Kenny, Carol King, Thurgood Marshall, Carey McWilliams, David K. Niles, Lee Pressman, Ray Wilkins, A. L. Wirin, Nathan Witt and others. On Page 801 of this same report is stated, "it is appropriate at this point to call attention to an unparalleled phenomenon in the International Juridical Association. That phenomenon consists of the fact that the national committee of the International Juridical Association numbers among its members a larger percentage of high-ranking Federal Government officials than is or ever has been the case with any other Communist-front organization in this country." Among these officials it lists "Abe Fortas, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, at a salary of $9,000."

On Page 1093 of this same report, in a section devoted to "miscellaneous Communist and Communist-Front Organizations" we find the American Law Student's Association. On its "Faculty Advisory Board" are listed Prof. Abe Fortas from Yale Law School, Prof. Walter Gellhorn and Prof. Philip Jessup from Columbia University among others.

In "Human Events," August 7, 1965 edition, we read, "In the early 1940's Fortas joined the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, later listed as subversive by Atty. Gen. Tom Clark. In the 1930's Fortas was affiliated with the National Lawyers Guild, subsequently found subversive by Congress.

"He was also a supporter of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare in 1947, three years after it was listed as a Red front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities; a Senate subcommittee found it a Marxist operation 'serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist party in the United States.'"

The Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee, after an exhaustive investigation and hearings entitled "Strategy and Tactics of World Communism," found that a book called "False Witness" is a "confection of falsehoods which was prepared under the direction of Nathan Witt and Albert E. Kahn, each of whom invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to testify regarding his Communist Party membership." (Page 88) "Its immediate goal was to secure new trials in the cases of Communist leaders who had been convicted. Its broader and long-range goals were to discredit Government witnesses, the Department of Justice, the courts, the FBI, and congressional investigating committees, and thus to immobilize the prosecution and investigation of the Communist conspiracy." (Pages 88–89) Albert E. Kahn, testifying on March 8, 1955, stated that he sent copies of this book, "False Witness," supposedly written by Harvey Matusow, to Abe Fortas's law firm, the York (Pa.) Gazette, Drew Pearson, "The Nation," and others.

Abe Fortas was one of the seven men selected in 1962 for the President's Committee on Equal Opportunities in the Armed Forces. This is the committee which wrote the Civil Rights "Gesell Report."

This report recommended that more Negroes should be recruited into the U.S. Armed Forces, more Negroes should be placed on Promotion Boards, Negro soldiers should be prohibited from gravitating to one military base service club and white soldiers to another; more Negro hostesses should be hired for service clubs, more Negro girls should be

secured for dances, unintegrated business establishments should be placed off limits to all military personnel, homes should be leased in the name of the Federal Government and Negroes moved into them. Segregated busses should be boycotted, ROTC Units in segregated schools should be cancelled, local civic clubs should not be joined if they do not admit Negroes, special officers with bi-racial staffs should be appointed on every military base to handle all complaints of Negro servicemen, base commanders should appoint joint Negro-white committees to break down local segregation practices. The base commander should be encouraged to lead the way to racial homogenization. The Gesell Report recommended political adviser liaisons directly between Negro servicemen and the Defense Department. Negro servicemen who believe they have been discriminated against should report their complaints directly to the visiting personnel from the Defense Department. The Gesell Report stipulates that the identity of the accuser remain anonymous and that the accused not be allowed to confront his accuser. (Gesell Report data taken from "Lyndon's Legacy," Pages 93–94.)

According to the New York "Times," (7/29/65) Abe Fortas is a friend of Pablo Casals and helped bring him to the White House during the Kennedy Administration. From "Un-American Activities In California" (Senate Fact Finding Committee of California) Year 1948, Page 311, we read, "Among other Communist fronts organized for musicians was the Musicians' Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. . . . Pablo Casals was honorary chairman."

Abe Fortas is a partner in the law firm of Arnold, Fortas and Porter, 1229 Nineteenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. This is a very substantial law firm with a total of about thirty lawyers, including partners and associates. Fortas's personal income, according to the N.Y. "Times," is in excess of $150,000.00 per year. Thurman Arnold, one of the partners, was formerly Assistant U.S. Attorney General in the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice, as was John Abt. Paul A. Porter, the other partner in the law firm, was Counsel to the Administrator of the A.A.A., was U.S. Representative to the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine and held many important posts in the New Deal.

In the book, "For the Skeptic," edited by Lyle H. Munson, former U.S. Intelligence official, beginning on page 109, we read, "For some undisclosed reason White's (Harry Dexter White) office arranged gatherings of a number of selected, high-ranking, policy-making officials from various departments of the Government. . . . With White as the initiator and activist, such a gathering could result in far-reaching changes in our Government. The gatherings included: . . . Benjamin Cohen, General Counsel, Office of War Mobilization . . . Lauchlin B. Currie, Administrative Assistant to the President . . . Abe Fortas, Under Secretary of the Interior . . . David Niles, Administrative Assistant to the President . . . Paul Porter, Associate Director, Office of Economic Stabilization . . Aubrey Williams, Executive Director, National Youth Administration and director of organization, National Farmers Union."

"A detailed study and analysis by the subcommittee staff of the documents obtained at Concord through Attorney General Wyman have revealed striking new phases in the life and career of Harry Dexter White. They also emphasize the importance of White's part in the conspiracy of strategically placed individuals in government to subordinate the interests of the United States to the imperialistic designs of the Soviet Union. (quoted from 'Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments,' August 30, 1955)"

Poor's Register shows Abe Fortas as a Director of the American Molasses Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y., doing 50 to 75 million dollars in sales per year. The Chairman of the Board is shown as Adolf A. Berle, Jr. (In 1939 Whittaker Chambers had supplied Mr. Berle with information naming twenty-seven members of the American Communist underground.) Mr. Berle is also listed as being a member of the 20th Century Fund of Boston and New York which has financed much of the Fabian Socialist activities in the United States.

Other directorships held by Abe Fortas are Su-Crest Corporation (1946), Federated Department Stores (1960), Carnegie Hall Corporation (1961), Greatamerica Corporation (1963) and Madison National Bank (1963).

The scandal regarding Robert G. (Bobby) Baker originated to some extent through a law suit instituted against Baker by the Capitol Vending Machine Company. Representing Mr. Baker was Abe Fortas. The N.Y. "Times" stated (7/29/65) that Fortas withdrew later as counsel "because of his advisory role in the Administration." The N.Y. "Times" also revealed that the night following the assassination of the late President Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson summoned Abe Fortas to the White House and Fortas went to work to plan what was later to become the Warren Commission.

"U.S. News and World Report" stated on October 26, 1964, "The so-called 'Bobby Baker case' is said to involve not only widespread 'influence peddling' but 'wild' parties for high officials in a cozy 'town house' near the U.S. Capitol, in which pretty girls reportedly figured.

"The Senate Rules Committee developed evidence that Bobby Baker, by using his position as secretary to the Democratic majority, was able to build a personal fortune while receiving a salary of $19,600 a year."

In 1948 in the fight for the U.S. Senate seat with Coke Stevenson in the Texas Primary Election, Candidate Lyndon Johnson had been declared the loser by a Federal Court judge. Abe Fortas, acting as attorney for Candidate Lyndon Johnson, took the case to U.S. Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black who set aside the lower court order. Fortas has been a close associate of Johnson for the past thirty years. It was Fortas who arranged the trust set-up for the TV holdings of the Johnson family. (From N.Y. "Times" articles)

On January 15, 1959, when Walter Wilson Jenkins was arrested at 10:20 p.m. (Case No. 168287) by the Morals Division of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police at the YMCA, 1636 "G" St., N.W., Washington, D.C. on a charge of disorderly conduct (pervert), he elected to forfeit the bail. On October 7, 1964, he was arrested again by members of the same police unit (Case No. 2208) at 8:35 p.m. at the same YMCA on a charge of disorderly (indecent gestures). Jenkins had just been at a cocktail party at "Newsweek," 1750 Pennsylvania Ave. Hostess of the party was Mrs. Katherine Graham, president of the Washington "Post." Present were many high U.S. Government officials, including Dean Rusk, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, William Wirtz, Robert McNamara, C. Douglas Dillon, and also diplomats from the Embassy of the Soviet Union.

Several days later when the story broke in the newspapers, it was learned that Clark Clifford and Abe Fortas had contacted the three Washington newspapers in an effort to either "kill" or soft-pedal the story. Arthur Krock, writing in the N.Y. "Times," October 17, 1964, stated "Although these advisers, Abe Fortas and Clark M. Clifford, are not members of the Administration, Mr. Johnson has deputized them for so many important personal and political missions that in Texas they would be described as wearing the brand of LBJ."

While there is no question of doubt that Abe Fortas is a very competent and successful lawyer and as far back as 1945 was selected as one of America's "outstanding young men," information from a number of sources raises questions as to the advisability of his confirmation as Supreme Court Justice.

Sen. John J. Williams of Delaware stated, "It is with regret that I must announce that I am not able to support the President in this instance." He said, "In my opinion the President could have made a far wiser choice" and that "contrary to the President's claim that he had looked all over America to find the best qualified man for the job, it is quite obvious that he did not look far beyond his inner circle of friends." Rep. Durward G. Hall of Missouri told the House of Representatives, "There is a serious question whether Mr. Fortas will be able to exercise independence because of his intimate ties with the President and because he has been a participant in some of the more dubious transactions involving the Johnson Administration."

The N.Y. "Times" (7/29/65) stated, "Mr. Fortas' appointment, in the view of students of the Court, means that there probably will be no appreciable change in the liberal course charted by the Court since 1962, when Mr. Goldberg replaced Justice Felix Frankfurter.

"It also keeps alive the tradition of a Jewish seat on the Court."

Many authorities believe that no one should be appointed a Supreme Court Justice without ever having been a judge. A pending bill, S-980, would require five years judicial experience as a qualification. Abe Fortas has had none.

[From the New York Daily News, June 27, 1968]

FORTAS NAMED CHIEF JUSTICE—L. B. J. NOMINATES A TEXAS CRONY TO FILL ABE'S SUPREME COURT SEAT

WASHINGTON, June 26.—President Johnson has nominated Supreme Court Justice Abe Fortas, a long-time friend, to succeed retiring Chief Justice Earl Warren, and chosen Federal Judge Homer Thornberry, a Texas protege, to fill the vacancy created by Fortas' elevation.

If confirmed by the Senate, Fortas, 58, would become the first Jew to serve as chief justice and the third member of the Supreme Court to be promoted to its chief.

Thornberry, 59, is the third Supreme Court nomination made by Johnson in his four and a half years in the White House. His previous appointments were Fortas and Thurgood Marshall.

Johnson called a press conference today to read Warren's letter of retirement and announce the Fortas and Thornberry appointments.

The President said he had discussed the nominations with the Senate Democratic and Republican leaders, "several members of the Senate," and the leadership of the Senate Judiciary Committee. He said he believed the Senate would approve them.

DIRKSEN DOUBTS FIGHT

Senate GOP Leader Everett Dirksen told newsmen he foresaw little Republican opposition to the nominations. Dirksen called Fortas a "very able lawyer" whose philosophy is "quite sound." He termed Thornberry, a former Congressman, a "very solid citizen.

Three Republican senators, however, have already gone on record against the appointment of a chief justice by a "lame duck" President, one who is leaving office. They were Robert P. Griffin (Mich.), Strom Thurmond (S.C.) and John Tower (Tex.).

NIXON CALLS FOR DELAY

Griffin said today he would fight the nomination because he felt "very strongly that such appointments should be made by the next President." He said he would be joined by at least four or five other GOP senators, including Dirksen's son-in-law, Howard H. Baker (Tenn.), and Hiram Fong (Hawaii), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Shortly before Johnson's press conference,

Richard Nixon, the front-runner for the Republican presidential nomination, told newsmen he believed the President should ask Warren to stay on until after the election in November. Otherwise, Nixon said, there would be Democratic as well as GOP opposition to the appointment and the new chief justice would "go in under a cloud and his prestige would be impaired."

Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield (Mont.), praising Fortas and Thornberry, said he hoped the nomination would be acted on this year. Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman James O. Eastland (D-Miss.) said no hearing on the nominations has been scheduled and that the normal procedure was to give a week's notice.

BOTH ARE DEMOCRATS

Fortas and Thornberry are Democrats. The retirement of Warren thus reduces the Republican members of the high court to three—Justices John M. Harlan, William J. Brennan Jr. and Potter Stewart.

At his press conference, Johnson read to reporters the letter from Warren disclosing his retirement, which was reported last week. The nation's 14th chief justice said he wanted to leave, not for reasons of health or because of any "associational problems," but "solely because of age." He is 77.

The former California governor said the problem of age "is one that no man can combat and, therefore, eventually must bow to it." He noted that he has been continuously in public sevice for 50 years.

"I therefore conceive it my duty to give way to someone who will have more years ahead of him to cope with the problems which come to the court," Warren said. He added that he had enjoyed every day of his 15 years on the bench and was grateful for his opportunity for public service.

In his reply to Warren, Johnson said he would accept his retirement "effective at such time as a successor is qualified."

"You have won for yourself the esteem of your fellow citizens," the President told the chief justice. "You have served your nation with exceptional distinction and deserves the nation's gratitude . . . Your wisdom and strength will inspire generations of Americans for many decades to come."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 26, 1968]

FORTAS PICKED FOR CHIEF JUSTICE, THORNBERRY IS NAMED TO COURT

President Johnson today nominated Associate Justice Abe Fortas to succeed Earl Warren as chief justice.

Judge Homer Thornberry of Texas was nominated as an associate justice to fill the vacancy caused by Warren's retirement—which the White House hadn't acknowledged until today.

At an impromtu news conference in his White House office, Johnson confirmed his receipt of Warren's resignation and disclosed the nomination of two of his oldest friends.

Fortas, a long-time Washington lawyer and very close adviser to Johnson, was named to the highest court of the land in 1965.

Thornberry, a former Texas lawyer and for 14 years a congressman from Texas, was named by Johnson in 1963 as a U.S. district court judge from the western district of Texas and from July 1, 1965, has been serving on the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals.

Fortas' nomination was widely speculated on ever since Warren's resignation became known on Friday.

FIGHT IS POSSIBLE

There is a possibility that some senators will oppose the nomination of Fortas on the ground that Johnson as a "lame duck president" should not name a chief justice.

Warren is 77. Fortas is 58.

Johnson read to newsmen Warren's letter to him of June 13, saying he had decided to retire "solely because of age."

Warren said: "I want you to know that it is not because of reasons of health or on account of any personal or associational problems, but solely because of age.

"I have been advised that I am in as good physical condition as a person of my age has any right to expect. My associations on the court have been cordial and satisfying in every respect and I have enjoyed each day of the 15 years I have been here.

"MUST BOW"

"The problem of age, however, is one that no man can combat and that, therefore, must eventually bow to it," Warren said.

Johnson wrote back today, saying:

"You have won for yourself the esteem of your fellow citizens. You have served your nation with exceptional distinction and deserve the nation's gratitude.

"Under your leadership, the Supreme Court of the United States has once again demonstrated the vitality of this nation's institutions and their capacity to meet with vigor and strength the challenge of changing times. The court has acted to achieve justice, fairness and equality before the law for all people."

Johnson told reporters he had discussed the nominations with the leadership of both the Republican and Democratic parties in the Senate, including James O. Eastland, D-Miss., chairman of the Judiciary Committee to which the nomination will go.

A number of senators, mostly Republicans, were moving today to build up support for challenging any court nominations by Johnson.

It now appears that the GOP leader, Sen. Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois, will not support the demand that Johnson leave to his successor any choice of new justices.

But an apparently growing number of his colleagues, believing—as one of them said—that Dirksen "is dragging his feet on this," are making their own move.

They may begin circulating, perhaps later today, a paper—something like a petition—to get signatures of other GOP members who will side with them in a demand that the seat left vacant by Warren's retirement, be kept open until January.

Another move the challengers are considering is a request, presumably directed to Dirksen, for a meeting of GOP senators to go over the issue in full.

FIVE FAVOR FIGHT

At a closed luncheon meeting yesterday, at least five senators spoke up in favor of a fight against Senate confirmation of any Johnson appointee to the tribunal, according to several senators who attended.

Among senators reportedly in this group were three moderates—Howard Baker of Tennessee, Hiram Fong of Hawaii and Robert Griffin of Michigan—and two conservatives—George Murphy of California and Paul Fannin of Arizona.

Baker is Dirksen's son-in-law, but he and the minority leader have differed on other issues.

Among senators who said they do not want to make a flat challenge on the appointment issue were two liberals, Edward Brooke of Massachusetts and Charles Percy of Illinois.

Some of the challengers were disturbed that yesterday's meeting was interrupted several times by roll-call votes on the Senate floor.

"That is not usually done, if Dirksen has something important he wants to discuss," said one man who had been at the meeting.

Dirksen himself would tell newsmen only that his GOP ranks were "divided" and that at this point the issue was not being treated as a "matter of minority policy."

HINT HE'S AGAINST FEUD

While refusing to say outright what his own view is, the GOP chief made a series of roundabout comments which—in sum—seemed to hint strongly that he is against a feud with Johnson on the matter.

He said he had talked about Warren's retirement with Johnson.

The minority leader told reporters that GOP senators "may have to just discuss it further."

But those who want to make a fight were worried that next Tuesday—the next regular day for a Senate GOP meeting—might be too late.

Sen. Griffin put it this way: "If we're not going to take a stand right away, the issue can be lost. As soon as the President makes an appointment, then we will be talking about a person rather than a principle."

Griffin and some of those on his side insist that they are not making just a partisan political fight. They do not dispute that the President has the power, under the Constitution, to replace Warren when his retirement becomes official.

But they are talking about the "desirability" of this.

FAVORS DELAY

As Baker put his position yesterday: "As sensitive as the Supreme Court has become in American life, a change in the government offers a unique opportunity. The appointment of the chief justice really ought to be a prerogative of the new administration."

Baker contended that he and others were not trying to hold up the appointment just because they believe Richard M. Nixon will be the next president, and the appointment should be his to make.

The Tennessean said some polls show now that Vice President Hubert Humphrey will win over Nixon in November. "That is not the issue," Baker said.

Others said they had no doubt the President has the power to make the appointment. But one GOP senator added: "But the Senate also has the power to confirm. The question is whether it is wise policy for the Senate to confirm a new chief justice when the people are in the midst of choosing a new government."

DIRKSEN'S VIEWS

The power argument and the role of historic precedent were cited by Sen. Dirksen in his discussion of the issue with newsmen. The minority leader made these points:

He referred to a Senate vote in 1960 which touched on presidential power to fill the court in the final months of an administration. That vote might be embarrassing to GOP senators this year, since all 33 Republicans in the Senate at that time favored letting the president fill court vacancies late in his term.

Dirksen cited what he considered something of a "precedent" in which Sen. Robert Taft of Ohio, when Republican leader, defended GOP support for the controversial Dean Acheson for Democratic secretary of state.

Illinoisan turned aside, as not a precedent, the Senate refusal—under Democratic control—to confirm Lewis Strauss as Republican secretary of commerce. Dirksen's comment on this suggested that mere "personal feuds" did not count on the question of Senate "intrusions" on presidential appointment power.

The GOP leader also discussed recent Senate investigations into the general question of whether one branch of government was "intruding" on another's prerogatives. In the context of the court discussion, this implied that out-and-out Senate resistance to a Johnson appointee might be just such an intrusion.

NO POLITICAL REQUIREMENT

[He told] reporters that there is no requirement in the law that Supreme Court justices be of any particular political affiliation. He contrasted this with the partisan division required on federal regulatory agencies.

And, finally, the minority chief said there was no question of the President's power to make the appointment.

He summed up his views by asking this question, which he did not directly answer:

"If it is admitted that the President has a clear constitutional power, wouldn't it be regarded as a bit of an intrusion—in the absence of anything derogatory about an appointee—to take a political viewpoint and say it shouldn't be done?"

[From the New York Daily News, June 27, 1968]

COURT KEPT IN LINE FOR GREAT SOCIETY

(By Jerry Greene)

WASHINGTON, June 26.—President Johnson defiantly ignored protests against lame duck action today to name Justice Abe Fortas chief justice of the United States and guarantee that the Great Society will be free of judicial curtailment for the next decade, or more.

Fortas, a pragmatic liberal and an activist, is a man not only friendly to the Great Society concepts. He, as a Johnson consultant and adviser, is one of the principal architects.

The choice of Judge Homer Thornberry to fill the Fortas vacancy will be an assist. Thornberry, for years a very ordinary Texas politician and an old pal of LBJ, has yet to make his mark in judicial circles but he has been a lifelong liberal.

Both appointments, undoubtedly, will be approved by the Senate despite vigorous objections from some Republicans. The promotion of Fortas was not unexpected.

LONG A BEHIND-THE-SCENES FORCE

The twin nominations will give the Supreme Court a lopsided liberal appearance. Only Justices Potter Stewart and John Harlan are generally regarded as conservative. They got more than an occasional touch of support from Justice Byron White and Justice Hugo Black, but the new lineup couldn't ordinarily be counted as less than 6–3 for the liberal views.

Where Chief Justice Warren has appeared blunt and forceful, Fortas will seem suave and mild of manner. But he is a very tough-minded lawyer. He is a perfectionist and a legal craftsman. He is persuasive and can be expected to swing heavy weight in influencing decisions.

The Fortas appointment is full notice that the Supreme Court will not deviate from the course pursued under Warren as an instrument for making law and policy, not merely for the interpretation of actions taken by Congress. Fortas has behind him a lifetime as an activist. His labors in government have been largely advisory. But behind scenes they have been forceful and effective. He won't stop now.

SYMPATHY WITH BIG BUSINESS AS WELL

Fortas was a young lawyer at the Interior Department when he met the then Rep. Lyndon Johnson to begin a personal and political friendship and alliance closer than is commonly understood. Fortas, the quiet one, complemented Johnson's brassy, talkative personality, soon the two found total agreement in the aims and objectives of FDR's New Deal.

It was Fortas who won a Supreme Court ruling for Johnson in 1948 to have him designated as the Democratic nominee for senator from Texas with that victory by 87 votes out of 988,295 cast in the primary.

It was Fortas, going great as a high-priced lawyer in private practice during the 1950s, who with James Rowe and Clark Clifford formed a team of advisers to help Johnson's rise to prominence in the Senate. Rowe is now helping Vice President Hubert Humphrey run his White House campaign. Clifford is defense secretary.

Fortas, Clifford and Rowe were always close at hand, watching and helping the wheels turn. There are few who know the operations of government and politics better. And none have had more influence with the President since 1963.

Yet with their liberal leanings, the three lawyers developed an understanding for and a sympathy with big business. Their clients were the nation's leading corporations. A year after he had been appointed to the court, Fortas broke with the Warren majority to register a strong dissent in an antitrust case.

Fortas has taken the position consistently that bigness in business is not necessarily bad. In his brief period on the court he has been increasingly involved in antitrust cases.

But apart from the feeling for business, as expressed in one opinion that "some mergers are distinctly beneficial to the achievement of a competitive economy," Fortas has remained firm in his Great Society liberalism.

Fortas has taken particular interest in civil rights litigation. He recently wrote the majority opinion in two New York cases which held that a policeman and 15 sanitation employes were illegally fired because they took refuge in the Fifth Amendment while under investigation.

DISSENTED FROM INTOXICATION RULING

A week later, Fortas wrote a long dissent where the majority ruled that a person can be jailed for public intoxication. The court left the way open for future consideration of this issue, but Fortas was emphatic in protesting that there is ample medical evidence that chronic alcoholism is an illness and should be treated as such.

The chief justice-designate went along with the majority in favoring punishment for draft card burners, and approving public aid for parochial school students. He voted for revival of the 1866 law for open housing.

Underlying all of the Fortas thinking is a lifetime of dedication to the FDR New Deal, the Harry Truman Fair Deal, the JFK New Frontier—through Johnson as vice president—and to the Great Society.

He is known to be very high on the protection of individual liberties, a factor which could be of substantial importance when the court considers, as it inevitably will, tests of the new crime control law, and whatever gun control laws that may be passed.

Johnson objected to the provisions of the crime bill authorizing wiretapping, and to sections which would override Supreme Court rulings on the use of confessions of criminals. Word was passed from the White House that these were believed to be unconstitutional.

A Fortas-led court judgment could be predicted.

[From the New York Times, June 27, 1968]

LIBERAL NOMINEES FOR SUPREME COURT POSTS: ABE FORTAS

WASHINGTON, June 26.—Abe Fortas, who was nominated today to succeed Chief Justice Earl Warren as the nation's highest judicial officer, is very much like Mr. Warren in outlook and almost totally unlike him in personality. During Mr. Fortas's three years on the Court the two men have usually been on the same liberal side of the issues, and a "Fortas Court" would be expected to be much like the "Warren Court"—liberal, venturesome and creative.

But while Mr. Warren is an amiable, grandfatherly type whose idealism seems almost naive, Mr. Fortas is a tough, sophisticated advocate who has built a solid reputation as a good Justice by hard work and intelligence. In the process he has rubbed a few Justices the wrong way.

"Abe Fortas has all the qualities of a good Associate Justice—scholarship, commitment and a feeling for the times," a Washington lawyer said. "But the great Chief Justices have also been healers."

PERSUASIVE DISSENT

An example of Justice Fortas's judicial prowess came a week ago Monday, the last day of the current Supreme Court term.

He wrote a persuasive dissent in a 5-to-4 decision saying that to punish chronic alcoholics for being drunk in public was "cruel and unusual" punishment and therefore unconstitutional under the Eighth Amendment. Many informed lawyers predicted that this minority view would eventually become the law.

Justice Byron R. White, while agreeing with the conclusion of the majority, wrote a concurring opinion sympathetic to the Fortas view, thus preserving the prospect of changes another day.

If the challenge to Mr. Fortas is to moderate the stern qualities that brought him success as a lawyer and Associate Justice, and to develop a Chief Justice's vital trait, the ability to "marshal the Court," his past history would suggest that this will be smoothly and efficiently done.

Mr. Fortas was born on June 19, 1910, the last of five children of a Jewish cabinetmaker who had immigrated to Memphis early in this century. By the time he was 13 years old he had begun earning money by playing the violin at social events.

NEW DEAL POSTS

After being graduated from Southwestern College in Memphis and the Yale Law School, he taught briefly at Yale and then entered the hurly-burly of the early New Deal. He served in about a dozen administrative positions, relished the bureaucratic infighting between the new agencies, and at the age of 32 became Under Secretary of the Interior to Harold L. Ickes.

In the late nineteen-thirties Mr. Fortas met Representative Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas and impressed him as a valuable counselor. Mr. Fortas has since tended to be at Mr. Johnson's side when important events required a trusted friend and confidant.

One of these occasions in 1948, proved to be a turning point in Mr. Johnson's career. Mr. Johnson had come out 87 votes ahead in the Democratic Senatorial primary, but his opponent had won a court order to keep Mr. Johnson's name off the ballot for the general election.

Mr. Fortas took the matter to Justice Hugo L. Black and obtained a reversal of the order. Mr. Johnson won the election, and Mr. Fortas, the lifelong appreciation of a future President.

Mr. Johnson has continued to call upon Mr. Fortas, for advice, legal and otherwise.

On the bench, Mr. Fortas invariably seems well-prepared, and he has a knack for asking the questions that reveal the pivotal issues in a case. He is said to be persuasive in presenting his views when the justices discuss cases in private before voting.

His most important opinions have been in the area of juvenile law, where he has insisted that youngsters be given many of the constitutional protections that adults must be granted in court.

Mrs. Fortas is a leading tax lawyer and remains a member of his former Washington law firm, Arnold & Porter. She practices under her maiden name, Carolyn Agger. There are no children.

An amusing after-dinner speaker who often pokes gentle fun at himself as well as at jurists and the legal profession in general, Mr. Fortas acknowledges occasional verbosity.

"My problem," he says, describing some of his lengthy opinions, "is that I like to begin each opinion with the invention of money."

WILLIAM HOMER THORNBERRY

Not long ago, Federal Judge William Homer Thornberry, looking back on his experience in the House of Representatives, said that his most agonizing moments were

in voting against bills that his friends had asked him to support and backing measures that his friends had opposed. "Finally," he said, "you make up your mind and do what you think is right as well as what is right for your constituents."

The 59-year-old member of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, who was nominated yesterday by President Johnson to the Supreme Court, has long indicated his independence and his beliefs.

His decisions as a district judge, to which he was named in 1963 by President Kennedy, and as a member of the Appeals Court, a Johnson appointment in 1965, have stressed his liberalism on civil rights, desegregation and freedom of speech.

Blunt-spoken advocate

A friend in Austin, Tex., where Judge Thornberry lives, who has known this stocky, gray-haired legislator and jurist for years, describes him as follows:

"He is blunt-spoken. He does not make a big fuss about what he believes, but he makes pretty clear what he means."

For example, more than 20 years ago, a community bordering on Austin wanted to become part of the city. Quietly, Mr. Thornberry, then a member of the City Council, learned that the area did not allow Jews. He said nothing until the community applied for inclusion in the city.

Then, without mincing words, he began a fight against the community unless it changed its charter to allow the sale of lots to Jews. His aggressive campaign blocked admission of the community, which refused to change its charter and is still not part of the city.

In recent years Judge Thornberry has argued off and on the bench for equal rights for Negroes.

During much of the Kennedy Administration as a member of the House Rules Committee, he was the only Southerner who voted on the liberal side, often giving the President a one-vote margin until the committee was expanded.

Childhood influences

Part of Judge Thornberry's ability to make up his mind quietly and then adhere to a decision despite pressure stems from his childhood experiences. He was born Jan. 9, 1909, and both his parents were deaf mutes. He communicated with them through sign language. His father died when he was a boy. He worked his way through the University of Texas and its law school.

Many years later, a publication at the University of Texas said of its eminent alumnus:

"He grew up in a silent household with little money."

Though like many Texans in public life, Judge Thornberry is a competent spinner of tales, he has the capacity for understatement. Once, when recalling how he ran for the Texas Legislature in 1936—he has never lost an election—with a campaign fund of $100, he added:

"Politics didn't cost as much then."

Part of the judge's success is undoubtedly due to his friendship with President Johnson, who used to refer to him as "my Congressman." Mr. Thronberry represented the 10th Congressional District in Texas, where he succeeded Mr. Johnson in 1948 and from which the President votes.

When Mr. Johnson was hospitalized with a heart attack, Mr. Thornberry visited him and played dominoes with him, a favorite pastime of Mr. Thornberry's. He was sworn in as circuit judge on the lawn of the L.B.J. Ranch.

Mr. Thornberry met his wife, the former Eloise Engle, during World War II, while he was stationed at Corpus Christi, where she was a civilian employee. They have three children—Molly, David Homer and Kate.

As excitement swept through Austin yesterday, Mrs. Thornberry, remarked to an acquaintance, who phoned congratulations:

"Homer's on his way home. I'm busy fixing him a steak dinner now."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, June 27, 1968]

BLOCK THIS RUSH ACT

President Lyndon B. Johnson dropped the other shoe yesterday, with a thud heard 'round the world.

He announced that he had accepted Earl Warren's resignation as Supreme Court chief justice and nominated Associate Justice Abe Fortas to succeed Warren and U.S. Circuit Judge Homer Thornberry of LBJ's home state of Texas to succeed Fortas.

It is a political rush act, in the end months of the L. B. Johnson presidency—an effort to prolong "liberal" control of the high court. Fortas is to the left even of Warren, which makes him a long way leftward and then some.

There is a swing toward conservatism in the United States, especially as regards official tenderness toward crooks, criminals and Communists.

Apparently the President has fallen victim to the professional-liberal conviction that professional liberals always are in the right and everybody else is wrong, and any means to gain professional-liberal ends are justified.

We think it is the U.S. Senate's patriotic duty to turn down the Fortas nomination and hold the chief justiceship open until the nation has a new President. We hope the Senate will on no account shirk that duty.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News June 27, 1968]

IT ALL BEGAN WITH THE NEW DEAL

(By Alton Slagle)

Abe Fortas descended on Washington in 1932, in the earliest days of Franklin Roosevent's New Deal, and quickly made friends with another young man named Lyndon Baines Johnson, then youth administrator for Texas. They met at the home of Arthur Goldschmidt, who later became deputy director of technical assistance for the United Nations.

Some years later—in 1948—Johnson made use of Fortas' legal abilities. His Senate victory in Texas was challenged by rightwing Democrat Coke Stevenson, who had lost to LBJ in the all-determining primary by 87 votes, and had filed suit to invalidate the election. Fortas filed countersuit and won. From that day until his appointment by President Johnson to the 1965 Supreme Court vacancy left by Arthur Goldberg, he remained Johnson's personal attorney.

NATIVE OF MEMPHIS

Fortas was born in Memphis, Tenn., in 1910, the fifth child of a Jewish cabinetmaker.

Fortas worked his way through high school and college—Southwestern College and the Yale Law School—by playing violin in a dance band. Music still is one of his passions. He has listed among his friends cellist Pablo Casals, violinist Isaac Stern and pianist Van Cliburn.

Fortas taught at Yale Law School from 1933 to 1937 commuting to Washington to work for various New Deal agencies. He was named undersecretary of the interior in 1942 when he was 32, serving until 1946, then formed a Washington law firm, Arnold, Fortas and Porter. He became one of the nation's most brilliant appeals lawyers.

In his firm was a cigar-smoking woman lawyer, an authority on tax law, who shared another tie with him: marriage. Fortas and the former Carolyn Eugenia Agger were married on July 1, 1935. They rode to work together in a Rolls Royce. They have no children.

While serving as attorney for Johnson before his Supreme Court appointment, Fortas also had dealings with Johnson aides.

THE JENKINS CASE

At one time, Fortas' firm was retained by former Senate Democratic Secretary Robert G. (Bobby) Baker, who was involved in a $300,000 vending machine contract suit that touched off a scandal. Fortas withdrew when it appeared his services to Baker might embarrass Johnson. He called it "a conflict of interest due to certain assignments I have undertaken for the new administration."

Trouble involving another Johnson aide, Walter Jenkins, propelled Fortas into one of his most embarrassing moments. Hours before Johnson heard of Jenkins' arrest on a morals charge in 1964, Fortas had been summoned by Jenkins, who told him: "Abe, I've got to see you. I'm in terrible trouble."

Fortas tried to get the story squelched in Washington newspapers. He was successful with two of them, then a wire service broke the news. Fortas obtained Jenkins' resignation.

The lawyer was always frank about the roles he played for the President. He made no boasts, but neither did he pretend that he and Johnson were just casual acquaintances.

APPROVAL WAS QUICK

When Goldberg resigned from the Supreme Court to succeed the late Adlai Stevenson at the United Nations, Johnson quickly nominated Fortas to replace him, and the Senate was quick to agree.

On the high bench Fortas established himself as a liberal and a champion of civil and individual liberties, a believer in psychiatry and the law, a believer in aid for oppressed nations and a believer in opening doors for the underdog.

He voted most like Chief Justice Earl Warren and other liberals—Justices William J. Brennan, Jr., William O. Douglas, Hugo Black.

In one recent decision, however, he disagreed with Warren, dissenting vigorously in a 6–3 decision upholding the constitutionality of New York's 1965 law requiring school systems to lend textbooks to pupils of parochial schools.

Fortas was the winning, and liberal, side when the court upheld the 1965 federal voting rights law, killed off payment of a poll tax as a condition to voting in state and local elections, and held unconstitutional a requirement that members of the Communist Party register with the federal government.

On several occasions, Fortas' vote has been decisive in producing liberal decisions.

FOR SUSPECT'S RIGHTS

He was with the majority when the court voted 5–4 to rule out all incriminating statements made in court by a suspect whose constitutional rights in regard to possible self-incrimination were not safeguarded by police.

Before his court appointment, Fortas set up the design of the Warren Commission, which investigated the assassination of John F. Kennedy, and before that, he had served as liaison between Johnson and the Kennedy family at the time of the President's funeral.

While not the first Jew to serve on the high court, he is the first to be appointed chief justice.

[From Americans for Constitutional Action]

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 26.—Americans for Constitutional Action (ACA) announced today, in response to inquiries from the Press, that the new nominee for Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Homer Thornberry, received a 5 percent rating for his final two years in Congress, 1961–1962, as a Representative from Texas.

ACA, national non-partisan, political ac-

tion organization, headquartered in Washington, added that Mr. Thornberry received a 16 percent cumulative ACA rating for the years 1957–62. The ratings are based on the voting records of the Members of Congress on major national and international issues.

The 5 percent 1961–62 rating and the 16 percent cumulating 1957–62 rating classify Mr. Thornberry, according to ACA, as an "extreme Left-wing Liberal."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, June 27, 1968]

HIGH COURT CYNICALLY MANIPULATED

(By David Lawrence)

Once again the membership of the Supreme Court of the United States has been cynically made an instrument of personal and political manipulation. The audacity of presidents in giving judicial appointments to political cronies was pointed out by this correspondent in what he wrote at the time when the two men now being named to fill vacancies on the nation's highest court—Abe Fortas and Homer Thornberry—were first nominated to serve on the federal bench.

Back in July 1963, President Kennedy announced that he was naming to the federal district court Rep. Thornberry, a Texas Democrat and for many years a political ally of Lyndon Johnson, then vice president. On July 11, 1963, this correspondent wrote:

"It is reported on Capitol Hill that the administration plans to defer action in the Senate on the Thornberry nomination until some time toward the end of the present session in order to assure his vote for administration policies in the closely divided Rules Committee of the House while important legislation is being considered by the committee in the next few months. . . .

"But why should Rep. Thornberry be rewarded with a federal judgeship? He has never served on the bench in any court. Why should the president of the United States give anyone a lifetime post in the judicial system on the basis of favors done of a political nature? How can there be confidence in the federal judiciary if judgeships become a matter of political patronage? Were there no lawyers or state judges in West Texas better qualified for the judgeship in question? . . .

"Does the system of using judgeships as a reward for past political favors mean that judges already on the bench can expect promotions to the United States Court of Appeals only if they 'play ball' with the administration in power?"

President Johnson in 1965 advanced Thornberry to the Court of Appeals and now has named him an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Also, when Arthur Goldberg was persuaded to leave the high court to become U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, President Johnson promptly appointed his long-time personal adviser, Abe Fortas, as associate justice. This correspondent wrote then, on July 25, 1965:

"Small wonder that the Supreme Court of the United States has steadily fallen into disrepute in recent years as it has developed into an oligarchy of politically rather than judicially minded individuals. Now President Johnson has selected Abe Fortas—his personal friend of long standing who has never had a day's experience on the bench—to be one of the nine justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. This is in line with the unfortunate trend of the past several years.

"Other presidents besides Johnson, Republican as well as Democratic, have appointed to the Supreme Court political associates or partisan supporters with a controversial background. . . .

"It is surprising that spokesmen for the bar associations, who often stress the need for a 'rule of law,' are willing to sit by without protest as political rather than judicial training becomes the major qualification for appointment to the highest court of the land."

What redress do the American people have when there is such blatant politics in appointments to the nation's highest court? The voters cannot express themselves on this issue directly at the polls, but they can hold responsible the members of the Senate who may soon vote to confirm the appointments. One third of the senators will be seeking reelection in November, and the people will have a chance to reject those candidates who go along with the "packing" of the Supreme Court with lifetime appointments of political cronies by a "lame-duck" president.

Other senators of both parties who will be voting on whether or not to confirm and who happen not to be up for re-election this year will hardly be indifferent, moreover, to the way public opinion reacts to this strange episode. For when a president with just a few months left in office undertakes to deprive the next president of an opportunity to appoint a chief justice of the United States—a position vitally affecting the operation of the American Constitutional system—it is hardly likely that the American people will approve what appears to them to be a case of political manipulation. There may even be a filibuster in the Senate to prevent action until the convening of the newly elected Congress in January.

[From the New York Times, June 27, 1968]

WARREN-JOHNSON LETTERS

WASHINGTON, June 26.—Following are the texts of a letter of retirement and a letter of explanation sent June 13 by Chief Justice Earl Warren to President Johnson and the text of the President's.

CHIEF JUSTICE'S LETTERS

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C., Section 371(B), I hereby advise you of my intention to retire as Chief Justice of the United States effective at your pleasure.

Respectfully yours,

EARL WARREN.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In connection with my retirement letter of today, I desire to state my reason for doing so at this time.

I want you to know that it is not because of reasons of health or on account of any personal or associational problems, but solely because of age. I have been advised that I am in as good physical condition as a person of my age has any right to expect. My associations on the court have been cordial and satisfying in every respect, and I have enjoyed each day of the fifteen years I have been here.

The problem of age, however, is one that no man can combat and, therefore, eventually must bow to it. I have been continuously in the public service for more than 50 years. When I entered the public service, 150 million of our 200 million people were not yet born. I, therefore, conceive it to be my duty to give way to someone who will have more years ahead of him to cope with the problems which will come to the Court.

I believe there are few people who have enjoyed serving the public or who are more grateful for the opportunity to have done so than I. I take leave of the Court with the warmest of feelings for every member on it and for the institution which we have jointly served in the years I have been privileged to be part of it.

With my very best wishes for your continued good health and happiness, I am

Sincerely,

EARL WARREN.

THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER

MY DEAR MR. CHIEF JUSTICE: It is with the deepest regret that I learn of your desire to retire, knowing how much the nation has benefited from your service as Chief Justice. However, in deference to your wishes, I will seek a replacement to fill the vacancy in the office of Chief Justice that will be occasioned when you depart. With your agreement, I will accept your decision to retire effective at such time as a successor is qualified.

You have won for yourself the esteem of your fellow citizens. You have served your nation with exceptional distinction and deserve the nation's gratitude.

Under your leadership, the Supreme Court of the United States has once again demonstrated the vitality of this nation's institutions and their capacity to meet with vigor and strength the challenge of changing times. The Court has acted to achieve justice, fairness, and equality before the law for all people.

Your wisdom and strength will inspire generations of Americans for many decades to come.

Fortunately, retirement does not mean that you will withdraw from service to your nation and to the institutions of the law. I am sure that you will continue, although retired from active service as Chief Justice, to respond to the calls which will be made upon you to furnish continued inspiration and guidance to the development of the rule of law both internationally and in our own nation. Nothing is more important than this work which you undertook so willingly and have so well advanced.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson is to be commended for his nomination of Associate Justice Abe Fortas to be Chief Justice of the United States and Judge Homer Thornberry to a member of the Supreme Court.

These two appointments by the President continue his record of nominating the best people for the most important public offices in the land.

Justice Fortas has already demonstrated his high competence during the 3 years in which he has served on the Supreme Court.

Judge Thornberry has had wide judicial experience in Federal courts as well as experience in the private practice of law and as a county attorney in Texas.

I had the pleasure of serving with Homer Thornberry in the House of Representatives where I came to know and admire his total dedication to the public interest.

The Supreme Court is one of the foundation stones of the American Government as set forth in the Constitution. The two nominations by President Johnson will help assure the strength and stability of that foundation.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the President's appointments of a new Chief Justice and a new Associate Justice of the Supreme Court offer dramatic justification for the approval of my proposal, House Joint Resolution 1279, for the election of all Federal judges.

The President, in making these lame-duck appointments, has brought two questions to the surface regarding the highest court of justice in our land. First, what general political motivations lie at the bottom of this action? And second, to what extent should any President go to his closest personal friends for making lifetime appointments of this kind?

By all rightful considerations of the public interest the President should have

left these appointments to his successor. The new President to take office in January will carry with him a mandate of the people which, by any reasonable standard, should be reflected in the lifetime appointments of men whose Supreme Court service will virtually be beginning at the same time the new President enters the White House.

House Joint Resolution 1279, providing for the election of Federal judges, is designed to avert exactly this kind of situation. Many Americans will wish that President Johnson, instead of making these lameduck appointments yesterday, would have expressed his support for the election of Federal judges as a means of making our Government more responsive to the people of the country.

Some would say that this would put the court in politics. But I ask you—what, other than politics, could have been the President's motive in making these appointments?

What we need on the Supreme Court today is not a group of personal friends of the President or of anyone else. Rather, we need a court made up of judges trained in the law and trained in writing decisions. We need a court made of men sensitive to the constitutional safeguards which have too often been laid by the wayside in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard much recently about "the establishment" and about how young people and others of fresh imagination and energy bitterly resent their difficulty in making an imprint on the course of public events. We see today in America a forceful challenge to the established ways of government of the past years. The President's appointments are a crude effort to defy that challenge and to perpetuate a system that has already been discredited. I urge our colleagues in the other body to consider these appointments carefully for the good of our Nation.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, is there now anyone so bold in this land who would step forward and say that the appointment of Supreme Court Justices for life to the bench removes that branch of government from politics? If so, then yesterday's appointment of Mr. Justice Fortas as Chief Justice and of yet another who shares Great Society beliefs, supposedly in its waning hours, should once and for all put that illusion to rest.

And should there still be those who in their naivety point to any proposal that the Congress review these Justices periodically and call it "radical and dangerous," then, this too, serves only to confound and perplex those who have seen the protection of the "separation of powers" principle become nonexistent.

I feel the urgent necessity to introduce this resolution because the Supreme Court has established itself as "a second legislative branch" completely frustrating the will of the people as it is supposed to be expressed through the Congress of the United States.

Never in the history of our democracy has the citizenry of this land confronted a crisis as grave as that which now exists. I am speaking not of the riots in our streets; not of the continuation of what is already the longest war in which our Nation has been involved; not of the great debt incurred by our Government which has placed heavy tax burdens upon every citizen; not of the regrettable and incomprehensible failure of our law-enforcement bodies to protect lives and property; and not of the myriad of other tragedies spread across the headlines of daily newspapers and uttered from the lips of radio and television newscasters. I am most fervently speaking of the undeniable and sweeping change in the form of government which we have learned to hold so dear and for which Americans have lived and died. I earnestly believe there can be no lasting solution to any of the problems we are frantically attempting to resolve until a more fundamental issue is decided, that of whether the system of government we have known is to be permitted survival.

The resolution which I am introducing is an essential first step toward maintaining that government which was conceived by those who drafted our Constitution. Citizens of this country are now living in a national welfare state, the evolution of which is largely attributable to decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. Had these decisions been limited to an interpretation of the law, as was intended by the Founding Fathers, we would not now be experiencing the trauma of crushed ideals and shattered freedoms. It is imperative for us to understand what the Supreme Court is doing. Stated simply, it is legislating under the guise of interpreting the Constitution. It has assumed powers never intended for its use and has plunged this Nation into bold and frightening sociological experiments.

Our Founding Fathers carefully and purposefully included in the Constitution of 1787 an intricate system of checks and balances. It was their purpose to establish an effective government without bestowing absolute power upon any segment thereof. The House of Representatives was established and given the power to make laws; but the Senate was given the power to reject those laws. Likewise, the Senate was created and given power to enact laws; but the House of Representatives can reject those laws. Even when the Senate and House of Representatives concur in the passage of a law, the Chief Executive has the power to approve or reject the same; but if the law is rejected by the President, his rejection can be overruled by two-thirds of the Senate and House. Through this "balance of powers" the will of the American people could be expressed, legislation suggested, hearings held at which expert testimony could be obtained, and a thorough analysis of the need for new laws could be arrived at.

A judiciary was established and given the power to interpret laws; but the power to make law was expressly reserved for the people through their representatives in Congress. Today, we are witnessing a usurpation of power by the judiciary. That which was most feared by the framers of the Constitution has come to pass; namely, resignation of the policy of our Government into the hands of a few. Decisions are being handed down by the Supreme Court which are tantamount to laws; and the judiciary has become an effective legislative branch of the Government. The tragedy of this occurrence is the total and complete removal of the people from an eminent part of the lawmaking process.

Although I am not in accord with many of the laws of this land which have achieved that status through Supreme Court decisions, it is not my intention to discuss the merits of those laws. It is very definitely my intention to depict their impact upon this Nation and the fact that the Founding Fathers never, not in their wildest dreams, conceived of the Judiciary having the ability to make such laws.

The impact upon this country of laws enacted by the Supreme Court is oftentimes greater than laws enacted by the Congress.

It is equally true that many of the decisions of the Court have been rendered with noble purposes and without question there has been instances where many individuals have benefited, however, the broad question of the impact of far-ranging and novel experiments by the Court upon our total society has been ignored. The members of the Court, being shielded by life tenure from the will of the people and, apparently insulated by their station in life from the realities of the world in which we live, have, on occasion, thrown prudence to the wind. Can anyone make a pretence of loyalty to this country and justify a decision which protects the employment of an admitted Communist in a factory devoted to the production of armaments for national defense? Their release of admittedly guilty persons who have returned to society to wreak havoc upon it, is a black mark in the history of the Court.

Only yesterday, I read that Danny Escobedo was arrested once again on a narcotics charge. You will remember, the Escobedo case established by the Supreme Court the principle that his interrogation by police without a lawyer present was grounds for reversing a conviction, where by his own admission, Escobedo had confessed to the crime. And who can forget the case of Andrew Mallory whose conviction for rape in Washington, D.C., was reversed by the Supreme Court on the grounds that Mallory was held too long between his arrest and arraignment. In this case, there were three suspects arrested together, each agreed to a lie detector test, and following these tests interrogation by police brought a confession from Andrew Mallory that he was the one who perpetrated the crime. After his release, Mallory committed another personal assault in Philadelphia for which he was convicted and sentenced from 11½ to 23 years imprisonment. This second victim—and probably others we do not know about—would have been spared the ravages of this criminal if justice had not miscarried—if the courts had not seized upon a dubious technicality to set him free. Probably, the most notorious of these decisions in the area of criminal law is the Miranda case, whereby the Court threw out a written confession by Ernesto Miranda convicted by a lower court of kidnaping and rape. Because Mr. Miranda was not fore-

warned, his signed confession was held invalid and his conviction overturned.

The far-reaching scope of Supreme Court decisions in criminal cases has usurped the prerogatives of the legislatures of the various States and one would do well to observe with fear the restraints which these decisions have placed upon local law-enforcement institutions.

In the name of protecting individual rights, the Supreme Court has made law which, if not checked, will ultimately cause the destruction of society. On its face, the results of these actions don't seem too bad, however, in their application, there is not a hardened criminal in the United States who does not take full advantage of the benefits bestowed upon him by the Supreme Court. Most respectable citizens do not even know of the intricate web which the policeman must weave if he is to comply with the "laws of the Supreme Court." He may, however, ask any criminal and receive a complete explanation.

Let us look more closely at the Court's decision in Miranda. The case turns upon the question of when counsel was appointed for an accused indigent. The Court held that counsel must be appointed, not only for the trial, but as soon as the accused is charged with a crime. This rule was derived by virtue of the Supreme Court's interpretation of the meaning of the sixth amendment of the Constitution. I want to read that amendment in its entirety.

It says:

> In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right of a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense. [sic]

The language of the amendment is plain and lends no support whatsoever to the Court's "interpretation." Even if one feels the rules which have evolved from these decisions of the Supreme Court which are under discussion are good rules, he must admit there is no authority in the judiciary to make the same. If he then asks where the authority rests, he need only read the 10th amendment of the Constitution which states:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The Supreme Court has so busily created laws which diminish the protections States have established for their citizens that soon one's only refuge will be to turn to the Almighty. Yet, even prayer has not escaped the dominating hand of the Court. "Interpreting" the first amendment to the Constitution, the Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional for children in the New York public school system to participate in a recitation of these words:

> Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country.

This decision of the Court may be found in the case of *Engel* v. *Vitale* (370 U.S. 421 (1962)); and it should be noted that the portion of the first amendment to the Constitution involved in the case says no more than:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

I do not dispute the applicability of the first amendment to States by virtue of the due process clause of the 14th amendment. That is another subject. I do dispute and shall continue to dispute the holding that the simple prayer I have quoted is an "establishment of religion". Writing a dissenting opinion, Mr. Justice Stewart said the Court had "misapplied a great constitutional principle." He said the issue involved was whether "those pupils who wish to do so may join in a brief prayer at the beginning of each school day"; and he said, further, he was unable to see how an official religion could be established thereby.

There are many cases which have been concluded in the lower Federal Courts, holding in accord with Engel against Vitale; and it may be safely said that the Supreme Court has successfully banned prayer and Bible readings from public schools. To give only one example among many, the case of *Stein* v. *Oshinsky* (224 F. Supp. 757 (1963); 348 F. 2d 999 (1964); Cert. denied, 382 U.S. 957) holds that children cannot even voluntarily say, before having milk and cookies:

> God is great, God is Good
> And we thank Him for our food.
> Amen

Or

> Thank you for the World so Sweet,
> Thank you for the food we eat,
> Thank you for the birds that sing,
> Thank you God for everything.

That same Supreme Court which decided Engle against Vitale and which begins each session following the Court Crier's supplication, "God save the United States and this Honorable Court", refused to hear the case of Stein against Oshinsky. The Supreme Court has itself violated the first amendment, but not quite so vaguely. It has clearly created law which prohibits the free exercise of religion. Is there no sanction against the judiciary?

No one can deny that many persons have benefited from some of the decisions of the Supreme Court. I would be the last to state that the "one-man, one-vote" rule, arrived at by the Court in *Baker* v. *Carr* (369 U.S. 186 (1962)) did not greatly benefit the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia. But, I cannot use the desirability of this action to defend the obvious extension of the Court's jurisdiction into legislative areas in arriving at that decision.

I am not alone in questioning the scope of this decision. Mr. Justice Harlan, joined by Mr. Justice Frankfurter wrote:

> I can find nothing in the Equal Protection Clause or elsewhere in the Federal Constitution which expressly or impliedly supports the view that state legislatures must be so structured as to reflect with approximate equality the voice to every voter. Not only is that proposition refuted by history * * * but it strikes deep into the heart of our federal system. Its acceptance would require us to turn our backs on the regard which this Court has always shown for the judgment of state legislatures and courts on matters of basically local concern.

And, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, joined by Mr. Justice Harlan said:

> To find such a political conception legally enforceable in the broad and unspecific guarantee of equal protection is to rewrite the Constitution.

The case of *Wesberry* v. *Sanders* (376 U.S. 1 (1964)) is the Georgia sequel to Baker against Carr; and the Supreme Court held that congressional districts must be composed of substantially equal numbers of people. Again, I do not argue here today that the law of the land imposed by this decision is necessarily bad law; but I heartily agree with that portion of Mr. Justice Harlan's vigorous dissent which reads:

> Today's decision has portents for our society and the Court itself which should be recognized. This is not a case in which the Court vindicates the kind of individual rights that are assured by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment * * * The Claim for judicial relief in this case strikes at one of the fundamental doctrines of our system of government, the separation of power. In upholding that claim the Court attempts to effect reforms in a field which the Constitution, as plainly as can be, has committed exclusively to the political process * * * this Court, no less than all other branches of the Government, is bound by the Constitution. The Constitution does not confer upon the Court blanket authority to step into every situation where the political branch may be thought to have fallen short. The stability of this institution ultimately depends not only upon its being alert to keep the other branches of government within constitutional bounds, but equally upon recognition of the limitations on the Court's own functions in the constitutional systems.

Certainly, in the field of civil rights, beginning with *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (347 U.S. 483 (1954)), the Supreme Court has led and continues to lead the Congress. This school segregation decision was much more than simply a move to end segregation in schools, it was the beginning of a trend—marking the entry of the Supreme Court into areas heavily weighted with political overtones.

The importance of Brown against Board of Education is not whether segregation is right or wrong. Rather, its importance rests in whether the Court had the power to render such an unprecedented decision. Until this case, the Court had, through many decisions, recognized its limitations. In numerous decisions, the Court had stated there was no constitutional prohibition against legislation providing for separation of the races; and in the case of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson* (163 U.S. 537 (1896)), the Court said that such legislation was "no more than an official recognition of prevailing social custom."

When the Court decided Brown against Board of Education it rejected all legal precedent and donned the robes of society's social conscience.

In the years since the Brown case, the Court has moved from its position of creator of civil rights to a position of

taskmaster for the advancement of social and economic goals. Tragically, but understandably, society has been unable to meet the demand of this second legislative branch of the Government; and the result has been the violence which is so prevalent in the streets of these United States.

Today we are looking back upon a nation which once stood for individual freedom. We are looking ahead to an egalitarian society, the type of society which, history has proven, will destroy itself. Much of the responsibility for this change in the structure of the American Government rests upon the U.S. Supreme Court.

Until 1900, the War Between the States constituted the major, if not the only real national emergency in this country; and, therefore, the Government did not find it necessary to assert broad powers. Every such attempt was squelched by the Supreme Court. And later in the cases of *Hammer* v. *Dagenhart* (247 U.S. 251 (1918)), *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.* (298 U.S. 238 (1936)), and *Bailey* v. *Drexel Furniture Co.* (259 U.S. 20 (1922)), the Supreme Court correctly held that Congress was attempting to assert control over local matters which control was reserved to the States. But, following President Franklin Roosevelt's appeal that the national emergency warranted different constitutional decisions, the Court began to take a complete about face; and now that it has turned completely around, it is moving posthaste in the other direction. It is incumbent upon the citizens of this Nation to do something in the interest of self-preservation; and I am suggesting that which must be done.

Judicial life tenure was granted to Supreme Court Justices in order to shield the Court from political pressures. The shield has been used, however, to respond to political pressures through legislating without fear of reprisal. Thus, the balance of power, so carefully created by the framers of our Constitution, is in a state of imbalance; and it must be restored.

The resolution which I am introducing proposes a constitutional amendment providing for confirmation of the appointment of Supreme Court Justices by two-thirds of the House and Senate. It provides, further, that the House and Senate shall reconfirm a number of the Justices during each third year. This does not destroy the intent of the Constitution. On the contrary, it is a means by which the meaning of the Constitution can be restored and the powers of this Government rebalanced. It is not required by reason that a Justice of the Supreme Court, who holds in his hands the power to destroy our system of government, be answerable to someone?

Finally, Mr. Justice Hugo L. Black, the senior member of the Supreme Court and long considered one of its most effective liberal voices, was quoted in the April 1, 1968, issue of U.S. News & World Report. In the Carpentier Lectures at Columbia University Law School, delivered March 20, 21, and 23 of this year, he said:

> The courts are given power to interpret the Constitution and laws, which means to explain and expound, not to alter, amend or remake. Judges take an oath to support the Constitution as it is, not as they think it should be. I cannot subscribe to the doctrine that, consistent with that oath, a judge can arrogate to himself a power to "adapt the Constitution to new times."
>
> But adherence to the Constitution as written does not mean we are controlled by the dead. It means we are controlled by the Constitution, truly a living document. For it contains within itself a lasting recognition that it should be changed to meet new demands, new conditions, new times.
>
> It provides the means to achieve these changes through the amendment process in Article V.

Mr. Justice Black has eloquently stated the problem which exists and the method of solving it. I urge my colleagues to take this first step which I am proposing.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and my honor to have as a classmate, as a fellow freshman in the 81st Congress, the Honorable William Homer Thornberry, whom President Johnson has nominated to the Supreme Court of the United States.

During his service in the House there was not a Member on either side of the aisle who did not hold him in the highest respect. Of such as Homer Thornberry are great judges made, and to that appraisal there will not be a single dissenting voice among the hundreds of his colleagues in his years of service in the House.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the appointments of Mr. Justice Fortas and Homer Thornberry.

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

There was no objection.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT DESIGN MUST MEET ACCEPTABLE STANDARDS OF NOISE AND SONIC BOOMS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Appropriations today struck out a $223 million item for the development of supersonic transport until such time as industry comes up with an acceptable design.

The committee has also recommended that the $30 million heretofore advanced for this project be returned to the Treasury.

I want to congratulate the committee for its wisdom and good judgment. The committee has instructed the appropriate agencies to first come up with an acceptable design that will meet the standards of noise and supersonic booms in this country before any money is spent on this project.

Mr. Speaker, I am not at all disturbed with the fact that the British and the French are now developing a supersonic transport known as the Concord. That aircraft will produce a supersonic boom of such gravity that I am sure it will be barred from operating over the United States at supersonic speeds. I am certain that Congress sooner or later will approve legislation which I have introduced which would require that no supersonic flight can be made over the continental United States which produces supersonic booms of more than 1.5 pounds of pressure per square foot at ground level.

This is a serious problem. It is one confronting this Nation, and the world, and I believe the Committee on Appropriations today showed extremely good judgment in not funding any more money until the designers of these aircraft are prepared to come before Congress and to come before the people and say that they have designed an airfoil and a powerplant that will give us the thrust and the lift, and the speed that we need to fly at supersonic speeds which will not produce devastating supersonic booms in their wake.

We know the damage that supersonic booms can do. We had the example just recently at the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs where a supersonic flight broke some 300 windows and seriously injured a number of soldiers, including one colonel who had a piece of glass shattered through his neck. I do not know how he is doing at this moment, but that example just gives us a preview of things to come in this country if we do not insist upon research to counteract this problem of sonic booms before billions of dollars are spent on the development of a supersonic transport. I do not believe we should spend any more on supersonic planes until we have one designed that will not produce sonic booms in excess of tolerable limits. If the engineers say they have not reached that state of science where they can guarantee against sonic booms, then I say, Mr. Speaker, society just is not ready for supersonic flights. I do not believe that we have to jeopardize millions of people in the name of so-called progress. The aircraft industry has a responsibility to our people and until they break through the sonic boom problem, there just will not be any supersonic flights over the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I congratulate the House Committee on Appropriations for its good judgment.

THE SERIOUSNESS OF THE CRIME PROBLEM IN AMERICA TODAY

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, All of us are keenly aware of the seriousness of the crime problem in America today. We are confronted with it on every hand, and the news media constantly report evidence that crime is on the increase in all parts of the country.

The recent statistics released by the Federal Bureau of Investigation are further evidence of the fact that we need to take some tangible and forceful action in order to deter those who are bent on breaking the law. It is abundantly obvious that much of the increase in crime in recent years has been brought about by the attitude of the top echelon of our law-enforcement authorities as well as the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. These decisions have given the criminal encouragement, protection and almost a license to commit crime at will. In addition, many of our courts have a growing tendency to release vicious criminals, to probation and turn them loose to prey further upon the innocent.

Something must be done by the Congress to change the present procedure and atmosphere if lawlessness and violence are to be wiped out in our Nation. If some of our national leaders who are now crying out against the crime wave would help the Congress enact the necessary laws to put a curb on the Supreme Court in its all-out effort to protect the criminal elements and to strengthen the hands of law-enforcement officials, we would then be in a much better position to combat crime throughout the Nation. In an endeavor to stop the coddling of prisoners and to in a small way increase the protection to society as a whole, several necessary changes in the law must be made. Action should be taken immediately and forthrightly.

The omnibus crime control bill, which the Congress recently approved, and which has now been signed into law, will, I believe, provide some remedial steps in restoring the proper perspective in dealing with crime in America. This law actually is only a first step toward that which is badly needed in order to overcome court decisions of recent years. The omnibus crime control bill reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee contained several sections which were later deleted by the Senate when it passed the bill. I have, therefore, introduced a bill which incorporates these important sections. It is my hope that immediate consideration can be given to enactment of these provisions. The purpose of my bill is to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Federal courts to review certain rulings in State criminal cases, and it provides that section 3502 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to deny jurisdiction to Federal courts to reverse convictions in State courts involving admissions and confessions admitted as voluntarily given where the highest court of the State has affirmed such convictions. The bill also contains section 3503, which would provide that eye-witness testimony is admissible in evidence and limits the appellate jurisdiction of the Federal courts in both Federal and State cases admitting this testimony into evidence. The language of the bill is clear and simple, and its purpose is to further insure that society as a whole will be adequately protected.

The bill also sets forth procedures in obtaining writs of habeas corpus, as follows:

The judgment of a court of a state upon a plea or verdict of guilty in a criminal action shall be conclusive with respect to all questions of law or fact which were determined, or which could have been determined, in that action until such judgment is reversed, vacated, or modified by a court having jurisdiction to review by appeal or certiorari such judgment; and neither the Supreme Court nor any inferior court ordained and established by Congress under Article III of the Constitution of the United States shall have jurisdiction to reverse, vacate, or modify any such judgment of a state court except upon appeal from, or writ of certiorari granted to review, a determination made with respect to such judgment upon review thereof by the highest court of that state having jurisdiction to review such judgment.

I firmly believe that legislation of this type is necessary if we are to adequately protect the public interest against the rise in crime which is gaining momentum all over America.

Those who continually assert that we need to go all out to protect the rights and privileges of the accused regardless of the effect on society as a whole were strongly opposed to the provisions added to the omnibus crime control bill relating to Federal courts. They apparently have no interest in protecting society but only in the coddling and pampering of the criminal element. These same people in the judiciary and out have nearly wrecked crime enforcement in America. They have so shackled our police and handcuffed enforcement officials that justice has been a mockery of in numerous trials of self-confessed vicious criminals. They will likewise be opposed to the provisions of this bill. I believe, however, that the time has come when we need to keep in mind that society as a whole needs to be protected against those who willfully and deliberately violate our laws. Nor can we sit back and let those who have little concern for our national well-being trample down the great constitutional principles which we have so long and painstakingly established.

The dogooders, leftwingers, and others who are constantly bending over backward to extend rights to the accused at the expense of society as a whole are never around to assume any responsibility for the results of their endeavors.

The No. 1 step facing us today is the curbing of the majority of the members of a Supreme Court which majority has done so much to wreck law enforcement in America and to bring about violence and lawlessness on every hand. We need the help of every law-abiding citizen in this effort to restore peace and tranquility in America. This is merely one step but it is an important one.

PRESENTATION OF AIR FORCE COMMENDATION MEDAL TO COL. CLOYCE TIPPETT, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, on June 19 it was my great pleasure to attend the presentation of the Air Force Commendation Medal to Col. Cloyce Tippett, U.S. Air Force, retired. Colonel Tippett is an outstanding American who has rendered great service to his country and was most deserving of the tribute accorded him in this presentation. Remarks detailing Colonel Tippett's contribution to the Air Force were made by Brig. Gen. Jammie M. Philpott, U.S. Air Force. I include these remarks in the RECORD for the recognition of all Members of Congress:

REMARKS BY BRIG. GEN. JAMMIE M. PHILPOTT, DEPUTY ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF, INTELLIGENCE, AT THE PRESENTATION OF THE AIR FORCE COMMENDATION MEDAL TO COL. CLOYCE TIPPETT, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 1968

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to express to you General Wheless' regrets for not being able to be here for this occasion and especially to Colonel Tippett whom he has known for a number of years. General Wheless anticipated being here this afternoon to preside at this ceremony; however, he has not been returned to duty and he has asked me to represent him.

On this occasion I believe it appropriate to briefly review some of the highlights of Colonel Tippett's career which started at Randolph and Kelly Fields, Texas in 1936.

Following the war, he was accredited to all Central and South American countries as a representative of the International Civil Aviation Organization. Because of his extensive knowledge of Latin American affairs Colonel Tippett has served his active duty periods with the United States Air Force Foreign Liaison Division from 1960 to the present.

Colonel Tippett's retirement from the Air Force Reserves culminates a long and active association with the United States Air Force which he has carried out with both loyalty and distinction.

Because of this it is fitting that Colonel Tippett's service be recognized with the awarding of the Air Force Commendation Medal.

Colonel Shertzer will you please read the citation.

CITATION TO ACCOMPANY THE AWARD OF THE AIR FORCE COMMENDATION MEDAL TO CLOYCE J. TIPPETT

Colonel Cloyce J. Tippett distinguished himself by meritorious service while assigned to the Foreign Liaison Division, Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, Headquarters United States Air Force, from 25 July 1961 to 17 April 1968. During his active duty periods, Colonel Tippett's highly professional skill, knowledge of Latin American affairs, and dedication to the United States Air Force, assisted to a marked degree in the development and maintenance of cordial and mutually beneficial relationships with the accredited Air Attaches, representatives of foreign missions, and other representatives of foreign Air Forces in the Washington area. The distinctive accomplishments of Colonel Tippett culminate a distinguished career in the service of his country, and reflect credit upon himself and the United States Air Force.

ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 10th anniversary of the founding of the Americans for Constitutional Action. This group has for the past 10 years been providing the American people with a comprehensive analysis of the voting records of the Members of Congress.

The ACA is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, nationwide political action organization which is dedicated to preserving our constitutional government as envisioned by our Founding Fathers. The main purpose of this organization is to protect American's social and economic freedoms and to combat trends toward socialism and a regimented society. In the true American tradition, the ACA has supported candidates for Congress who will protect these basic constitutional freedoms.

The board of directors and trustees of the Americans for Constitutional Action are a group of distinguished Americans. Among the trustees are patriotic Americans from the fields of business, government, law, and medicine. One of these trustees, Mr. John Wayne, celebrated Hollywood actor, has actively supported and campaigned for the cause of constitutional government. Over July Fourth, John Wayne will act as grand marshal of Atlanta's annual Fourth of July parade, and I have the honor of participating in that event. Mr. Wayne has always supported the goals of the ACA, and I consider him one of the outstanding members of this organization.

For the information of my colleagues, there are eight basic principles which the ACA adheres to. They are the following:

First. Man has the right to life, liberty, and possessing, utilizing, and disposing of his honestly acquired property.

Second. When any individual, group, or government deprives a person of his God-given rights, it is done in violation of natural law.

Third. No man can deprive posterity of their God-given rights or he cannot vote away or give away their economic and political freedom.

Fourth. All powers of government should be obtained by delegation of the individual. The government does not have the right to forcibly seize power or obtain power by voluntary delegation by individual citizens.

Fifth. Safeguards must be erected against an expanding government to insure that the instruments forged to protect the rights of the people will not be used to destroy those rights.

Sixth. To insure economic freedom, we must strive to preserve the free market system into which government can only intrude to protect individual rights and to prevent predatory action.

Seventh. The prevention of onerous or punitive taxation, including inflation, which tends to destroy economic freedom must be ameliorated. A slave is a person to whom economic freedom is denied.

Eighth. For every right there is a collateral responsibility. Unless there is a general prevailing individual self-discipline, which stems from devotion to the moral code, it is impossible to achieve that balance between public order and individual freedom which is essential for spiritual growth and material prosperity.

As we approach the Fourth of July, I hope each of you will join in rededicating yourselves to strengthening the principles of constitutional government and extend your best wishes to members of ACA as they celebrate their 10th anniversary.

AMERICANS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, today Americans for Constitutional Action completes a decade of service to the American electorate and also to numerous Members of Congress. For 10 years their efforts have played a vital and often decisive part in congressional elections; their winning percentages have been consistently high during their years of participation. This fact was dramatically pointed out by the nonpartisan, authoritative Congressional Quarterly when they reviewed the 1964 elections and found that out of 121 House contests where ACA and the AFL–CIO's COPE endorsed competing candidates, ACA endorsees won 68 races while 52 were won by COPE candidates.

ACA's published ratings—ACA Index—on the voting records of all legislators at the close of each session, provide an invaluable measure for the voting public to see for themselves how they are truly being represented. The news media also use the Index widely as a reliable gage of voting trends and varying individual patterns.

Conservative candidates who receive ACA's support are provided with a variety of services ranging from the counseling of new candidates to professional campaign assistance in areas where needed. Along with additional services such as in-depth research, speech material, art layouts, news releases, and use of ACA publications. However, regardless of ACA's involvement, a firm policy of never making endorsements without a prior request from the candidate, is maintained.

When manpower is needed in a given area, it is recruited if possible from the candidate's own district or State and takes direction directly from the candidate in an assigned capacity. This may include organizing the campaign, speechwriting, statistical research, fundraising, organizing committees, and election-day workers, or whatever needed.

ACA has organized citizens groups in some areas on a statewide or district level. They were organized to support conservative incumbents or to seek out new candidates where necessary. By their nonpartisan stature they have often been a tremendous asset to officeseekers on not only the congressional level but to State and local candidates.

After observing the many facets of ACA through the past 7 years I have developed a deep respect for their capacities and the leadership that makes them possible. And I want to say, "Thank you, ACA," for what you have done for so many of us in this Congress and in the past—I hope that you will continue and ever expand your efforts for good government through your voter education programs, campaign assistance, and in future ways that may not yet be on your planning boards.

PATRIOTISM TODAY

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, there appeared recently in the June 21 issue of the Lauderdale County Enterprise of Ripley, Tenn., one of the outstanding weekly newspapers in the Nation, an article that was so outstanding from PFC Danny Ray Falkner, who is presently in the armed services in Korea, that I felt it should be brought to the attention of the Congress.

I know that many of us are getting letters from time to time from these hippies and draft-card burners not wanting to go to the service, but this young man is a true American in every respect. The letter speaks for itself:

EDITOR:

I am PFC Danny Ray Falkner. I have been a life-long resident of Lauderdale County. I graduated from Ripley High School in May of 1967. I'm presently a member of the United States Army Security Agency, which is stationed in Korea along the demilitarized zone.

Recently, I have been deeply touched over the matter of patriotism in our young people of today.

I hope you will publish this statement in order that it may help our young people, not only of Lauderdale County, but of the whole United States, in the way of patriotism.

Recently, there have been many riots and numerous people burning their draft cards, in protest against the Viet Nam war, and against the draft. From seeing all of this, a very serious question has arisen: "Patriotism, is it dead?"

As a member of the United States Army, I have been deeply touched by the fact that our American young people of today are doing such foolish stuff. These young people don't seem to realize what they are doing.

Ever since 1775, we Americans have been fighting for our freedom. We were fighting for the right to do as we wish, fighting to have the privilege of free vote, and the right to free speech. Our fore-fathers fought for such freedom, in order that generations to come might enjoy this privilege. Our men in Viet Nam today are fighting in order to help a country to rid itself of Communist aggression.

The young people also don't seem to realize that unless we continue to resist Communism, we will soon be under Communist rule, where we wouldn't have the right to do as we wish, nor have the right to express ourselves freely.

As for myself, I don't like war any more than anyone else does, but I realize the fact that we must fight in order to keep our freedom. Such stuff as burning draft cards and rioting in protest goes to prove that patriotism in our young people of today is at an all-time low, and something must be done about it, and quickly.

I agree a person has the right to express

himself, but when it comes down to where he burns his draft card and causes riots that endanger the lives of innocent people, it's absolutely foolish.

A person should want to serve his country. A person should have so much pride and respect that he would be willing to lay down his life in its defense.

We should remember the words of one of the famous patriots of the American Revolutionary War, Nathan Hale.

Nathan Hale was a school teacher before the war. He quit his job when the war broke out and joined the army. As you and I know, Nathan Hale was caught and hung as a spy. But his last words were not of protest and hate; they were of love and devotion to his country, and these words were, of course, "I have but one life to give to my country." Nathan Hale thought so much of his country that he was willing to lay down his life in its defense. Our young people of today should remember his words.

I enlisted in the army for one reason, and one reason only. The reason was because I was proud of my country and I was proud of those who fought and died before me for my country in order that I might enjoy the freedom that I now enjoy.

I was willing at least to give up a few years of my life for my country. And now if needed, I will give my life in its defense, because, as I've said, I'm proud of my country.

A person should be proud and be willing to serve if he is called to do so. He shouldn't go with hate or go rebelliously in his heart. There are many people all over the world who would love to have this freedom that we enjoy.

If a person goes with pride and honor in his heart, there will be no need to burn draft cards or cause riots, and above all there will be no need for people to wonder, "Patriotism, is it dead?"

DANNY R. FALKNER,
Co. B, 508th ASA Gp, Korea,
APO San Francisco, Calif. 96207.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT REQUIRES EXEMPTION FROM PERSONNEL CUTBACK TO AVOID MAIL SERVICE CHAOS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation to exempt the Post Office Department from the personnel cutback requirements provided in the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, now awaiting President Johnson's signature.

I have been studying carefully the potential effect of the order on the Department, which already is grappling with a massive increase in mail volume. Clearly, the need will be for added manpower, not less.

The mail volume has increased sharply and postal employment practices have been changed in the Department during the past 2 years, so that the proposed cutback can result in chaos in our mail service.

I have discussed this matter already with our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, to which committee my bill is being referred. He has assured me that his committee will give early consideration to my bill.

The mail volume in fiscal year 1969 will be 11 percent greater than it was in fiscal year 1966, which is the base year to be used by departments in establishing new employment ceilings.

What is more, there was an important change in the work schedule of postal employees in 1967, requiring more employees because of an expansion of the 5-day workweek, a change in overtime practices, and virtual elimination of split shifts.

The Post Office Department, unlike any other business, has no control over its workload. It has to handle whatever mail is dropped in the mail chutes or piled on the post office platforms.

Here are some of the key factors which are changing between fiscal year 1966, the base year, and fiscal year 1969:

There is a population increase of 7 million, an increase of 4 million in the number of homes in the United States receiving city delivery of mail, an additional 666,377 rural homes, a total of over 358,000 new businesses, and a per capita increase in volume of mail of 8.8 percent.

Even with that big increase in demand for postal service, and the changes in employment practices in the Department, the increase in personnel has been held in check.

In June 1966, the Department employed 489,898 permanent and 188,000 nonpermanent workers. By June 1969, it is now estimated that the Department—with the ordered cutback—will be employing 566,437 permanent and about 195,000 nonpermanent workers.

Unless we give consideration to the special demands of the postal service, I do not see how the Department will be able to handle the mail load while undergoing a big reduction in personnel.

Of course, the effect of the manpower reduction ordered in the tax bill will not be overnight. It will be gradual—by attrition—over a period of months.

During that time, however, the prospect is for the mail volume to keep increasing.

The only alternative is to cut back on postal service. If my mail is any indication, the American public is in no mood to accept anything less than the mail service which it is now receiving.

My bill simply exempts the Post Office Department from the employment limitations in the tax measure. It does not change sections in the bill dealing with reduction in expenditures in fiscal 1969.

THE SILENT DEATH

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate the ease with which one can purchase murder weapons, I recently purchased, in the Times Square area of New York City, a switchblade, a 5-inch gravity knife and other gruesome weapons. These so-called hunting knives are, in reality, only used to hunt people.

Now, while the public is rightly demanding and I am supporting strong gun control legislation, I call for a parallel effort to control these vicious knives. I call upon the Department of Justice, as well as State and local law-enforcement agencies, to crack down by enforcing existing laws. And to tighten existing law, I shall introduce legislation to effectively prohibit the manufacture of these weapons and to prevent the distribution of knives already produced.

Mr. Speaker, in all parts of the country, especially in those areas with effective gun control laws, the number of knife murders is steadily climbing. During 1965 and 1966 there were approximately 20,000 homicides in the United States. Of those 4,700 were committed with knives—that is just under 25 percent. And a national magazine recently reported that in some communities knife murders exceed gun murders by as much as 5 to 1.

As I said, there are existing Federal, State, and local laws controlling the distribution of switchblades and similar weapons. However these laws are too weak and are rarely enforced. Under a 10-year-old Federal law designed to stop the spread of these knives there have been only 17 convictions—that is in 10 years, Mr. Speaker.

Because these knives are a dreadful extension of violence in our society; because they are readily available, even to minors; because existing laws are ineffectual; and because these knives have no constructive purpose whatsoever—for all these reasons I shall introduce legislation to block the manufacture, distribution, and availability of switchblades, gravity knives and similar weapons.

The following points will be included in this legislation:

First. Clearly and specifically prohibit any individual, transporter or common carrier from carrying such knives in interstate travel;

Second. Prohibit the sale of surplus military switchblades;

Third. Prohibit the sale of such knives to an individual who is not a resident of the State in which the knife is sold;

Fourth. Prohibit the ordering of such knives by telephone;

Fifth. Prohibit any distributor or shipper dealing in interstate commerce from selling, transporting, or distributing such knives in any instance; and

Sixth. Prohibit any manufacturer dealing in interstate commerce from manufacturing such knives.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the Members' attention an excellent article on the problem of switchblade knives This article, written by Jack Harrison Pollack, appeared in the May 26 issue of Parade magazine and, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include it in the RECORD at this point:

WE MUST STOP THE SALE OF SWITCHBLADE KNIVES

(By Jack Harrison Pollack)

It could happen to you or any member of your family, any time, anywhere—on a crowded subway or a lonely suburban street. The motive could be robbery, rape or senseless slaughter. Tempers flare. Suddenly a hand streaks toward a pocket. There is a swift click. A hidden, daggger-tipped blade darts out like a snake's tongue. Clutched in a fist is a murderous "switchblade" or

"gravity" type knife which in close quarters, police say, is as lethal as a loaded revolver.

Millions of words have been written and spoken in and out of Congress about the menace of guns; civic organizations press for legislation to curtail their sale. Too little has been said about concealed knives. Yet crime statistics show that knives cause far more trouble than guns. They accounted for 23 percent of U.S. murders in 1966, and the rate is probably higher today. In many communities, the ratio of knife crimes to gun crimes is as high as five to one. When newspapers report these crimes, they usually say "knife stabbings." But police records often reveal that switchblade or gravity knives were the weapons used.

Isn't it against the law to possess these dangerous knives? Most states have a law against carrying concealed weapons. And in at least 12 states these knives are specifically prohibited—and federal law prohibits their interstate shipment. But the laws are often so vaguely written that they are rarely enforced, and as a result are cynically flouted.

KNIVES AND SCHOOL

Parade learned in a nationwide survey that these switchblade and gravity knives (also called "springblade," "swingback" and "snap" knives)—*which are designed exclusively for violence*—are frequently as easy to buy in many parts of the U.S. as a package of gum or cigarettes. In many fair-sized cities, they are prominently displayed in store windows, and are sold openly, even to teenagers—no questions asked. Some cautious storekeepers, though, sell them from under the counter or cache them in the rear of the shop.

In New York City, the knives are advertised in seedy Times Square store windows with the come-on price—"from 88 cents up." On Chicago's South Side, they are for sale not far from a public school, and they have indeed been bought by thrill-seeking juveniles, who take them up as a fad, and take them to classes and school dances. In some California cities, where a state law prohibits the carrying of any knife with a blade of over two inches, knives and daggers with blades up to nine inches are illegally acquired by hoodlums and others.

In these and other communities, I recently purchased some of these knives. I saw them being sold to scores of minors and grownups, in flagrant violation of local and state laws, often with policemen passively patrolling outside the stores or in the vicinity. You can even charge these illegal purchases to your credit card service!

The knives are mainly manufactured in Japan, Germany and Italy and are smuggled into the U.S. Many have gaudy handles and are labeled "007." Others, also to attract the unhealthy fascination of teenagers and sophomoric adults, are emblazoned with such words as "Lion," "Tiger" and "Eagle." These knives cost from $3.98 to $25 for the more elegant Italian models.

What is the difference between these and conventional knives? First, they have a daggerpoint tip. Second, unlike ordinary pocketknives, they can be operated with one hand. To open a switchblade, you merely press a button, and the blade flies out instantly and locks into position. A gravity knife opens when held firmly by the fingers and quickly snapped with the arm and wrist. The blade leaps forward, automatically locked into place. In states where there is a specific prohibition against switchblades, gravity knives are now coming into greater circulation. These one-handed weapons may not be as multi-purpose as a Boy Scout's jackknife but they are infinitely swifter to open, and thus are favorites with street fighters, muggers and strongarm robbers. "I never even saw the knife," said one victim of a switchblade attack, "I only *felt* it."

I asked merchants why they sold these deadly knives. Here are some of their cynical, if whimsical replies: "People want them for protection." "You don't break your fingernail opening them." "They're easy to peel potatoes with." "You couldn't get a kid a nicer present." "Girls like to use them instead of hatpins."

Salesmen and manufacturers also have an ever-ready alibi: "If people can't get these knives, they'll find other weapons to commit crimes with—guns, icepicks, baseball bats and what-have-you." But countless crimes would never have been committed if switchblade and gravity knives were not so readily available. Police, judges, teachers, social workers and other responsible citizens are increasingly disturbed by the growing use of these weapons. A Midwestern police officer admits: "Nearly three out of four of our stabbing cases this year involved these knives. We sure need a tough law against them."

In 1958, Congress did pass a law to ban the interstate shipment of switchblade knives. Penalties for violation are up to five years in prison and a $2,000 fine. The bill was introduced by Sen. Warren G. Magnuson (D., Wash.) in response to urging the police chiefs across the nation, who were trying to cut down street warfare by youthful gangs. But the Justice Department admits there have been only eight convictions in the past five years. People who were vitally interested in the legislation at the time of its passage seem almost to have forgotten its existence. Senator Magnuson said he hasn't followed the progress of the law, but he has the impression it has "gone a long way toward correcting the situation." However, when asked whether the law had been effective, Attorney General Ramsey Clark declined to comment.

Knives are also on the list of forbidden imports. Customs men say they have seized 2,500 knives from persons returning from Europe in the past 12 months, but only one commercial shipment was confiscated, a consignment of Japanese knives seized in Los Angeles.

MORE THAN A MILLION

A decade ago, switchblade production in the U.S. was reported at 1 million knives a year. This was supplemented by the importation of another 200,000 knives. The federal law exempts from its provisions members of the armed forces when engaged in the pursuit of their duties, and one-armed persons, who may carry switchblades of less than three inches in interstate travel. When I told a storekeeper that I wanted a switchblade for a one-armed friend, he said: "Here's a gravity knife that's just as good. I'll show you how to open it." Another merchant hesitated to sell me a switchblade, but he produced a knife with the usual pushbutton removed, and then told me that I could replace the mechanism in a hardware store!

Most state and local laws are weasel-worded on the subject of the knives, and are often contradictory. Some do not make clear that it is a crime to buy and sell them, but only to "possess" or "carry" them.

Laws have also been handicapped by poor enforcement. Last month in New York City a detective saw a man pull a switchblade on the doorman of my apartment house. The detective seized the knife and told the man to move on. "Why didn't you lock him up?" asked the doorman. "Maybe I should have," said the detective, "but I'd have to go to court to testify against him—and so would you."

A few localities have taken effective action against knives. Philadelphia has passed an ordinance which carries penalties of up to 90 days in prison and a $300 fine for any seller or carrier of switchblade and gravity knives. When storekeepers display the weapons, police crack down. "This law has virtually dried up knives at the source," Ephraim R. Gomberg, executive vice-president of the Philadelphia Crime Commission, says.

How can you protect yourself and your family from this threat? Here are three things you can do immediately:

1. Find out if any of your local storekeepers display or sell switchblade or gravity knives. If they do—and are violating local or state law—notify the police and help prosecute them. Preferably, this can be done through your civic, religious, fraternal or PTA organizations.

2. If your local or state law needs clarifying, or if your state and town has no law against these knives, you can work for the passage of new laws. And add your voice to others demanding strict enforcement.

3. Make certain that your children and their friends do not buy or carry the knives.

Not long ago, a decorated young war hero—who had survived several overseas battle wounds—was getting off a bus with his girl friend. Suddenly, without warning or provocation, a drunken stranger pulled a four-inch switchblade from his pocket and plunged it into the veteran's heart, killing him almost instantly. Who was the murderer? A mentally ill man with a long police record of assault. He couldn't carry a gun without a permit. If needed laws were enacted and enforced, he wouldn't have found it so easy to roam the streets and ride the buses with an equally murderous weapon.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Could you not also do the same thing with reference to a kitchen knife or a common steak knife that you use for cutting meat?

Mr. WOLFF. The kitchen knife is made for the purpose of cutting meat for human consumption, but these knives are made for the purpose of inflicting injury upon individual persons.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, approximately 10 years ago it was my pleasure to participate in the sponsoring of legislation, legislation which Congress passed, prohibiting the interstate shipment and sale of switchblade knives as well as the gravity knife.

Mr. Speaker, I trust the matter to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] has referred will receive the attention of the producers of such weapons and that the appropriate committees of the Congress will take action thereon.

Mr. PASSMAN. This will mean that I will have to head for the use of chopsticks.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON—AGE SHOULD BE NO BARRIER TO THE VOTE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support of President Johnson's proposal for a constitutional amendment to permit 18-year-olds to vote.

Today young people are among the best informed in all history. We need

their fresh ideas to help meet the needs of today's changing world. I do not mean to imply by this that this is an issue that will divide liberals from conservatives. It is a proposal worthy of their accord regardless of party.

The requirement of 21 as the voting age in 46 of our States derives from medieval England. It is illogical to suppose that the age of 21 is a relevant test of majority today. The quality and scope of our education have made such a test obsolete.

The President's proposal has already met with popular support.

In both the 89th and 90th Congresses I introduced a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that citizens 18 years old or members of the Armed Forces of the United States should not be prevented from voting in certain elections on grounds of their age.

It is my opinion that 18-year-olds, fresh from the study of politics and American Government in our high schools, are better versed in public affairs than were the 21-year-olds of 50 or even 25 years ago, and that this segment of our society would make a notable contribution to our political progress. It is time to give them the opportunity for direct participation in the political life of the country.

PROTEST OF PRESIDENT'S NOMINATIONS TO THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest with all the vigor at my command the installation of justice by crony as exemplified by "lameduck" President Lyndon Johnson's nominations to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Abe Fortas, Johnson's nominee as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, is a glorified fixer. He demonstrated this beyond doubt in the infamous case of Walter Jenkins, a Johnson White House intimate, who was arrested in the basement of a Washington, D.C., YMCA and forfeited bond on a morals charge.

The nomination of Homer Thornberry, another close friend of the lameduck President, as an Associate Justice, brings into sharp focus the immediate need for Congress to establish qualifications for members of the Supreme Court. There are literally hundreds of members of the bar in this country with far more legal and judicial experience than Thornberry.

Mr. Speaker, this Government as ordained by the Founding Fathers cannot survive if its High Court is to continue to be used as a tool of politics and a dumping ground for cronies.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman realize that Homer Thornberry goes to the Supreme Court with more Federal judicial experience than any other Member now sitting on the court, with the exception of one Member?

Mr. GROSS. That is no testimonial to the court now sitting, I would say.

Mr. ALBERT. But it is a testimonial to Homer Thornberry.

Of course, the gentleman has made charges about the distinguished nominee for the position of Chief Justice, whose credentials will be gone into by the other body and will be subject to open debate. I think it is admitted the gentleman nominated is one of the most brilliant men in America. I doubt that my friend can substantiate the very serious charges he has made about one of the brightest minds in our country today. I do not think the gentleman wants to be unfair.

Mr. GROSS. I have only 1 minute this evening, but I will be glad at some later date to take more time and to read into the record what happened on the occasion of the Walter Jenkins episode to prove my point. I will be glad at any time, with the gentleman on the floor, to ask questions or to comment, to take some time to do that, if the gentleman insists upon it.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT E. BAUMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to pay tribute to a young man with whom most of us have been well acquainted. His service to the Congress began in 1953, as a Page in the House, and has continued to the present day where he serves as manager of the Republican telephones in the House cloakroom. I pay tribute to this young man, Robert Bauman, because at the end of this week he will retire from his position in the House, to begin his career in the practice of law.

Like many young men of ability and determination, Bob completed his education by working his way through school. He has asked for no handouts from the Government, be it State or Federal. He had no stipends or other financial help. Putting himself through undergraduate and law school has only been accomplished by the hard, long efforts of working by day and going to class by night. This very morning in Annapolis, he, along with other young men entering the legal profession, was sworn into the bar of the State of Maryland.

I congratulate Bob on this achievement. He has worked long and hard and the reward is well deserved. As he leaves his tenure as a Republican assistant in the House of Representatives, I and all of my colleagues wish him well. Bob will leave a lot of friends when he leaves the employ of the House. His absence will be noted, I am sure, by many of those who have depended upon him for legislative information, and much more by those who have enjoyed knowing him personally. His reputation as a wit—sometimes it can be a particularly cutting wit—is well known around the cloakroom. He possesses a sense of humor that sometimes is woefully lacking in some men in politics. That sense of humor has often relieved the tension of long and arduous sessions of the Congress. It, coupled with his dedication to the Republican Party, will cause him to be sorely missed by all of us.

I would like to say a few words now about my own personal association with Bob Bauman, which began as long ago as 1957, when I was serving as national chairman of the Young Republicans. At that time, Bob was still in college, and was active in the College Young Republicans. I knew him then as a particularly competent, bright, and aggressive politician, with a distinct leaning to the political right in the GOP. As the years went by, I became associated with him in Young Republican conventions, in national Republican conventions, and in other conservative activities. At the same time, he continued to be active in the Republican Party in his own State of Maryland, while pursuing his law studies at Georgetown University at night.

I once attended a testimonial dinner in his honor. It may seem strange for one so young to have had a testimonial dinner—but Bob, at that time only 27—was retiring as national chairman of Young Americans for Freedom. Some of his friends thought he should be so honored, and I was proud to attend and add my tribute to the many others that were given that night. During his tenure as national chairman of Young Americans for Freedom, which was more than 3 years, YAF became a nationally known name, one which commands more respect from Members of Congress than almost any other youth group. When he retired from that post, he of course did not retire from politics, but went on to become a founding member of the board of directors of the American Conservative Union. I have had the honor of being chairman of the ACU since 1966, and Bob has served well as secretary to the board. I have also worked with him during that time when he, as a member of the national executive board of the Young Republicans, continued to be active in that group.

My greatest admiration for Bob is because of his profound dedication to the same great principles of constitutional government and just administration of the law which I hold so important. Were it not for my belief that these principles are threatened today by sinister forces both from without and within this Nation, I would not undertake the time-consuming and arduous political responsibilities that I now have. Those of us who have worked for these conservative principles of government sometimes become discouraged at the slow pace of our progress—and I do think we have made progress in recent years—but our greatest comfort is in knowing that young men like Bob are moving up to take their places in the struggle.

His concept of the law, and of the place of this Nation in the world, have been well manifested by his many speeches, writings, and efforts on behalf of conservative candidates for office. He has been a delegate to three Maryland State Republican conventions, and was a delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1964. In all of these endeavors,

he has sought to advance the conservative principles in which he believes.

It may seem strange that a young man, just past 30, could have amassed 15 years of service in the Congress. But Bob was truly a fortunate young man to have been appointed a page in the House at the age of 15. Even at that age, Bob was a dedicated Republican, and he found in serving Members of Congress a thrill which most boys of that age have never known. His awe of the Capitol, the Congress, and the legislative processes, has never diminished since that time. I once heard the story of how Bob came to be named as a page. I think other Members will find it amusing and instructive.

While a freshman in Easton High School, Easton, Md., Bob was an avid reader of the New York Times, oddly enough. He laboriously clipped newspaper items about the Republican campaign of 1952, and in so doing, came across an item about the number of Republican page jobs that would be opening up after the beginning of the Eisenhower administration and the convening of the Republican 83d Congress. Although Bob's parents were not active politically—I believe at that time they were not even registered Republicans—Bob had been doing his part in local campaigns in Maryland's First District in the 1952 campaign. He had marched in parades, passed Republican literature, worked at headquarters, and done everything that a novice politician is advised to do. So, when he learned about the opportunity for Republican pages, he simply presented himself to the Congressman from his district, the late Edward T. (Ted) Miller. Ted Miller remembered the boy, and although he said he did not have much influence on patronage appointments at that time, he would see what he could do. Bob's request might have seemed presumptuous to some who are familiar with the manner in which most page appointments are made, but to those who know Bob, it seemed the most natural way for him to approach the subject.

Mr. Miller did succeed in getting the page appointment, and Bob never forgot that favor. He worked for Mr. Miller in every election in which he ran including his Senate campaign in 1962. In his last campaign, Bob managed Mr. Miller's winning campaign for delegate to the State constitutional convention last year in Maryland. When Mr. Miller died in January of this year, Bob was one of the pallbearers. Those who remember Ted Miller's service in Congress will realize what a fine, honest, and dedicated political mentor he was to Bob Bauman.

In his time in the House of Representatives, Bob has seen hundreds of Congressmen come and go. At present, he has had longer service in the Congress than 366 of those in office.

May I say in closing that I am proud of Bob and his achievements. I will miss seeing him daily on the House floor. But the Republican Party and the State of Maryland will surely benefit from the years he will now dedicate to further service. At this point, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD a biography of Bob Bauman which appears in the 1967–68 edition of "Who's Who in American Politics":

[From "Who's Who in American Politics" 1967–68 edition]

ROBERT EDMUND BAUMAN

Born, April 4, 1937, son of John Carl and Florence House Bauman.

Married, November 19, 1960 to Carol Gene Dawson of Indianapolis, Indiana.

Children: Edward Carroll (Teddy) (b. 1962), Eugenie Marie (b. 1965) and Victoria Ann (b. 1967).

Education: Capitol Page School, Library of Congress, 1955; Georgetown University School of Foreign Service, B.S. in International Affairs, 1959; Georgetown University Law Center, Juris Doctor, 1964.

Political Positions: Secretary and Member of the Board of Directors, American Conservative Union, 1964 to present; Member, Board of Directors and past National Chairman, Young Americans for Freedom, Inc., 1960–1966; Member, National Advisory Board, Young Americans for Freedom, 1966 to present; Program Committee Chairman and Member of the National Executive Committee of the Young Republican National Federation, 1965–1967.

Delegate from the First Congressional District of Maryland to the Republican National Convention in 1964; Delegate to three State Republican Conventions in Maryland representing Talbot County; Asst. Doorkeeper and Assist. Sgt. at Arms, Maryland Delegation, 1956 and 1960 Republican National Conventions. Delegate, Young Republican National Convention, 1959.

National Chairman, Youth for Nixon, 1960; President, Georgetown University Young Republican Club, 1959–1960.

Government Positions: Manager, House Republican Cloakroom, 1965–1968, by appointment of Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Minority Leader; Asst. Manager, House Republican Cloakroom, 1959–1965, by appointment of Hon. Charles A. Halleck, Minority Leader; Minority Staff, House Judiciary Committee, 1955–1959; Page, United States Senate, Special Session, 1954, by appointment by Senator John Marshall Butler of Maryland; Page, U.S. House of Representatives, January 22, 1953–1955, by appointment of late Hon. Edward T. Miller, Representative from the First District of Maryland.

Publications: Articles and reviews; *National Review*, The *New Guard*, *Republican Battle Line*, *Easton Star-Democrat* and other Maryland newspapers.

Legal Residence: 10 Sycamore Avenue, Easton, Md. 21601.

Mailing Address: 328 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003; Phone: 546-6555.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader at this point.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from Ohio for yielding. I want to join him in congratulating Bob Bauman for his long, faithful, constructive, helpful service to those of us on our side of the aisle. It has been a privilege to know him personally, and I believe it is a great tribute to his ability and conscientiousness that he has held this job, or other jobs, and at the same time has continued his education.

I certainly wish him well in his new career, which I am certain will be successful. We will miss him badly on our side of the aisle, every one of us.

I am confident that he will do extremely well as an attorney in the State of Maryland. We welcome him back when he does have the time to come and see us in the future. Bob Bauman has been a good friend, a most helpful employee on the Republican side, and will be missed badly. We hope and trust that he will have the best of good fortune in the future.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished minority leader for those kind words. I am certain, with the work of Bob and others this fall, we might just have a few more openings for pages on our side.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from Ohio and our distinguished minority leader in commending Robert Bauman, our Bob. One of the finest customs of the House is occasionally, like this one this evening, when Members take the floor and say what is in their hearts concerning those who have labored for and with us for so long. I commend the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN ASHBROOK, for being so thoughtful as to do this and give us a résumé and a letter concerning Bob Bauman, because he truly represents a Horatio Alger story in American history. He has done for himself what others in this day and age fail to try, by lifting on their own bootstraps. His work as a night student has resulted in his being sworn into the Maryland bar in his chosen profession as an attorney at law today. We are very proud of him.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to take 1 minute also to commend his lovely wife Carol Jean and the three children who must have been good backing for this young man who has studied at night so that he could help the leadership of tomorrow see daylight around the corner. This corner, which many of us have been trying to turn for so long, will be further assisted by young men like Bob Bauman and by the fine family that stood with and behind him all this time. I am very impressed by the gentleman's statement that Bob has served here longer than 366 Members have served in the Congress; in numbers of Members, 434 of us, more than there are days in the year. With the history that the gentleman is inserting in the RECORD I am sure many people will be impressed. We have a number of employees around here who have started as pages and who have served as counsels to committees and become attorneys at law in their own rights and are making their mark in the history of our Republic. He is known to all of us as an outstanding young Republican and now as a Republican in his own right and an attorney at law and, as the gentleman has said so well, the founder and instigator and expander, if I may use that term, which is a good medical term, wherein we expand plasma, if need be, at times of deficit through the YAF.

I congratulate Bob and congratulate the gentleman for taking this time. He must be just as proud today of being sworn into the bar as other people are when they hang up a shingle or maybe when they are first elected. Congratulations. I hope he has fair winds and following seas in his practice.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

I would certainly add, as a member of the bar myself, that the law profession can certainly use some honest and direct people like Bob Bauman. Quite

often we are inclined to think that lawyers are not as proper and honest as they should be. I know we are getting a good, honest member of the bar in Bob Bauman.

I am reminded of the story of the woman who was walking through the cemetery looking at the tombstones and one of them said, "Here lies a lawyer, an honest man." She said to her husband, "When did they start burying two people in the same grave?"

Well, I am afraid that many people just think that way about members of the bar. I know Bob will work hard to elevate the reputation of the bar just as he had to alleviate the problems of the Republican Party and to make it as viable an instrument in our political processes with a conservative philosophy within the Republican Party as he possibly could.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield for insertion in the RECORD to his own Congressman, ROGERS C. B. MORTON, and to CHARLEY HALLECK, who appointed Bob some 15 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that various statements may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dedicated employees of the House of Representatives has decided to leave Capitol Hill. Bob Bauman, whom I am pleased to claim as a resident of my district, plans to enter law practice in Easton, Md.

Bob came to the Hill as a page in the House of Representatives in January of 1953, while Dwight Eisenhower was in the White House and Edward T. Miller represented Maryland's First Congressional District. He is a familiar figure in the Capitol, where he has been of great service to the minority Members of this body for so many years.

I know I speak for all of us in saying, "We hate to see you leave." But, at the same time, we can be proud of the accomplishments he has made here, and in no way do we want to hold him back. Our best wishes go with Bob, and our heartfelt thanks for a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, it would be remiss of me not to add a very personal note concerning Bob Bauman. He has been a very loyal supporter of mine; he has spent a great deal of his vacation time working in my behalf throughout the First District of Maryland. In addition to the services he has rendered to me as a Member of Congress, I must express my gratitude and the gratitude of Republicans throughout our State for the services he has performed in behalf of my candidacy and for the Republican Party in Maryland.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as one who had a little something to do with Bob Bauman's progress from page boy to manager of the House Republican telephones, I want to express my satisfaction with the fine job he has done for all of us through the years. He has certainly justified the confidence we placed in him with succeeding promotions to positions of greater responsibility.

As far as I am concerned, he has been a minority staff member who has brought credit to that operation. He has been most accommodating to our membership and very efficient in the discharge of his duties. And certainly Bob deserves a lot of credit for the diligence with which he pursued his education. He got it the hard way, but he got it, and more power to him for that.

You know, if I could not find anything else good to say about Bob, I would have to admire his judgment in one respect: he married an Indiana girl.

While we shall all miss him around here, in my opinion he is moving in the right direction, and I wish him every success in his new career as a member of the bar.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to Bob Bauman, a capable and congenial young man who has demonstrated exceptional ability to serve and cooperate with House and Senate Members and employees since he first worked on Capitol Hill as a Capitol page more than 15 years ago.

Since serving as both a House and Senate page, Bob has served as a minority staff member on the House Judiciary Committee, assistant manager of the House Republican cloakroom and most recently and competently as manager of the Republican cloakroom. During those same 15 years, Bob has been associated with such organizations as the American Conservative Union, the Young Americans for Freedom, the Young Republican National Federation, and the Georgetown University Young Republican Club, serving each in various leadership capacities. In 1960 he was national chairman of Youth for Nixon. He has also represented the State of Maryland as a delegate to the Young Republican National Convention, three State Republican conventions and in 1964 as a delegate to the Republican National Convention.

His enthusiasm and ability as a leader have been recognized consistently by his coworkers. I am certain that he will be as successful and as well respected as a practicing lawyer in Maryland as he has been in all his other endeavors.

Bob will be missed by his many friends on Capitol Hill. However, I have no doubt that his interest, concern and participation in government operations and political affairs will continue and perhaps one day bring him back to the Hill and the many friends he has here.

I and my colleagues thank Bob for his years of service in government and I extend my sincere best wishes for success in his career as an attorney.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to the many, many others today in praise of an outstanding young man. Seven years ago, before I was active in politics or was even a member of the Republican Party, a young man raised in integrity and American heritage, dedicated to hard work and intellectual exercise found himself a political philosophy and a code of life which reflected honor and praised enterprise. This attitude reflected on everyone and everything with which Bob Bauman came in contact, including me. Bob Bauman helped develop a sense of purpose and direction for me and for many other young people in our blessed country through his participation in the Young Republicans and the Young Americans for Freedom. His service to this House and our country has been notable and important and his career of success is just starting. To the Baumans, one and all, but especially to Bob, may I say "Congratulations, and God bless you, yours, and your future."

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in acknowledging the fine service performed by Robert E. Bauman for members of the minority. His courtesy, helpfulness, and consistent good humor under stress have been much appreciated.

His very conservative views on legislation have been forthright and presented with intelligence with no attempt to impose.

I wish Bob Bauman well in his future career in law and in Government.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I know I express the sentiment of all Republican Members of the House of Representatives when I say we are sorry that Bob Bauman is leaving his position as manager of the House Republican cloakroom.

We are, however, grateful that he has seen fit to train Ronnie Lasch to succeed him.

Bob Bauman came from a humble background but his parents were great Americans. They were not ashamed to work.

Bob's record is well known to all. A page school graduate, and now a full-fledged barrister.

Although Bob Bauman is a Republican through and through he has always placed his country ahead of his party, even as a member of the National Advisory Board of the Young Americans for Freedom.

I wish Bob and his lovely wife, Carol, and little Teddy, Eugenie and Victoria, the best of everything in the years ahead.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in this salute today to Bob Bauman, Manager of the Republican telephone, who is leaving our scene to engage in the practice of law in the State of Maryland.

Bob Bauman's recognition of the significance of congressional business—and the fact that much of it must be handled by telephone during periods of active House debate—has contributed immensely to our own reputation as lawmakers and as Representatives of the people of America.

Bob Bauman's fine example has served to influence many younger men who have come to the House of Representatives as pages and in other capacities of service.

It is not my intention to review Bob Bauman's career or experience. I do wish, however, to voice this expression of respect and affection and to extend to Bob Bauman this wish for success as a lawyer and as a distinguished and active citizen of the Nation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that Bob Bauman is leaving as manager of the House Republican cloakroom. I am exceedingly happy that he will no longer be among us, handling his various duties with good humor and dis-

patch. I am filled with joy at the prospect that come next Monday Bob will not be waiting in the cloakroom with the latest news about the American Conservative Union, Young Americans for Freedom, the intricacies of Maryland politics or perhaps the inside story on what Ronald Reagan really told Nelson Rockefeller in New Orleans.

I am a happy man, Mr. Speaker, because Bob's departure means that a brilliant, perceptive, dedicated young American has begun his career as a lawyer and that he has begun walking down a road, which may be long and hard and filled with twists and turns—but one which I am confident will lead him back to the House of Representatives as one of its Members. On that day, Mr. Speaker, I will be an even happier man than I am today.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the truly deserved tribute being paid today to Robert E. Bauman, the diligent manager of the House Republican cloakroom.

While I am a newcomer to the House, Bob Bauman and I enjoy a long-time friendship dating back to undergraduate days, when Bob and his talented, attractive wife—then Miss Carol Gene Dawson—were leaders of the college youth for Nixon. Bob was managing an important role in youth politics, while simultaneously carrying a full course of study and energetically serving Members of the House. In early 1959, at age 21, Bob was already in his sixth year with the House of Representatives. Those of us who were his fellow undergraduates felt, appropriately, I think, that it was a unique privilege to know a peer who was already an institution within an institution.

It is a double loss that we feel now that Bob Bauman is leaving his 15-year service in the House. It is very secure that I am in the conviction, nevertheless, that it will be only a matter of months before Congress hears from him again.

To an unusually able couple, the Bob Baumans, go my warmest and best wishes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, we sure will miss Bob Bauman. I have great respect for Bob; for his knowledge of the operations of the House of Representatives; for the impartiality and fair play he has consistently demonstrated in dealing with all the Members.

I wish Bob Bauman well in his practice, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio for taking this special order to honor this deserving individual who has been so helpful to all of us.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Robert E. Bauman as he concludes his tour of duty as manager of the Republican telephones, to begin the practice of law in his native Maryland. We regret his departure, but we are very proud of his accomplishments and appreciate greatly his splendid efforts.

Although he is a young man, he has already compiled an enviable record of service to his country and his party. In addition to his duties here in the House, he has been active in State and National Republican affairs, while, at the same time, continuing his education. Ambition and hard work have paid great dividends and I know he will bring to the practice of law the same high qualities he has displayed in his position here.

During my years in the House, I have relied greatly upon Bob and have found him always helpful and courteous. His future clients will profit from the same dedicated effort.

Bob Bauman represents the type of young, dynamic leadership we covet for our party and I am sure we will find him in places of increased responsibility. He has our deep appreciation and we wish for him, and his good wife Carol, every happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, Robert Bauman's "retirement" as manager of the House Republican telephones is indeed a loss to those of us who have worked with him and who have come to rely on his effective and dedicated service.

Bob Bauman is in many ways representative of the many thousands of young men and women who today are contributing enormously to the political and governmental life of our Nation. Beginning with his appointment by the late Edward T. Miller, Representative in Congress from the First District of Maryland, as a page in the U.S. House of Representatives, Bob Bauman has achieved a most impressive record of service in a short period of time. In addition, he has found the time to continue his education in both international affairs and law. Today he will be sworn in as an attorney before the Maryland Court of Appeals.

As Bob Bauman launches his new career, I wish him well and express the hope that his many talents will not be lost to his party and to his country. Our Nation needs young men of ability, ideals, and dedication to make our democracy a continuing success; men like Bob Bauman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to hear that Bob Bauman is leaving us after 15 years of service to the Congress.

Bob has been a fine and efficient manager of House Republican telephones, following a number of years of faithful and friendly service in managing the Republican cloakroom. We will miss him on the Republican side.

I want to join in wishing Bob the best of everything in his new career.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with my distinguished colleagues in marking the end of Robert E. Bauman's 15 years on the Hill. Mr. Bauman is ending one distinguished career for another in the law in which I am sure he will contain and maintain his success. Mr. Bauman came to the Hill as a page at the age of 16, and leaves it at the age of 31 as manager of the House Republican telephones. Yet, in spite of the hard work of his official duties, he has found time and energy for an active extracurricular life in politics. An assistant doorkeeper and an assistant sergeant at arms of the Maryland delegation to the Republican National Convention in 1956 and 1960, he graduated to full membership of the delegation at the famous convention of 1964. His career has culminated in selection to the national executive committee of the Young Republican National Federation, and to directing positions in several other political organizations.

I am sure we will miss him in the House Republican cloakroom, but our loss will be the gain of others. I join my distinguished brethren in wishing Mr. Bauman a career to equal the one he has left.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure to join with my colleagues today in honoring the work of Robert E. Bauman, manager of the House Republican telephones. Bob has discharged his responsibilities in a diligent manner. I want to congratulate him upon admission to the Maryland bar. We shall miss him in the House—where his services have been so helpful—but wish him every success in his new endeavors.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my good friend and colleague, JOHN ASHBROOK, of Ohio, in paying tribute to a very fine and dedicated young man who is leaving his responsibilities here in the House in order to enter the private practice of law. Bob Bauman is an outstanding citizen. He has been a loyal employee whose efforts have been concentrated on doing the best job he is capable of doing for not only House Members, but for these United States. He has measured up to all that has been expected of him, and it has been a sincere pleasure to have worked with him.

As manager of the Republican cloakroom, Bob's absence will be regretted. I know that his successor will carry on in Bob's tradition, but I shall miss his presence. I know that I speak for all of us when I wish him godspeed in his new endeavors.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret to learn that Bob Bauman is leaving his work in the House of Representatives.

Bob has been most courteous, efficient, and faithful in his work on the Republican side of the aisle, and he will be missed by all of us.

It is my understanding that he will soon start the practice of law, having been admitted to the bar only recently. I wish him every success and attend this with every good wish to Mrs. Bauman and their children.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I join with my fellow Republican colleagues in a special tribute to Mr. Robert E. Bauman on the occasion of his retirement from more than 15 years of dedicated service on Capitol Hill. During his tenure as manager of the Republican Cloakroom, he has earned admiration, friendship, and appreciation of the Members he has served with outstanding efficiency and dedication. Bob kept the wheels running smoothly in a most intricate and exacting position. His special skills, know-how, and his astute judgment helped our Members to legislate with ease and coordination of efforts. Losing Bob is like losing a good right arm. He was a great public servant, and we will be ever grateful for the excellence of his services to us.

Let me take this opportunity to wish Bob Bauman every measure of success in

the future, and to extend an invitation to revisit his old haunts on Capitol Hill—he will be always welcome.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, every one of us regrets to see Bob Bauman leave his post as manager of the telephones in the cloakroom on our side of the aisle. All of us, however, rejoice that the opportunity has come for him to apply his many talents in a more challenging and more rewarding field of endeavor.

There is great significance in Bob's leaving here to enter into the practice of law in Maryland. He is a self-made man. This opportunity to enter upon a professional career for himself is of his own making. Bob is an example of what a young man can do if he has the determination and willingness to make the sacrifices to realize an ambition. We are proud of him.

Bob began his career on Capitol Hill as a page. He graduated from Page School and then went to Georgetown University School of Foreign Service and received a bachelor of science degree in international affairs and subsequently graduated from Georgetown University Law Center in 1964.

While doing all this he served in various capacities with the Congress. From 1955 to 1959 he was on the minority staff of the Judiciary Committee and served there until appointed by Minority Leader CHARLIE HALLECK to be assistant manager of the House Republican cloakroom. Our present minority leader, JERRY FORD, promoted him to manager of the cloakroom in 1965.

Bob Bauman is an example of a young man determined to get his education and a law degree. It required a tremendous amount of sacrifice. It is not easy to devote one's days working and one's nights attending school. This in itself bespeaks of the caliber of man and it also portends a great future for him in the legal profession.

As it would say in the vernacular, "he has what it takes." He has not only a winning personality and ability. He has a capacity for sacrifice and hard work. I predict for him a great future and wish for him the very best.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a special pleasure to join with many of our colleagues in expressing appreciation for the long and valuable service rendered to minority Members—and I am sure those majority Members who wandered to our side of the aisle received the same courtesies—by our young and able manager of the House Republican Cloakroom, Robert E. Bauman.

Since Bob Bauman is resigning, effective the end of this month, to enter the private practice of law, it is especially fitting that we pay him this tribute. For he has been of immense help to all of us—available when needed, informed, loyal, alert, and on his toes at every moment. In the midst of the confusion that often reigns on the House floor, his has been a cool head and a ready hand. We could not ask for better service.

But I have an additional reason, Mr. Speaker, for expressing gratitude to Bob Bauman. In an arena where partisan politics and political philosophies come in all shades of the rainbow, he has never allowed his personal preferences to interfere with the effective carrying out of his responsibilities. Bob Bauman is a convinced and forthright conservative in a party which has its liberals and moderates as well as conservatives. To my knowledge, however, he has always submerged his own feelings in the greater interest of serving all our colleagues—with equal attention, courtesy, and respect.

I consider this fact, in the kind of job Bob Bauman has been called on to fill, an attribute of the highest significance. Combined with his obvious abilities and the warmth of his personality, it foreshadows a long and successful career in the law and in whatever area of public service he may enter. Together with our colleagues, I wish him the great success he deserves.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND THE HUNGARIAN MINORITY IN SLOVAKIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, since January, all of us have followed with great interest the changes taking place and the new measures promised by the new government in Czechoslovakia. Following the fall of the Stalinist-type Novotny regime, it seemed that liberalizing efforts would be made both with regard to personal and group freedom and with regard to the problem of relationships between Czechs and Slovaks living in the state.

The limited restoration of certain democratic rights, such as press and religious freedom, are favorable signs. However, a Czechoslovak delegation returning from Moscow recently has reported Russian doubts about this liberalism, and we still do not know for certain whether Moscow will continue to allow even this limited restoration of personal freedom.

Beyond the personal freedom issues, the problems of nationalities living in Czechoslovakia are now in the center of discussion and debate. Throughout its 50-year history Czechoslovakia was plagued by nationality problems. The German nationality problem led to Nazi occupation following the Munich Pact. The Allied victory in World War II resulted in the expulsion of the German minority. At this juncture the Slovaks were, on paper at least, admitted to a position of equality, but the assymetric solution failed to achieve equality.

Therefore, it is of great significance that at the present moment both the Czechs and the Slovaks are now willing to settle the problem by creating a Federal state based on national equality. It is my hope that this willingness will find its expression in constitutional settlement, and that liberalization will proceed in spite of anticipated Soviet and East German reaction.

Simultaneously, the fate of the Hungarian minority in Slovakia has emerged. The approximately 1 million people of Hungarian origin in southern Slovakia have been the stepchildren of first the Republic and then the Communist Czechoslovak state.

After the Munich Pact, the first Vienna award attached the southern Slovak region, with its overwhelming Hungarian population, to Hungary, a nation regarded by the exile Czechoslovak government as its arch enemy. A Hungarian population, to Hungary, a writing in the Bratislava paper Uj Szo—New Word—Joseph Gyonyor, recounts the events as follows:

> The decree No. 12 issued June 21, 1945, belongs to the most important ones. Under this decree, persons of Hungarian nationality were deprived without any compensation and effective immediately of their land holdings and real estate, regardless of their financial status.
>
> A series of atrocities was carried out against these unfortunate people . . . where it was not possible to remove them immediately from the country, hundreds of Hungarians were dragged to the (Hungarian) frontier and left without food or drink.
>
> The Government declared in June, 1946, the so-called re-Slovakization. The purpose was clear. The Hungarian minority could not remain in this country. In promoting this purpose, the "Magyarized" part of the population was permitted to return to their original nationality. The fact was, however, that these people . . . could have safely declared themselves Slovak during the time of the First Republic. It is no secret that this measure was coupled with the matter of citizenship. I ask you, who would have been willing to leave the place of his birth under insecure conditions? It was thus that 410,820 Hungarians were forced to deny their nationality in writing.

So much about the immediate postwar period. The thaw in Czechoslovakia now permits a partial description of the situation at the height of the Communist terror, 1949–54. Coming on the decision of the Presidum of the Czechoslovak Communist Party that persons tried unjustly in the years 1949–54 should be rehabilitated, Gyonyor continues:

> It is likewise natural that not only those persons must be rehabilitated who were sentenced in a political trial. Who knows the number of workers who were victims of illegal administrative measures? Neither is the number of these people known who spent months and years in forced-labor camps . . . Neither can we collect the names of all those who were dismissed without reason and who remained together with their families without a job.

As to the equality of treatment of Hungarian nationality citizens, another writer, Charles Patho, writes in the same paper:

> Equality of status is still a paper equality. For 20 years not a single politician of Hungarian nationality has been considered worthy to become a member of parliament. We find them only rarely in the lower echelons of civil service, and only now and then can we find Hungarian experts in leading positions in any enterprise or plant in the country. The diplomatic service does not even know we exist.

The critical articles appear with regularity in the sole Hungarian-language

daily, Uj Szo, as the air of press freedom infiltrates over the barriers of censorship in Czechoslovakia.

However, the Hungarian minority is now hopeful of obtaining some of its rights. The concept involved is that there must be complete equality between the nations and nationalities in Czechoslovakia if peace and stability are to prevail and nationality persecution cease. This equality must be constitutionally defined, and supported both by adequate school and cultural institutions run by members of the minority, and by sufficient budgetary resources from the state, regional, and local authorities. The economic discrimination against the Hungarian-inhabited area has been patently documented by many of the writers in Uj Szo. A new concept is represented by them: self-administration. This is less than the self-determination which ended the existence of the First Czechoslovak Republic, but more than the autonomy which means very limited self-government. They call for the creation of smaller counties, which are more or less ethnically homogenous, and where local government would guarantee equal rights of both the Czech and Slovak minorities. It also calls for equalizing the economic burdens and for state aid to equalize educational and economic opportunities.

Party Secretary Dubcek's recent visit to Budapest showed, through remarks he made there, that no decision has yet been made about accepting the minority demands, but we know that strong opposition to the Hungarian minority demands has come from the Slovaks and Czech Stalinists. David Binder, writing in the New York Times on June 23, 1968, describes the situation as follows:

> In May and early June, Hungarians returning from visits to Bratislava . . . and other Slovak communities, reported that the minority had come under intensive pressure from Slovak Chauvinists.
>
> A recent visitor to Slovakia said that "in some villages the Hungarians feel it is better not to go out at night" and then went on to speak of beating and scuffles. . . .
>
> A Slovak cultural official, Ondrej Kulik, told the Hungarian minority newspaper in Bratislava, Uj Szo, "If the Hungarians want to destroy our state then nothing remains for us but to drive them out with weapons.

Despite these sorry occurrences hope is still high that the federalization of Czechoslovakia will increase the rights of the Hungarian minority, and that Czechs, Slovaks, and Hungarians will find a peaceful coexistence.

It is important, in conclusion, that we all recognize the twofold struggle going on in Czechoslovakia today. The first is the struggle for personal and ethnic freedom. The second is the struggle for independence from Russia so that the peoples of the state may solve their own problems in a democratic, evolutionary process.

I include the following pertinent material:

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CULTURAL FEDERATION OF HUNGARIAN WORKERS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA—CSEMADOK—PRINTED IN UJ SZO, BRATISLAVA, MARCH 15, 1968

Nations and nationalities are living together in our country. A solution of the nationality question cannot be restricted to a settlement of the relationship of the (two) nations but must include the question of the nationalities on the basis of full equality of rights.

Unfortunately, deficiencies existing in this regard could not be solved even by positive resolutions of the Central Committee of the Slovak Communist Party in the last few years. Implementation of these resolutions was made near impossible as they were not within the jurisdiction of the Slovak National Council, and the central authorities of the state simply failed to act on them. Thus the odd situation arose that on the one hand, the Slovak National Council was charged with their implementation but on the other it was not granted sufficient jurisdiction to do so. Therefore, it is the opinion of the Central Committee of the CSEMADOK that the only truly equitable solution would be a reform along federal lines including a settlement of the constitutional position of the Hungarian and other nationalities on the basis of the principle of self-administration.

By presenting proposals for solving these problems, the Central Committee of CSEMADOK wants not only to demonstrate its enthusiasm and full consensus toward the resolutions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (CSR) and Slovakia and the changes occurring therefrom since January but also its fullest support of these resolutions.

In regard to the question of nationalities we have accomplished much but have also committed grave errors. The errors have originated basically as follows:

The nationalities are not recognized in the Constitution and other basic statutes in addition to the two nations as equal societal factors;

The legal position of the nationalities is not regulated by statute;

The nationalities have no constitutionally elected nationality organs or constitutionally guaranteed nationality institutions;

As a result the nationalities do not enjoy complete equality of rights.

The full and complete equality of nations and nationalities must be constitutionally guaranteed.

Statutes of constitutional character must define the legal position of the nationalities.

It must be stated clearly that the nationalities form an organic, undetachable part of the CSR. Not only as individuals but also as social groups the nationalities are citizens of equal status in our land. The CSR consists of nations and nationalities and nations and nationalities must possess equal rights.

The constitutional position of the nationalities must be clearly and concretely determined by a constitutional statute.

1. Nationality organs and institutions must be created participating in the work of the political, administrative, economic and state security authorities as part of the national organs and expressing their will on the basis of self-administration principles in order to solve problems of the nationalities.

In order to do so at the earliest possible date:

(a) We propose the creation of the following organs and institutions as integral parts in the structure of legislative and executive organs:

A Nationality Committee in the Slovak Council to be composed of the deputies of the nationalities and experts as members; and in the Representative Assembly an office of representatives (poverenictvo) of the Slovak National Council.

Likewise nationality committees should be created in the national committee of every district to be composed of nationality deputies and experts in order to form a nationalities office in the committees.

In order to satisfy special economic and financial needs of the nationalities the National Assembly and the Slovak National Council shall act within the framework of the debate and approval of the State, territorial and regional budgets. Similar jurisdiction should be granted to the Nationalities Secretariat of the Government of the CSR and the Representatives' Secretariat of the Slovak National Council and the various ministries and offices in order to equalize national living standards.

(b) We propose the territorial organization of areas inhabited by different nationalities—

The new counties created in the 1960 Territorial Reorganization hinder the good neighborly relations and friendly coexistence of the various nationalities. They retard the practical realization of nationality policies defined by Party and Government resolutions. Practice has shown that districts inhabited overwhelmingly by one nationality progress both economically and politically faster and more efficiently.

The need both for a further improvement of the economy and the solution of the nationality question securing full equality of rights necessitates the creation of territorial units integrated from the standpoint of nationality. This can be accomplished by a territorial reorganization of the districts, a measure also favored by geographic considerations.

Simultaneously full equality of rights for the members of the nations and nationalities forming the minority in any given district must also be constitutionally guaranteed.

(c) We propose that members of the nationalities (experts) should be called in as members in addition to the deputies of the committee of the Slovak National Council:

In order to facilitate a more active participation of the nationalities in public affairs;

That everywhere members of the nationalities be granted proportional representation in selecting the deputies to be elected to the governing bodies and that the representation of the nationalities consist of experts and activists who can adequately represent their interests at each level of government;

Great care shall be exercised in the Slovak Trade Union Council and the Slovak Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Youth Federation by the creation of a Hungarian nationality section and also by establishing Hungarian advisory sections in the Slovak committees of the mass organizations.

In order to facilitate these measures and in order to contribute to the preparations of the 14th Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and to the planned changes of the Constitution, we propose the following:

To anchor constitutionally those principles which guarantee the national existence, position and free cultural development and reenforced self-reliance of the nationalities.

To elaborate these principles with political and professional expertise defining the legal position of the nationalities and helping to create institutions in order to realize the rights and guaranteeing a most efficient solution of societal and national equality on the basis of self-administration.

To review all laws and decrees which were passed in regard to citizens of Hungarian nationality and the deletion of discriminatory legislation.

2. Substantial differences exist in the school and educational level between the nations and nationalities. In order to fulfill with efficiency the tasks resulting out of the scientific-technological revolution, an expansion of the democratization process demands the approximate, but clear, levelling of the differences in the political, economic and cultural living standards between nations and nationalities. The present school structure secures "the availability of equal learning opportunities of each child" in their mother tongue only on a grade school level. Youth participation in mother-tongue instruction on secondary school level fails to respond to the requirements of our age and

hinders the necessary process of economic and political equality. Lack of the necessary network of secondary schools further increases existing unhealthy differences in educational level between secondary school and college graduates.

One of the basic requirements of progress in the Hungarian-inhabited areas of our country lies in the further development of nationality schools. Only educational-informational instruction in the mother tongue can promote the harmonious, open-minded development of the individual toward a deeper understanding of Socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism. Prevailing practices in nationality school administration ignoring national considerations have only created an atmosphere of mistrust and educational obsolescence. Therefore, it must be made possible that Hungarian schools should be led and guided by Hungarian educational institutions. This alone offers a guarantee that they will keep peace efficiently with the achievement needed to fulfill educational-informational purposes common to the entire country.

In order to solve existing problems of the Hungarian school question and promote its further development, we propose:

Creation of conditions facilitating equal opportunities for the nationality in regard to employment and higher education and adequate admission ratios at college levels by a proportionate admission of Hungarians to the universities and professional schools;

Creation of legal requirements enabling an independent solution of the problems unique to the administration and leadership of nationality schools and the establishment of the needed scientific and research institutions.

An increase in the number of Hungarian university and college students especially in the sciences and regulation of their possible study in Hungary at university level.

3. The most unique expression of the existence of nationalities is their culture. Its independent development lies in the most basic interest of each nationality. Nationality cultures occupy an important niche in the Czechoslovak cultural context, but they also relate organically and inseparably to the culture and tradition of their own nation—in our case to the general Hungarian culture and tradition. Great care must be exercised in guaranteeing further cultural development, for men are most sensitive in this regard. Cultural development of the societal life of nationalities requires, however, the presence of scientific institutions and laboratories.

Therefore, we propose:

To apply successfully the same principles toward nationality culture which are used toward a democratization of Czech and Slovak cultural life. Nationality culture must be regarded as a culture *sui generis* and not as a translation of Czech and Slovak culture into Hungarian language. While nationality culture forms a part of Czechoslovak culture, it is also a part of the general national (Hungarian) culture to which it is tied by unseparable bonds. Its development must be secured both financially and personnelwise;

Establishment of scientific cultural institutions and laboratories which form the requirement for the maintenance of their national existence;

Intense participation by pertinent national institutions and national committees in regard to the care and financial security of the culture of the nationalities. They alone can solve these problems in cooperation with the cultural associations of the nationalities.

II

We are convinced that without the measures outlined in Chapter I the solution of the nationalities' problem will stagnate in a state of half-solution and will continue to be dependent on individual goodwill and subjective decisions, a state intolerable in a democracy.

We are also convinced that the implementation of these measures and the realization of these principles will result in a most efficient strengthening of the national consensus and would substantially reenforce patriotism. These measures will immediately and considerably promote the building of socialism, strengthen confidence in the Czechoslovak Communist Party, enhance the rapprochement of nations and nationalities and forge a more perfect unity among the peoples of our country.

The Central Committee of the CSEMADOK suggests to the political representatives of the CSR that they should clearly explain the constitutional position of the Hungarian nationality in Czechoslovakia in the action program of the Central Committee of the Czech and Slovak Communist Parties and that the Czechoslovak CP should appoint a working group composed of Hungarian and Ukrainian nationality members of the Party and delegate to them the task of working out the part of the action program dealing with the nationalities.

III

The National Front and the social organizations united in the National Front are important organs of our national life. The democratization process that has begun with the January meeting of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party provides ample space for an active work by social organizations enabling them to harmonize their work with real life and the views and interests of their membership thereby fulfilling the purposes, needs and claims of society and social life. Thus they can become the mobilizers of the broadest strata of society.

We know that overcoming the mistakes of the past will require hard work, cool analysis, patience and unity. We will work honestly for the good of socialism united in close cooperation with the nations of Czechoslovakia.

[From Uj Szo (Bratislava), March 20, 1968, Radio Free Europe translation]

SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY AND THE NATIONALITY QUESTION

(By Karoly Patho)

The conservative forces which slow down the development of our socialist society are being pushed into the background. The period of unlimited personal power is over. Our society is proceeding toward a real democracy which will guarantee maximum opportunity for all citizens of our country to fight, to take a stand—in line with the interests of the working people—against the harmful factors and symptoms which stand in the way of our political, economic, and cultural development.

* * * * *

The democratization of our social life is linked with a complete and just solution of the nationality question. This was indicated in the resolution of the plenary meeting of the Central Committee of our Party and the Slovak National Council, which considers a confederation, based on the brotherhood of the two nations and the nationalities, as the solution of the nationality question. Certainly the legal and political conditions for complete equality of status, for the economic and cultural development of workers of Hungarian and Ukrainian nationality, will also be established within this confederation.

The Central Committee of Csemadok has published proposals for a reasonable solution of the Hungarian question, and has presented this as a suggestion to the CC of our Party. Thus, we can confidently state that never before have we been so close to a just solution of the nationality question. But we must state, for the sake of the truth, that good and reasonable proposals can become a practical reality only if they are accepted by the broad masses of the workers, who must not only demand the implementation of the ideas expressed in the proposals, but also take part in the effort to strengthen socialist democracy and work out a just solution of the nationality question.

Not even in cities and villages with Hungarian populations, can development of democracy and the solution of the nationality question be merely an internal affair of Party organizations and national committees. It is their moral duty to lead the struggle to strengthen democracy, to develop the activities of the broad masses of workers, to ask the opinion of the population concerning the solution of the above-mentioned social questions, and to present them to the highest organs of Party and state power.

I would like to point out that if in the past we felt it necessary to ask the opinion of the workers concerning the solution of social questions, then today, when we are trying to create a new atmosphere in which to establish the fraternal coexistence—based on complete equality of status—of the nations and nationalities of our country, this necessity becomes increasingly pressing.

Those leading personalities who are unable to shed their conservative ideas and harmful methods of operation—in other words, who are unable to cooperate in the revival of democracy and the just solution of the nationality question—would do well to stand aside, and to yield their positions to qualified persons who—not for personal advantages but because they may have a sense of responsibility for our socialist society, for our people and nation—will lead the public movement for real socialists democracy and a just solution of the nationality question.

In the course of development of socialist democracy we shall certainly reach the point where the regulation of the affairs of Hungarian workers in Czechoslovakia will no longer depend only on the views of one or two "established" persons, but when the competent agencies will take into consideration the opinions of the broad masses of Hungarian workers (participatory democracy).

To achieve practical implementation of complete equality of status for Hungarian workers in Czechoslovakia—in other words, to enable them to solve their specific nationality problems themselves—it will be necessary in addition to other important factors that workers of Hungarian nationality establish Hungarian districts. Therefore, I consider the establishment of Hungarian national districts a key issue in the solution of the nationality question. But, if we want such radical changes, then the question arises, have the May 19 national committee elections lost their timeliness?

In my opinion, the right thing for the competent agencies to do is to establish the confederation as soon as possible and, within it, district and central state organs of workers of Hungarian origin in Czechoslovakia; then these organs—through competent management and in close cooperation with the elected organs of the population of Hungarian nationality—could establish Hungarian districts and then, together with the new district organs and institutions, schedule the national committee elections at a later date.

The establishment of districts with Hungarian majorities will require that the continuous chain of Hungarian villages—even though it is interrupted by one or two Slovak villages—be organized into districts that are Hungarian in character. The best solution, in my opinion, would be the reestablishment of small districts, like those that existed prior to the regional arrangement. This would mean that there would be about 15 districts with a Hungarian majority.

But it is quite possible that the competent agencies will stick to the idea of larger districts, because they consider an increase in the number of offices inexpedient. Certainly, in this case, the Hungarian districts will be larger as well.

And while considering the possibility of establishment of larger districts, we should also consider which south Slovakian towns should be the capitals of the Hungarian districts.

Practical experience reminds us that the national composition of the population of district capitals influences the development of the nationality character of the district as a whole. Thus, if we were to choose a town with a Slovak majority as the district capital, this would inevitably have an effect on the character of the district. Because of this, it is my opinion that the capitals of the Hungarian districts should be south Slovakian cities that are Hungarian in character. These are: Dunaszerdahely, Komarom, Galanta, Parkany, Ipolysag, Zseliz, Tornalja, Szepsi, and Kiralyhelmec.

If we consider these cities as the capitals of the Hungarian districts then we must see to it that the villages near the mixed-population district capitals but belonging to the chain of Hungarian villages are included in the new districts. This solution would make it possible for the great majority of Hungarian workers in Czechoslovakia to belong to Hungarian districts and enjoy the advantages of administrative autonomy.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to arrive at a solution that would enable all workers of Hungarian nationality to belong to Hungarian districts. One reason for this is that a number of Hungarian villages are located in areas where the majority of the villages are populated by Slovak workers. The other reason is that in a number of south Slovak cities—as, for example, Ersekujvar, Leva, Losonc, Rimaszombat, Rozsnyo, and Kassa—which are at present district capitals, a large number and, in some cases the majority, of the population are Slovak workers. Thus, even with the best will, besides the nine or ten Hungarian districts there will be another eight districts with a minority of workers of Hungarian nationality. (The list could be completed with the Bratislava and Nyitra districts.)

In the districts with Hungarian minorities the principles of equality of status and bilingualism for Hungarian workers should be implemented just as it is for minorities of Slovak nationality living in Hungarian districts.

It is also quite logical that the interests and equal status of Hungarian workers be protected by nationality offices and institutions to be established on the district and central level, regardless of whether the citizens in question are of Hungarian nationality living in Hungarian districts or minorities in districts of mixed population.

In my opinion, it would be a grave mistake to establish the national composition of the south Slovak cities and villages on the basis of the results of the latest census. A number of actual instances have proved that the results of this census—from the point of view of national composition—do not agree with the facts. I know, for example, not only of individual families but of a number of villages where, according to the census, the majority of the population is of Slovak nationality, but at the same time no one—except the teachers and one or two officials—speaks the Slovak language. These distortions call attention to the fact that the national composition of the population can be correctly established only on the basis of the language spoken in families and in everyday life.

Finally, I would like to point out again that we cannot remain indifferent to the complicated problems involved in the transformation of our society. Because indifference and submissiveness will retard the development of socialist democracy and the solution of the nationality question, and thus will slow down the development of our socialist society.

[From Uj Szo (Bratislava), March 24, 1968, Radio Free Europe translation]

STANDPOINT OF THE LEADERSHIP OF THE HUNGARIAN SECTION OF THE SLOVAK UNION OF WRITERS

The great majority of the Czechoslovak people, and among them the members of the Hungarian minority, are tensely watching the rebirth developing in the wake of the resolutions passed at the December and January conferences of the Czechoslovak CC. This involves complete liquidation of the social, political, and economic distortions that are paralyzing our socialist development and hindering the development of the specific requisites for socialist construction and the consistent reorganization of state functions in a spirit of equal national rights. The resolutions passed at the CP district conferences, the attitude of social organizations, and the spontaneous demonstrations of the broad masses of the populace prove that the people have identified themselves with these revolutionary targets, and fully support the progressive forces grouping themselves around Comrade Dubcek.

In this historic hour, we Hungarian writers in Czechoslovakia side with the Party and the people, and wish to participate actively in the process of renewal which our socialist society is undergoing. With regard to the solution of the nationality question, we agree with the proposal worked out by the Central Csemadok (Cultural Association of Hungarian Writers in Czechoslovakia) and submitted to the highest state and Party bodies. We think it essential that this proposal become an integral part of the programs under debate.

In recent years the Hungarian writers in Czechoslovakia have repeatedly stated their opinions on the vital problems of the Hungarians living here. We have stood up for our rights in the name of humanism and in the interest of socialism, we have asked that our human dignity be respected. We did this at a time when it meant taking a risk, when it meant taking a stand which could result in the sacrifice of one's private and public existence. Our initiatives were known only to a small group of people, and in most cases it was utterly impossible to state our targets to a wider public. Socio-political conditions were unfavorable, and we were also handicapped by the demagogic or opportunistic attitude adopted by the majority of Hungarian functionaries. We do not wish to give the impression that we were the only ones who know the truth. We have no more right to claim this than other people have. On the other hand, the responsibility inherent in our mission obliges us to lay before the public the problems of the Hungarian nationalities that we consider important.

We shall now stress those elements of the nationality question which relate to cultural problems, the foundation of our national cultural life, which should be reorganized in a spirit of autonomy. In addition, we shall also mention those elements which were not emphasized by the Csemadok proposal.

1. We suggest the development and promulgation of a cultural policy in accordance with the principle of self-administration. We consider the following points necessary.

a. The establishment of a central independent managerial body for Hungarian school affairs.

b. Under the guarantee of instruction in our mother tongue, the setting up of a network of Hungarian-language kindergartens, apprentice schools, elementary, and specialized secondary schools; the reorganization into an independent high school of the Hungarian section of the pedagogic faculty of Nyitra; the opening of a Hungarian section in the Nyitra agricultural high school or at the Pozsony and Kassa medical faculties; that training of secondary school teachers in our mother tongue be considered.

c. Rescinding of the measures concerning joint administration of Hungarian and Slovak schools.

d. Supervision of the teaching of history in the secondary schools, and introduction of the teaching of the history of the Hungarian people in line with the new situation.

e. In specific cases and in a suitable ratio permission for and financial support of study in Hungary.

2. In the interest of developing our intellectual life and our national culture, we consider the establishment of the following institutions necessary in addition to a guarantee of their financial maintenance.

a. A National Hungarian Scientific Institute—with departments of philology, literary science, history, and ethnology.

b. A National Hungarian Library.

c. A permanent Hungarian Theater in Pozsony.

d. A professional Hungarian Folklore Ensemble.

e. An independent Hungarian book and newspaper publishing house.

f. A new Hungarian daily in addition to *Uj Szo*.

g. A cultural-political weekly.

h. The transformation of *Termeszet es Tarsaladom;* which is now a transmutation of *Priroda a Spolocnost*, into an independent review.

i. Introduction of Hungarian television programs.

3. Federation of the nation will make necessary the reorganization and enlargement of social organizations. We suggest, in the interest of greater activity on the part of the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia:

a. The foundation of a independent Hungarian pioneer and youth association functioning along the lines of the Slovak Youth Association.

b. The establishment of a Union of Hungarian Teachers in Czechoslovakia.

c. The reassessment of the status of the Hungarian sections of the Union of Journalists and the Union of Writers, and consideration of their being transformed into independent associations.

4. At the time of the first republic, the elite among the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia—Communists, non-Party members, workers, peasants, and intellectuals alike—played an active and progressive role in the life of the country. In spite of this—and as a reaction to the events of 1938—the Hungarians in this country were summarily and collectively held responsible for the dismemberment of the republic, and this collective charge was made in such basic documents as the Kassa government program. We demand revision of this indictment, considered official to this very day and never properly and publicly corrected; and we demand the rehabilitation of innocent people persecuted under the collective charge; and we further demand a review of the trials of those who protested against the deprivation of their rights between 1945 and 1948, and reimbursement of financial losses suffered because of the illegal decrees enacted between 1945 and 1949. We demand an official and public annulment of re-Slovakization, and the renaming of villages in Hungarian-language territory whose names were changed. And now a word about the unjustified charge that Hungarians are bourgeois nationalists. In the course of socialist construction Hungarians have given repeated evidence of their political maturity, and have fulfilled their civic duties in an exemplary manner. On these grounds, they request rights equal to those due to the peoples of the republic.

5. The forthcoming elections are an extremely important event in the lives of Czechoslovak Hungarians too. We consider it necessary, from the viewpoint of the democratization of our society, to play an active

role in the preparations for the election. In view of the fact that the process of renascence has begun comparatively late, postponement of the elections is especially important for us.

We must put an end to the political practice, so far as Hungarians are concerned, of disregarding the necessary rotation of functions and favoring those who hold conservative views. It is not true that, aside from those who presently hold office or positions of authority, the Hungarians have no personalities capable of playing a political and public role. Because of this false attitude, it frequently occurs that people of other nationalities, whose only qualification is that they speak Hungarian, are appointed to public office.

We deem it necessary, from the viewpoint of the democratic renewal of our public life, that all public figures who, either out of passivity or opportunism, are politically and morally unfit for their posts, be excluded from public life.

We request that a sufficient number of Hungarians be included at every level on the committees set up to prepare for and manage the elections.

The Slovak nation has, in the course of its history, repeatedly experienced what it is to be oppressed, subordinate, and cheated. Now, when it has arrived at a stage of fully developed-independent national existence, we trust that it will know its job, and that it will deal with the state-political position of the nationalities under its jurisdicton on a basis of full equality of rights and self-administration. The principle expressed by Budovit Stur more than a hundred years ago is still valid ". . . It does not make for happiness if we raise our standard at the expense of other people, and by oppressing them; happiness is achieved when we live with people who are as cultured, as happy, and as satisfied as we are."

[From Uj Szo (Bratislava), Apr. 12, 1968, Radio Free Europe translation]

IN THE DEFENSE OF INNOCENTS

(By Jozsef Gyonyor)

"We suggest the reconsideration of all those articles of law which were passed after 1945 which concern the citizens of Hungarian nationality and we also suggest the annulment of discriminatory laws." (From the resolution of the Csemadok Central Committee.)

One shivers when one reads about the arrest of innocent people and the tortures of the condemned. The question arises: were these monsters born by mothers? Who can tell the number of those people who in the last quarter of a century were illegally arrested, how many people lost their health or life on the grounds of unjust court sentences?

I was reading recently that the presidium of the Supreme Court urges the rehabilitation of persons tried injustly in the years between 1949–1954. However, before we start to deal with this subject, we must know the meaning of this Latin word, now a topic of priority all the country over. According to the dictionary "rehabilitation" means the restoration of one's honor and good reputation, a compensation, an exoneration of the detrimental legal consequences due to arrest. People who are rehabilitated will be reinstated in their rights. Putting it plainly, the illegal sentence must be quashed, and the rehabilitated compensated for the damage done by illegal detention and the execution of the punishment. All this, however, is not enough. A complete rehabilitation demands that the innocently condemned be reinstated—if possible—in their original position. And naturally, that at least as much publicity should be given to this as to the reflections cast on their good reputation at the time.

It is likewise natural that not only those persons must be rehabilitated who were sentenced in a political trial. Who knows the number of workers who were victims of illegal administrative measures? Neither is the number of those people known who spent months and long years in forced-labor camps or had to do forced labor. Neither can we collect the names of all those who were dismissed without reason and who remained with their families without a job. The infringement of the law, however, did not begin in 1949, but earlier. There is no sufficient explanation for the fact that the Supreme Court counts the illegalities from 1949, because the series of illegal actions began with the decrees discriminating against the Hungarian citizens. For the sake of historical authenticity, however, we shall give an account at least of the most flagrant ones.

They were opened by the decree No. Four issued by the Slovak National Council on 27 February 1945. This was followed by the decree issued April 7 (No. 26.) and by the one issued May 15. (No. 33.)

After this, came the era of President Benes. Perhaps there has never been in the course of history a king by the grace of God who ruled his subjects with such inhuman decrees. The decree No. 12 issued 21 June 1945 belongs to the most important ones. Under this decree persons of Hungarian nationality were deprived without any compensation, and effective immediately, of their agricultural real estate, rich and poor alike. Assets which were not confiscated on the grounds of this decree were taken away on the grounds of decree No. 108 of October 5, which the executive bodies were ordered to carry out, and which did not even exempt the movable property of the Hungarians.

We shall look now into the events themselves and find out who were those people who carried out every presidential decree? They were first of all those persons who were afraid to have to account for having been fascists during the war, who moved speedily away from the northern districts and became rulers over life and death in Hungarian towns and villages. The teachers and employees of the former Hlinka party were transferred—mostly as a punishment—to South Slovakia. These politically corrupt elements, former Guardists, left-overs from the estate owners, and other "experts" flooded the Hungarian villages and towns. It was rumored that they were forgiven all their sins because they were good enough to beat the Hungarians. Unfortunately, they really beat up and hit the Hungarians in the true sense of the word. Notices were on display in offices with the text "Na Slovensku po slovensky" (Speak Slovak in Slovakia). And how many mothers were hit because they talked Hungarian with their sons on the streets.

A series of atrocities were carried out on these unfortunate people, from whom they wanted to take away their houses, land, shops, or their honor. Where it was not immediately possible to put them out of the country, hundreds of Hungarians were dragged to the frontier and left there without food or drink.

The "peoples tribunal" began its activities and Hungarians were convicted chiefly on account of their nationality. They were resettled without compensation, and even those persons were taken to court who only had "earth" in their flower pots.

In the resettlement office work was started on a "scientific" basis. Lists were drawn up containing the names of those Hungarians whom they wanted to resettle in Hungary. They were divided into two categories on the grounds of articles No. 5 and 8 of the Agreement. What was the difference? Persons belonging to the first category could take with them all their movable assets, while those included in the second category could only hope for the chance to take 50 kilograms of luggage per person with them.

Of the 105,047 persons qualified for resettlement, only 68,407 left the country, and an additional 60,000, afraid of the hopeless future, left of their own free will. On the other hand, those persons whom they wanted to get rid of—the "criminals"—on the grounds of paragraph No. 8 stayed on in the country on account of the new circumstances.

The exchange scheme did not and could not attain its goal. It was a great mistake of the time that the number of Slovaks in Hungary was wrongly estimated and the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia, whose number amounted to three-quarters of a million, were left out of consideration.

The Czechoslovak Resettlement Commission, working in Hungary, distributed in vain between the fourth of March 1946 and 25 June 1946, 790,000 newspaper copies, 490,000 propaganda booklets and 540,000 leaflets, but results did not come up to expectations. Neither were the 266 lectures on the Budapest radio of much help. The magic of the spoken word also had no effect. Neither did the 277 meetings, organized in 133 villages and towns in Hungary, attain the results anticipated. It was in vain to flood the villages with thousands of books, to organize 60 concerts; there were only 59,774 who registered for resettlement within the framework of the exchange action, while 13,499 persons were taken to Czechoslovakia arbitrarily outside the scheme. After the unsuccessful action, the question arises: what sort of data were the point of departure of the Prague Foreign Ministry and the Slovak offices in charge, how did the "experts" work? As far as I know, the number of Slovaks in Hungary was estimated at 540,000, but most of the Hungarians living in Slovakia were considered Hungarianized Slovaks.

It was on the grounds of this false theory that the government decreed in June 1946 the so-called re-Slovakization. The purpose was clear. The Hungarian minority could not remain in this country. In the interest of this purpose the "magyarized" part of the population was permitted to return to their original nationality. The fact, however, that those people who on account of the one-time class oppression had actually become magyarized, and who at the time of the first republic could have safely declared themselves Slovak, were not taken into consideration. The scheme was carried through in the same year, in the period between 17 June—and July first. It is no secret that this action was coupled with the matter of citizenship. I ask you, who would have been willing to leave his place of birth under insecure conditions? It was thus that 410,820 Hungarians were forced to deny their nationality in writing.

As regards those people with whom they could not reckon in the course of the resettlement of their Slovakization, their fate was settled by "providence" so that they were scattered in Bohemia. Decisions were reached on the grounds of further registers of the resettlement office and in accordance with the decree No. 88 issued 19 November 1945, and forwarded to 9,610 heads of families, with the signature of the chiefs of the district labor offices. Only 2,154 Hungarian families changed their residence of their own free will and moved to some farms in Bohemia, where they were hired as farm hands. The remaining 41,640 persons were put on cattle-trucks on a cold winter day and moved with military assistance to the historical parts of the country. But with this, their tragedy has not yet ended. The part of their property which was not confiscated by official bodies was looted by unknown culprits. Many of them could return to their abandoned homes only after long years. They were treated as war criminals, though most of them were the sons of workers and of poor peasants. However, their guilt was never established by any court or administrative body. They were merely taken to the market

and carried off as slaves. Was that recruitment? No, there is another expression for it: forced expulsion.

People who were not broken by so much suffering and slander, were granted, after the coming to power of the working class, citizenship under decree 245/1948. But according to sub-section three of section one of this law, around 300 persons were not happy about it. The list of names of these persons was forwarded accompanied by a circular letter of the Ministry of the Interior dated 16 December 1948 (No. 190/1948) to the districts. There is no need for us to say that many innocent Hungarians were also included on the list, who could live and work in the country even ten years later only with a residence permit.

In order to make the series of illegalities complete every Hungarian language school was closed down, although under the decree issued by the Slovak National Council on the Sixth September 1944, the elementary schools set up prior to the Sixth November 1938 could have continued to function. After this, the teachers were sacked and the children were not even permitted to learn the alphabet in their own language for almost half a decade.

There are only brief facts and only a small fragment of what really took place.

How often did we put the question to ourselves in the course of the past two decades; what did we do, that for the sins of a few bourgeois politicians hundreds of thousands of ordinary men were totally outlawed? Perhaps it was our generation which had to answer for those historical offenses the Hungarian great landowners inflicted on the Slovak people? Whatever the reason, we must establish for the sake of historical objectivity, that South Slovakia and its people have changed hands several times during the last quarter of a century. After World War I, it was annexed to Czechoslovakia. On the grounds of the Vienna treaty, part of the territory and inhabitants were returned to Hungary, while in 1945, the exile government liberated it as a Czechoslovak area. Our fathers were not asked in 1918, where they wished to belong. The representatives or our national minority did not give their signature to the documents of the Vienna treaty. From the class point of view, the totalitarian measures, also affecting the working people, even if they were Communists, are inconceivable.

Thus far, it was rumored in Hungarian nationality groups, that the atrocities were started by "Husak, Novomesky and Okali." It was even stated in the resolution passed on the 16 January 1959 by the Central Committee of the Slovak National Council, that it was only after the denunciation of the bourgeois nationalist activities of "Husak and his associates," that the Leninist nationality policy could be implemented by the Czech CP among the Hungarian language population. The first chapter of the report was also written in a similar spirit.

In the meantime, the "bourgeois nationalists" mentioned earlier were rehabilitated. I suggest therefore, that Dr. Gustav Husak, Ladislav Novomesky and Danial Okali should take a stand in Uj Szo in the matter of the charges raised against them.

It is well known that people of Hungarian nationality had a share in the construction of socialism in our country, though they had few political rights. For all this however, they were not appreciated. Thus far, neither the Supreme Court nor the state agencies, took steps for the calling to account of the people guilty of the cruelties committed against the inhabitants of Hungarian nationality. It is strange, but it seems, that statesmen and the press alike, have forgotten the events of 20 years ago. Nothing was mentioned even when the radio and television spoke about the necessity that Hungarians illegally arrested and persecuted, must also be rehabilitated. Neither did the papers, that some parliamentary commission has dealt with the rehabilitation of the whole Hungarian national minority. And yet, there is no question that everybody suffering under the collective charge, the whole of the Hungarian minority, must be rehabilitated.

This year has been declared by the UN, as the international year of human rights. I am certain that before long, the parliament and government of the Czechoslovak socialist republic will take count of the inhumanities committed against the Hungarian minority. On the grounds of this, the government resolution stipulating re-Slovakization must be revoked and invalidated fully, because we still have villages whose inhabitants are afraid to declare themselves Hungarian. Further, the list issued by the interior minister on the grounds of the provision of law No. 245/1943, must be revised, and every discriminatory law and decree invalidated, as a disgrace to the Czechoslovak statute books.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today we are discussing another minority issue that of the almost 1 million Hungarians living in Czechoslovakia close to the Czechoslovak-Hungarian border.

Reading the material appearing in the only daily paper of the minority—Uj Szo—which exposes courageously the abuses of the Communist regime in the past, we have both praise for the valiant struggle these people lead for a restoration of their human rights both as individuals and as an ethnic group in a multi-national state and compassion for their past sufferings on the hand of Communist dictatorship.

We feel that their demands submitted to the Government for self-administration of the Hungarian-inhabited areas, expansion of Hungarian-language secondary schools, scientific establishments and cultural events and institutions are fair and that their support of the reforms demonstrate their ardent wish that totalitarianism should disappear from their state. Their demands on a personal and group level freedom is consonant with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations and the best principles of our Nation and all freedom-loving nations.

We are listening carefully to their voices and to the policies which by federalization and expansion of individual freedoms are trying to make life more humane and bearable in totalitarian Czechoslovakia and hope that the voices of freedom, humanism, and democracy will win out over the forces of Russian imperialism, totalitarian communism and oppression. The events in Czechoslovakia again demonstrate that freedom cannot be erased off the minds of people even by Communist indoctrination and police terror and that peace and stability require both a restoration of individual freedom and just treatment of minorities as well.

In this regard we are wishing success to those efforts which would bring peace between the nations and nationalities of Czechoslovakia rather than exacerbate existing differences and which would help unite them in the quest for peace and human dignity and freedom for the individual instead of living in a totalitarian Communist dictatorship.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join today the distinguished gentleman from New York and my other colleagues in discussing the fate of the almost 1 million Hungarians in Czechoslovakia.

The events of the last 6 months in Czechoslovakia restore our hope that the indomitable human desire for freedom and a democratic form of government cannot be destroyed by oppression, terror, and indoctrination, but will pervade even the circles of those who for a time were ardent adherents of a totalitarian ideology. Of course, the potentials open to the Czechoslovak people are still limited to a degree. The Soviet Union continues to exercise an imperialist protectorate over the region and attempts through economic and political means to stop the force of change that the people of Czechoslovakia desire to implement in order to regain their national identity and their reputation for democracy.

This is the first time in the last 22 years that the Hungarian minority in Slovakia can express its hopes and desires within the framework of the present political structure of the country. A veritable flood of articles have appeared in the only Hungarian-language daily Uj Szo—New World—in Bratislava, denouncing the grievous deeds against the minority after World War II and during the Novotny era, and demanding new solutions based on the principle of equality that has been promised. We ought to follow their struggle with great attention since either a solution or stagnation of the question of Slovaks and Hungarians in Czechoslovakia will constitute the supreme test regarding the sincerity of the reform, and its capability to bring peace and stability. Their demands for self-administration, near proportional representation in state and public agencies and institutions, and a more equitable educational institutional framework in their mother tongue, are certainly justified. They contribute to the implementation of those human and minority rights which were so eloquently and resolutely expressed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the U.N. in 1948, and which also form a historical tradition for the spirit of both Masaryk and Kossuth.

Presently there are some surface tensions between Slovaks and Hungarians in the area. But these are due, to a large extent, to misinformation and unfounded rumors, and encouraged to a degree by the Soviet Union which hopes to use the divide et impera approach to Czechoslovak events. It is our earnest hope and desire that Slovaks and Hungarians will find a way of accommodating each other and solve the nationality issues, since both were, until very recently, the victims of the same political, ideological and ethnic discrimination.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am joining today with my distinguished colleague from New York in discussing the developments in Czechoslovakia relating to the almost 1 million citizens of Hungarian nationality in that country.

We are witnessing interesting and very important events in that country. The popular resentment against Communist totalitarianism finally found its expression even among the more sensible elements within the party and is resulting now in concessions to the people in the field of personal rights and press freedoms. As the dam of oppression has been

broken, the flood of the desire for democracy and human and group rights is now emerging in world and script all over that country despite the rear-guard actions of the Novotny wing and their mentors, Moscow and East Berlin.

The liberalization process also embraced the members and leaders of the Hungarian minority. They support fully the liberalization measures and hope that they will result in improving their legal and economic situation and do away with the conscious discrimination that has been practiced against them for decades.

The difficulties are now centering on making the Slovaks, themselves victims of discrimination until now to understand that if they are able to secure equality for themselves, they must grant equality to the minority in the midst, the Hungarians.

Hungarian demands include an agglomeration of the Hungarian-inhabited areas into counties with local autonomy, more educational institutions, recognition of their group rights in the constitution, certainly demands which are compatible with democracy and the unity of the state. These rights are identical with the ones given to individuals and minorities in the U.N. Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and would form the basis of a peace between nations and nationalities in the area which is the prerequisite for stability in the Danubian area. We hope that Soviet obstructionism and Communist diehards will not succeed in reversing the trend for more freedom and equality in Czechoslovakia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with pleasure my distinguished colleague from New York in discussing the fate of the Hungarians in Czechoslovakia.

Today the overwhelming desire for human rights and a nontotalitarian existence has pervaded Czechoslovak society so much that even the Communist Party leadership must take these desires into consideration and try to head off a revolt by offering concession in the sphere of personal and group freedoms.

As a result the grievances of the unjustly oppressed and sentenced and the nationalities who were gravely discriminated against are raising their voices and ask for a recognition of their rights and a partial remedying for the wrongs of the past. Whether they will succeed is not clear yet as Moscow and its East German minion, Ulbricht, is trying to sabotage the liberalization attempts both economically, politically, and to a limited degree even militarily through the phony maneuvers at the time when major decisions on reform are taken in Czechoslovakia.

The Hungarian minority was probably the most oppressed minority in the last few decades. While the Slovaks had also their share of discrimination, Hungarians were in 1945 deprived of their citizenship, many of them were expelled or forced to declare themselves Slovaks in order to remain in their homes, and 76,000 of them were deported to the Sudeten region to do forced work in 1946–47. They also suffered after the Communist takeover and lost many of their elite to forced labor camps and prisons during the Novotny era.

Today their leadership must react to the ever-increasing demands for human and minority rights evinced by the masses of the Hungarians and some of them are spearheading a movement for reform that would not only include a restoration of the general human and civil rights of the citizen but also a proportional representation of the nationalities in public bodies and professions and self-administration of the Hungarian-inhabited areas which should be constituted as counties.

Finally, they point out the inadequacy of Hungarian-language institutions on the secondary and college level in Czechoslovakia and the absence of any research institutions, TV programs, radio programs, and adequate press products for almost 1 million people. Last but not least they want official recognition of their group rights in the Constitution and the annulment of all the discriminatory legislation against them even though they are no longer enforced.

We hope that the intrigue of Moscow and Pankow will not succeed in stopping the reforms in Czechoslovakia and that the Hungarians and Slovaks will both achieve their aims and will find a modus vivendi among themselves and with the Czechs in the state of Czechoslovakia.

For a description of the tensions present I insert an article by David Binder, from the New York Times, June 23, 1968, which elaborates on the fears of the Hungarian minority because of the lack of understanding on the part of the Slovaks:

HUNGARIAN MINORITY TENSIONS WITH SLOVAKS WORRY BUDAPEST

(By David Binder)

BUDAPEST, June 21.—Tension between the Hungarian minority in Slovakia and the Slovaks has caused worry here this month.

Hungarians also complain about discrimination against the Hungarian minority in Rumania.

It is understood that both Alexander Dubcek, the new Czechoslovak Communist party chief, and Janos Kadar, the Hungarian leader, have intervened personally to calm tensions between Hungarians and Slovaks.

They conferred on the matter at a meeting in Budapest last week and agreed to continue working closely together to resolve the nationalist conflicts.

In May and early June, Hungarians returning from visits to Bratislava, the Slovak capital, and other Slovak communities reported that the minority had come under intense pressure from Slovak chauvinists.

A recent visitor to Slovakia said that "in some villages the Hungarians feel it is better not to go out at night," and then went on to speak of beatings and scuffles.

REUNION AVOIDED

A woman who went to Bratislava to attend an alumni reunion of her Hungarian school there, said many of her former classmates stayed away from the festivities because they feared trouble with their Slovak neighbors.

There are believed to be almost one million of Hungarian origin in Slovakia, although fewer than 700,000 openly declare themselves to be members of the minority. Under the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which was dissolved in 1918, all Slovakia belonged to the Hungarian crown.

Between the wars, Bratislava was officially a trinational and trilingual city—with Austrians, Hungarians and Slovaks enjoying equal rights.

Czechs, though a tiny minority in Bratislava, soon took over most of the leading political and economic posts, acting as agents of the Prague Government. From the Slovak viewpoint, this exchange of Hungarian-Austrian masters for Czech masters served to their nationalism all the more during the period between the wars.

Meanwhile, some of the Hungarians of Slovakia, remembering the days when Bratislava was Pozsonyl—and the capital of a truncated Hungary—still hold it to be "theirs" and they have occasionally provoked the Slovak majority. After World War II about 120,000 Hungarians were resettled from Slovakia to Hungary.

Since 1945, Bratislava has become an almost exclusively Slovak city and has lost virtually all its cosmopolitan aura.

According to reliable information available here, groups of Slovak nationalists marched in May through villages where the Hungarian minority predominates, shouting: "Hungarians to the Danube." The Danube forms part of the border between Hungary and Slovakia.

Gyula Lörincz, a Stalinist who was appointed chief of the minority in 1946 by the Hungarian premier, Matyas Rakosi, inflamed Slovak resentment further last month by declaring that Hungarians "had not asked" to be included in Czechoslovakia in 1918.

Retorting to this sally, a Slovak cultural official, Ondrej Kulik, told the Hungarian minority newspaper in Bratislava, Uj Szo: "If the Hungarians want to destroy our state then nothing remains for us but to drive them out with weapons."

The hope in political and intellectual circles here is that the Czechoslovak democratization process will eventually slake Slovak nationalist demands for federal rights and then will permit the Hungarian minority to gain greater group liberties.

The Hungarians in Slovakia are hoping to obtain more schools and higher educational institutions as well as a theater.

SITUATION IN RUMANIA

The situation of the Magyar minority of 1,500,000 people in Rumania remains a sharper thorn in the Hungarian side. While Budapest intellectuals acknowledge that there is slightly greater travel freedom and that there have been economic improvements for the Hungarians in Rumania, they complain of other forms of discrimination.

They note that Hungarian textbooks are often printed in editions of under 5,000 copies, which a writer said, "is far too small for a minority that size." Imports of most Hungarian writings are barred by the Bucharest authorities. The intellectuals also excoriate the resettlement measures that have driven thousands of Hungarians out of their traditional homes in the Transylvania region of Rumania.

Earlier this year, the Rumanian regime abolished the Transylvanian territory known as the Magyar Autonomous Region, redrawing the administrative lines along the prewar county system. The reaction here was a shrug of the shoulders. "That region soon became neither Magyar nor autonomous." said an intellectual "so what is the difference?" What counts are personal liberties and equality.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject matter at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

VOTING AT 18

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a red letter day in the Congress. In a special message, the President earlier today urged adoption of a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18.

Every year since I have served in the House of Representatives—commencing in 1959—I have introduced a joint resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to enable all citizens to vote at the age of 18. As long ago as 1937, when I was a young instructor at Columbia University, I began agitating for the lowering of the voting age. In the ensuing 31 years, the reasons for the 18-year-old vote have changed as the nature of youth has changed, and the President has set forth eloquently and persuasively the compelling arguments to support adoption of what will be the 26th amendment to the Constitution.

IMPORTANCE IN AN ELECTION YEAR

I am hopeful that the President's message will furnish the impetus that will see this proposal through to final approval and ratification. I believe it is fitting that we consider such a proposal now, during an election year, at a time when we can witness the active participation of young people in the political campaigns of all the candidates.

Our political system can benefit greatly from the genuine idealism of young people. Many young people are more highly motivated toward political action than their elders. It is interesting that a great deal of this zeal for activity has occurred very recently, as many young people are beginning to appreciate the fact that in a democracy their interest and activity really counts and does make a difference.

YOUNG PEOPLE TODAY AS CONTRASTED WITH 1950

I am impressed by the fact that this generation of young people is on the whole more serious minded, thoughtful, and activist in spirit than their counterparts among the students of the 1950's. They are searching for the meaning of life, and their role in society. Their participation in belligerent demonstrations of a destructive nature, such as what occurred at Columbia University, is an inexcusable breach of discipline which cannot be condoned. Yet I sometimes wonder whether the senseless violence, animal energy, and nihilistic attacks on the "Establishment" would not be tempered and directed into useful channels if opportunities for expression were afforded at the ballot box.

It is argued by some that the modern generation of young people lacks the maturity to vote at the age of 18, and to lower the voting age will simply corrupt elections with those who lack a sense of balance. It is also argued that our Nation should not reward those prone to riot with a share of choosing our governing officials. It is further argued that the hippies and the yippies will lower the level of intelligence in the electorate, resulting in big votes for weird candidates, and votes being cast for superficial personal characteristics rather than meaningful policies.

YOUNG PEOPLE CAN ENRICH DEMOCRACY

Mr. Speaker, I do not see any overnight transformation in intelligence which occurs on the very day a young adult reaches the magic age of 21. And I would concur with the assessment of the President who expressed it this way in his message earlier today:

> The young people of America in this decade are far more ready, far better qualified, far more able to discharge the highest duty of citizenship than any generations of the past.

It is self-evident that confidence placed in young people will awaken them to a new sense of responsibility toward our Nation, and direct their energies and interests toward the constructive task of making democracy work.

I therefore trust that early action will be taken by the Congress and the States in the passage and ratification of this important constitutional amendment.

GRANTING PERMITS TO USE PUBLIC PROPERTY—NO MORE RESURRECTION CITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills of similar content which will require hereafter that no permit shall be issued for any demonstrations, encampment, or assemblage without first obtaining approval for such permit from the two Interior Committees of the Congress, as to one bill, and the two District of Columbia Committees of the Congress, as to the other bill.

As you are all aware, H.R. 16981, has been reported and may be acted upon by the Congress in the near future. This measure prohibits any officer or employee of the U.S. Government or the District of Columbia from issuing a permit for the use of land owned or under the control of the United States or the District of Columbia for camping, sleeping, or other overnight occupancy or for contructing or erecting any temporary buildings.

While we hope that there may be control over the use of Government lands in the future, an outright prohibition would prevent any overnight occupancy of public lands. Such a bill would even prevent a Boy Scout jamboree or any other proven organization overnight use of public lands. We might find ourselves in an awkward position if we had to deny completely and entirely worthwhile uses.

It is my opinion that the type of bill which I have introduced will serve for the Congress as the stewards of the people's property, the responsibility and say over who may or may not be given the right to obtain occupancy of public lands and for how long and under what terms. It is true there is a section of H.R. 16981 that orders the posting of bonds before using public lands for purposes other than overnight occupancy. But under the type of bills which I have introduced, the Congress could consider as a condition for the granting of a permit the amount and the terms of such a bond, rather than delegate to an appointed individual in the executive branch of the Government or in the District of Columbia government, the authority to require a bond or the amount of bond.

There could be a simple committee resolution which could be acted upon by a simple quorum of the committees involved and action by the full House or Senate would not be required. A committee could disapprove an application simply by taking no action.

I submit that under my bill the Congress, being directly responsible to the people, would have control over the use of land belonging to all the people. In addition there would be no risk of the challenge that some appointed official would inhibit the constitutional rights to lawfully assemble and petition the Congress. The very application to the Congress for a permit would constitute part of the petition.

If I may respectfully point out, any other type of bill might be challenged summarily particularly those which call for a complex prohibition against the granting of a permit as denial of the right to petition. In any event there should be some latitude allowed rather than an outright prohibition.

I am sure that the great majority of the Members of this House want to see no more Resurrection Cities. The bills which I have introduced today will give us all assurances there will be no more permits granted by the Interior Department or by the District of Columbia government. The method which I have proposed in my bills is a much more logical treatment of the procedure to require the committees of the Congress to consider such permits than to delegate this authority to appointed officials. Certainly the Members of the Congress, elected Representatives of the people, and their decisions should better express the will of the people.

WHY THE ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM MUST BE INVESTIGATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GALLAGHER). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, Dr. H. Beecher Charmbury, secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Mines and Mineral Industries, delivered an address in which he recommended a study involving all implications of the nuclear power industry.

Dr. Charmbury charged that environmental problems coming from the mining and burning of coal are infinitesimal compared with dangers that could arise from atomic reactors. He also asserted that the Federal Government has not disclosed actual costs of atomic power. His analysis reviews in depth the awful damage that could come from an accident in a reactor or in the transportation of nuclear materials.

I ask that the entire statement appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, along with an editorial on the Charmbury remarks from the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat of June 17.

The material supports my resolution for a top-to-bottom study of the civilian

reactor program. I have warned that air and water pollution from atomic reactors could be catastrophic, that a shortage of uranium could bring unnecessarily high prices for electricity, and that a full disclosure of the Atomic Energy Commission's civilian reactor program is essential both to the public safety and to the public purse.

Another factor involved in the projected study of the AEC program is the plan to detonate a nuclear device underground in Pennsylvania for the purpose of creating a natural gas storage reservoir. This week, opponents of the project presented a petition containing 9,500 signatures to a State official in Harrisburg. In all, almost 15,000 citizens of the Commonwealth have signed petitions asking that the idea be rejected.

AEC is already making the decisions on whether reactors may be built on sites selected by utilities, regardless of the desires of residents who may reject the idea of living next door to the atom. If this Federal agency can also decide to blast in an area despite opposition of local citizens, Heaven help the Nation.

The Charmbury address and the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat editorial follow:

A PLEA FOR THOUGHT AND ACTION BY H. B. CHARMBURY, SECRETARY, PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF MINES AND MINERAL INDUSTRIES

During the past five years, we have been living in a very air-land-and-water conservation-minded society. Hundreds, yes even thousands, of articles have been prepared for the public by the news media of Pennsylvania and the rest of the country severely criticizing the coal industry for the scars left as a result of more than 100 years of uncontrolled and unregulated coal mining to protect the general public.

Today, we have these controls, and the coal mining industry in Pennsylvania is to be commended for the job it is doing in working with government, conservationists, and others to protect, for future generations, our air, land, and water. The change in the coal industry's entire philosophy and attitude is almost simply unbelievable. From a slow start, we have built up to a point where there has never been greater cooperation between all groups concerned to have a healthy bituminous coal-producing industry in Pennsylvania with mining operations being conducted to protect the people now living in Pennsylvania, and those who live in and enjoy Pennsylvania in many, many years to come.

Now, however, government must turn its attention to other problems that might make our current problems from previous coal mining seem infinitesimal. These problems would be concerned with the life and death of our population as well as the preservation of our natural resources. I am referring to the radiation problems from the utilization of nuclear power plants.

In 1966, twenty-one new plants were licensed by the Atomic Energy Commission. In 1967, thirty additional plants were also licensed and in 1968 to date, an additional eleven plants have been announced by the Atomic Energy Commission. The total number of operating, licensed, under construction and in final phases of startup are ninety-nine plants. These plants are scheduled to be in operation by the end of 1975. The current forecast of the Atomic Energy Commission is the installation of 150 million kilowatts of nuclear power generating plants by the year 1980 representing approximately 30 per cent of the installed capacity in this country.

During the past decade, the general public has been fed a constant stream of information, principally from United States government agencies, on the desirable features of the application of nuclear energy. Science fiction has pointed out the theoretical tremendous levels of energy available from the splitting of the uranium atom. Frequent stories have been released to the public that one pound of uranium-235 is equivalent in heat energy to 3 million pounds of coal and, therefore, the coal mining industry was doomed.

In contrast, the undesirable, and in fact, dangerous features with respect to pollution from such plants and the production of deadly radiation to all living things created by the operation of these nuclear power plants have not been widely discussed with the public. What are the true facts.

1. The fundamental principal of the splitting of the nucleus of the uranium-235 atom by a "slow" neutron results in two fragments of the nucleus that are new and different chemical elements. Each of these two fragments without exception, is radioactive and in turn begins to disintegrate to a stable and different chemical element. Additional neutrons are released to maintain the "chain" reaction. Heat is released. Dangerous gamma rays are given off of this "chain" reaction. The truth is, for every pound of uranium-235 atoms "burned" in a nuclear reaction, there is created approximately an equal pound of radioactive fission fragments.

2. The public is not informed of, first, the volume and, second, the basic time required to control these radioactive materials.

3. The point is the radiation from these fission fragments cannot be seen or detected in any manner by the other senses of humans. Everyone is familiar with the effects of x-rays on human tissue. The same danger is present from the radiation constantly produced by the radioactive fission fragments.

Strontium-90 for example, a product of a nuclear power plant, is one of the most deadly radioactive fission fragments to all living things. This radioactive material is a solid and gives off beta rays and if present within the human body is a bone seeking material directly causing bone cancer. Worst of all, this material slowly disintegrates to a new and stable chemical element. It has a half life of 28 years. This term half life means that if you started with one pound of strontium-90, in 28 years the radioactive decay would reduce the weight to ½ pound and in another 28 years you would have ¼ pound and so on.

In fact, it would require 600 years to reduce the radiation danger of strontium-90 created in one year of operation of a single 1,000,000 kilowatt nuclear plant to a level acceptable to the public.

Other examples of very dangerous radioactive fission fragments such as cesium-137, iodine-131, cerium-144, and krypton-85, could be cited. The radioactive fission products accordingly exist in gaseous, liquid and solid forms and without exception, all give off deadly radiation to human beings and in fact all living things in our environment.

Mr. W. R. Harper in his book, "Basic Principles of Fission Reactors" states: "It may be calculated that a worker who stood ten yards from one gram of fresh unshielded fission products would receive a deadly dose of radiation in one or two minutes."

The commercial nuclear plants by 1980 will create a volume of radioactive elements that is almost beyond comprehension. There will be approximately a ton per day.

Recently actual operating data has been released concerning the practical facts of several of the operating commercial nuclear power plants in the United States. Here again two basic conclusions are evident.

First, not over 2 per cent of the uranium-235 actually present in the nuclear core can be fissioned without poisoning the core. The result is approximately ⅓ of the fuel assemblies per year must be removed, stored in the utility plant under water for 90 days, loaded in special casks, and transported by rail or truck to commercial processing plants to remove the valuable uranium materials. Subsequently, the recovered uranium is refabricated into new fuel assemblies and shipped back to the private utility plant.

Second, the regulations issued by the Atomic Energy Commission in the code of Federal regulations with reference to the licensing and design of a shipping cask for the shipment of the extremely dangerous spent fuel elements have been constantly undergoing modifications to assure the safety of the general public.

The magnitude of this rapidly developing public problem has been thoroughly discussed in the past five years by both academic and government sources. In general it is agreed that by 1980 there will be approximately 4,600 tons per year of spent fuel elements representing thousands of shipments across the United States to and from the estimated 150 nuclear power plants to be in operation by that date.

The importance of the special shipping casks is well stated by the publication of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory of Atomic Energy Commission in April, 1965, by Mr. L. B. Shaford of the Basic Problems of Heat Transfer, Shielding, Contamination, Pressure Build-up and Accident Analysis.

The Southern State Nuclear Board, a compact of seventeen southern states, published in 1966 a study "The International Traffic of Radioactive Materials". This document again points out the serious problems of safety, insurance and indemnity costs, legal factors and the numerous problems of the design and licensing by the Atomic Energy Commission of the large shipping casks required in the near future.

The staff at Johns Hopkins has thoroughly studied the density population of various cities in the United States to estimate the number of persons and the cost thereof to evacuate the public from the deadly gamma ray exposures in the event of a transportation accident by a truck or rail carrier. This report points out the very significant facts of what would happen to persons from a single spent fuel element exposure of the deadly radiation.

In view of this authentic information from Johns Hopkins University, it is necessary for each state to carefully control the use of its highways, railroads and airways for the transportation of highly dangerous radioactive materials required for the fuel cycle for commercial nuclear power plants.

Gentlemen, do we know all of the facts? What other key information has not been revealed to the public by government or by the press? What will be the total cost of this nuclear energy? What are the potential dangers?

Earlier this year I had a proposal submitted to the Department of Mineral Industries at my request to get some of the answers. In trying to get the proposal approved, I received the most fantastic government red tape treatment that I've had in six years in Harrisburg. I was told there was nothing for me to be concerned about. These things are all taken care of. Well, I am concerned. If people can be concerned with sulfur dioxide and fly ash from coal burning power plants, and if people can be concerned with mine drainage pollution coming from the mines which produce the coal, somebody better be concerned with the potential pollution from nuclear power plants.

Since I am not permitted to undertake this study, I am asking this Association to consider the possibility of making the study. I will be most happy to make the details available regarding what can and should be done so that the facts can be made known.

Eastern Europe doesn't have a monopoly

on "iron curtains", when it comes to the free flow of information.

Your association can help to lift the unseen iron curtain on information relating to the deleterious effects of uninhibited development of nuclear power plants. Not only are our natural resources, but humanity itself is directly involved.

The study I am asking this association to undertake would certainly help to lift that curtain, while, at the same time, prove invaluable to the States themselves when it comes to establishing regulatory legislation that could post guidelines on the orderly progression—not retrogression of mankind—in its headlong exploitation of such awesome power.

I am worried. I have seen results as to the cost of pollution from energy in the past. . . . I don't want to see the same mistakes with even greater costs take place in the future.

NUCLEAR ENERGY UNKNOWNS

Many are the uncertainties associated with peaceful uses of nuclear power.

Even when someone sets out to explain the beneficial aspects of the awesome power potential, what is heard often is only barely understood. And many questions, therefore, remain.

So it is understandable that there is much concern about the possible harmful aspects of widespread use of nuclear energy. And Pennsylvania's secretary of mines and mineral industries has put some of that concern into words as he issued a challenge to a soft-coal association to study the problems of producing electric power through atomic energy.

Dr. H. Beecher Charmbury told a group of coal producers that "the problems created by coal mining in the past are infinitesimal to what we could face through the massive use of nuclear power plants in the future."

That statement prefaced Dr. Charmbury's challenge. He said:

"For this reason I am asking your association (Keystone Coal Association) to undertake a full-fledged study of the problems connected with production of electric power through atomic energy. Such a study would not come under the scope of activities of the Department of Mines and Mineral Industries.

"I know that problems do exist, and the people of our nation must be made aware of the vast, deadly dangers constituted in the methods as well as by-products created in making electric power with atomic energy."

Dr. Charmbury noted that there has been an abundance of information about the positive aspects of nuclear power production but said that "an unseen iron curtain exists when it comes to information on the deleterious effects."

He went on in his talk to the coal producers as follows:

"I genuinely hope you will undertake this study because we are not just talking about the effects on our lands and waters but on humanity itself. Such a study could prove invaluable, too, in the ultimate creation of regulations—at the state level—if we are to progress, not retrogress, in exploitation of such an awesome power."

Dr. Charmbury noted the proliferation of nuclear power plants and said:

"The current forecast of the Atomic Energy Commission is the installation of 150 million kilowatts of nuclear power generating plants by the year 1980 and representing approximately 30 per cent of this nation's . . . capacity."

Without doubt, the American public must be fully—and in understandable language—informed about the still-young nuclear age. The people must be made aware of all the dangers that may arise as nuclear energy production facilities continue to sprout across the nation.

OUR YOUNG PEOPLE DESERVE TO VOTE

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the President's message today recommending the reduction of the voting age to 18. This has been a long time objective of mine and I have introduced legislation toward this end ever since I came to this House in 1959. I have felt that one of the blatant inequities in our American society has been the denial of this franchise to our younger citizens.

The history of these United States describes a long but unbroken progress from the rule of a tiny minority in its earliest day to what is now an almost universal suffrage. In this same decade, in which voting discrimination based on poll taxes, on race or color, or on voting districts have all been outlawed, the discrimination which deprives over 10 million of our younger citizens of their rightful vote must be our next objective.

No time could be more appropriate. These young people are today being asked to acquire more education and assume more and heavier responsibilities, and at an earlier age, than ever before. There is no group with a larger stake in the long term consequences of our Government's policies than these people. At a time when the "generation gap" has become an issue, and when increasing numbers of responsible, serious young people are asking for a broader role and participation in society—what more appropriate measure can be taken than the extension to these people of our society's most fundamental means of participation—the right to vote?

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. ARMY CHEMICAL CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, June 28, 1968, the 50th anniversary of the creation of the U.S. Army Chemical Corps, is a fit and proper occasion on which to honor the record, services, sacrifices, and accomplishments of this vitally important branch of the national military establishment. Equally—and perhaps more—importantly, the anniversary to which I refer affords a fit and proper opportunity to survey one of the major problems now confronting the American people and their national security policy—the deterrence and if necessary the waging of chemical and biological warfare.

It was a long time ago that the Spartans burned wet straw in smudge pots in order to conceal the movements of their troops against Hannibal's forces during the Carthaginian wars. And it was a considerable time ago—some of our younger citizens probably think shortly after the discovery of fire—that the German army released a cloud of chlorine gas over Allied lines near Ypres, Belgium, and caused confusion, gasping death, and thousands of maimed casualties. The launching of the gas attack on April 22, 1915, also launched what we have come to recognize as the modern era of chemical—more properly—chemical and biological warfare.

The first American troops that landed in France in 1917 had to depend on British and French equipment for protection against gas attacks. Within a short period of time the American Expeditionary Force not only had its own gas warfare equipment but its own gas and flame regiment. This regiment developed into the Chemical Warfare Service, which was organized as such on June 28, 1918. After the war—in 1920—the Chemical Warfare Service became a permanent branch of the Regular Army, a decision reflecting practical experiences gained in World War I—experiences including the simple, awesome fact that the some 6,000 German troops assigned to chemical warfare duties inflicted about 30 percent of the American casualties suffered during the entire war.

According to one historical summary:

Although chemical agents such as gas were not used in World War II, the contributions of Chemical Warfare Service units to combat operations were extensive. Chemical mortar battalions firing 4.2 inch high-explosives were famous in all theaters of war for their accurate fire in close support of Infantry. Flame throwers of the Chemical Warfare Service were one of the few weapons capable of driving fanatical Japanese defenders from their bunkers and caves in the Pacific, and were also a favorite weapon against the German pillboxes in Europe.

In 1946, the Chemical Warfare Service was reorganized as the Chemical Corps. During the Korean fighting the Corp's 4.2 inch chemical mortars firing high-explosive rounds in the same manner as in World War II once again demonstrated and proved the extent to which the vitality of the U.S. defenses and U.S. national security policy depended on the Army Chemical Corps.

To continue with the historical summary from which I quoted earlier:

In the Vietnam war, the Chemical Corps does not play the same role that it did in World War II or Korea. Smoke screens on a large scale are not needed because fighting there does not involve large units or troop movements, and the function of the 4.2 inch mortar battalions is being handled effectively by conventional artillery and mortars organic to infantry units. Nevertheless, the Chemical Corps has not let down its guard. Research and testing continue to prepare American forces for any eventuality and to provide a strong deterrent to any enemy contemplating the use of chemical agents on the battlefield.

Insofar as Vietnam is concerned, this report completely misses the boat. There has been considerable emphasis on the use of chemicals in Southeast Asia limited to tear gas and defoliants, and their value in the present conflict is increasingly obvious. In the case of defoliants, jungle areas with dense foliage provide perfect cover for enemy operations and defy efforts at detection. The use of defoliants has denied enemy units the use

of important areas and rendered allied operations correspondingly more effective. However, it is in the use of an improved tear gas that greatest benefits to allied forces have been realized. It has been impossible in many instances to route out stubborn enemy resistance in underground fortified bunkers with the use of conventional weapons. In these cases tear gas has been highly effective. There have been instances where tear gas could be used in lieu of more destructive devices where enemy forces were holding civilians captive. In each instance, a savings of lives has resulted. There is increasing use and growing demand for additional chemical weapons of the type described for the battlefields in Vietnam and this is coupled with an obvious need for improvement in weapons and delivery systems.

Research and testing, plus the Southeast Asia participation, is costing in the neighborhood of $300 million a year and absorbing the energies and capacities of some 7,000 scientists and technicians, constitute one of the contemporary hallmarks of the Army Chemical Corps. But such research and testing, which over the last quarter century or so have brought forth chemical and biological warfare—or "CBW"—agents including nerve gas and incapacitants, have also brought forth damning criticisms from usually well-intentioned but unfortunately misguided citizens of the United States and of other countries. For example, it was reported in the press on May 10, 1968, that the Federation of American Scientists had attacked U.S. development and production of CBW weapons and urged discontinuation of CBW programs. I understand that the Federation believes not only that the development, testing, and production of CBW weapons of mass destruction are pointless, dangerous, and provocative, but that all CBW weapons should be foresworn by the United States.

On the other hand, I believe it is instructive and imperative to mark well an editorial published by the New York Times in 1964, which stated, in part:

> Chemical and biological agents—repulsive though they may be—are, like nuclear weapons, here to stay and an understanding of them and of the defenses that can be erected against them are essential to the nation's security. 'Humane warfare' is far off, but the attempt to achieve it is worthwhile.

Using this New York Times editorial position as a background, I would like to submit for your consideration a few rules of thumb that I believe can guide the United States well as it reflects on and evaluates CBW military capabilities in relation to national security. The first rule of thumb is that the United States must develop and retain as many military options as are available to it in order to deter and if necessary mount military action against any conceivable aggressor or aggression. A second rule is that the fruits or payoffs of military research and development, and the resulting military capabilities, are hard to predict and can never be realized short of dedicated, sustained, and long-term efforts. A very recent issue of Newsweek reports:

> A chemical called BZ is the only dividend of the Army's oversold effort to develop psychochemicals and other incapacitants, beyond the riot-control arsenal, for a 'war without death."

Yet my reading—as a nonscientist—has led me to an almost equally recent issue of Ordnance, which presents a considerably more optimistic view of the possible effectiveness of incapacitating agents that might be used in close-combat situations in Vietnam. A third rule is that the fruits or payoffs of military research and development often have ramifications extending far beyond military capabilities. For example, several years ago the Army Chemical Corps found it possible to list no less than 11 areas, ranging from medicine, to health, to safety, to animal and crop research, in which the Chemical Corps had made valuable contributions to the welfare and better living of the American people.

I have not commented on the Russian capability for chemical and biological warfare. This is important enough to justify a paper devoted entirely to that subject. Suffice it to say at this time that the Russian effort is very much larger than ours. The Russians have developed a chemical and biological capability far greater than our own. The training program for Russian soldiers in this field is much more thorough and detailed than ours. It is an accepted fact that the Russians have developed production facilities and stocks of chemical and biological weapons far beyond the very limited capacity which exists in the United States. The Soviets take a highly realistic view of the importance of chemical and biological warfare, and they are much better prepared to wage war in these fields if it should ever serve their purpose to do so. This should be a cause for very considerable apprehension to the United States, where the emphasis has been in downgrading the significance of chemical and biological warfare and where constant attacks are being launched within our own country by those who seek to have our limited capability downgraded to an even greater extent.

In a word, then, on the basis of its past and present record of services rendered not only to the safety but to the general welfare of the Nation, and on the basis of truly well-founded expectations of invaluable services yet to be rendered, I am honored to play some small part in commemorating the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the U.S. Army Chemical Corps.

TEACHER CORPS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations has recommended a cutback in the Teacher Corps program.

In this period when the educational crisis continues to grow, I believe that the Teacher Corps should be expanded rather than reduced.

Educational surveys show that only 17 percent of the regular teachers want to teach in the innercity schools. Seventy-six percent prefer to teach in the suburbs.

Yet, we all know that the most serious problems in education today are in the poverty area schools in the cities and in the rural areas.

The Teacher Corps is directed at this very problem: Getting at the hardcore, poorly educated child.

The Corps recently graduated 657 teacher interns who have spent the past 2 years in some of the poorest sections of our big cities and rural areas.

A survey this month by the Teacher Corps showed that 72 percent of the graduates plan to teach on a regular basis in poverty area schools.

I know personally about the Teacher Corps program because it has been operating in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., for 2 years. It has done an excellent job of getting to children who really need help; reaching children who might otherwise be school dropouts of the future.

There have been 16 Teacher Corps interns teaching in three Buffalo schools. Their work is supervised competently by three team leaders who are veteran, experienced teachers.

The program is under the direction of the State University College at Buffalo in cooperation with the city school system.

Besides supplementing the Buffalo school system, the Teacher Corps interns have engaged in community activities.

They started a Boy Scout troop and are tutoring adults in an evening center. They also are making home visits to the parents of the pupils they teach.

Recently, the Buffalo Teacher Corps was responsible for bringing together about 150 representatives of 48 Buffalo civic organizations in an effort to get concerted action on a variety of community problems.

The corps in Buffalo recently helped to form an advisory council on education composed of school administrators in the Ellicott School District. This council seeks solutions to common educational problems.

As can be seen from the Buffalo work which I have cited, the Teacher Corps is serving a definite need in our major cities.

I hope sincerely that the House not only will reject the proposed reduction in the Teacher Corps budget, but also will make additional funds available for its work in fiscal 1969.

THE COMMEMORATION OF JAMES CHANEY, ANDREW GOODMAN, AND MICHAEL SCHWERNER, WHO SACRIFICED THEIR LIVES FOR LIBERTY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago I rose in the well of the House to inform the Members that three young Americans were missing in the State of Mississippi in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Neshoba County.

Today I rise to pay tribute to those three civil rights workers—James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner—who sacrificed their lives for liberty.

It requires a little historical memory to understand the circumstances within which these young men undertook the work of promoting civil rights and equal opportunity. They were murdered on June 21, 1964. On June 21, 1964, Congress had not yet passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964—Negroes in Mississippi and in other Southern States were denied service in places of public accommodation; they were discriminated against in employment; they lacked the whole array of Federal rights created by that act, the enforcement of which has begun to change the thinking and racial perspectives of the South.

These three courageous young men faced the most bitter opposition and hostility. They knew this, and they proceeded to the task of promoting liberty and racial equality.

On the date of their deaths, there was no Federal law providing adequate penalties for violent interference with civil rights—it was only this year that Congress passed legislation providing punishment up to life imprisonment for violence and murder committed to prevent the victims and others from exercising civil rights. Hence, these three young men faced not only the most bitter opposition and hostility, but they faced the possibility of violence unrestrained by fear of Federal prosecution and of life imprisonment. They faced this danger with a courage to match their calling.

Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner went to Mississippi to conduct voter registration drives and to open freedom schools under the auspices of the Council of Federal Organizations, an alliance of several civil rights groups—the Congress of Racial Equality, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

They, together with other volunteers, were preparing to offer courses of study designed to make possible greater freedom for Negroes in Mississippi—courses in the humanities, in the liberal arts, in the mechanical arts, and in the rights and the duties of citizenship.

Michael Schwerner and his wife, Rita, had opened one of the first two freedom schools in Mississippi. They opened their school in a five-room space in the town of Meridian. They established a library with a collection of some 10,000 books which were available for everyone in that community.

These three—Michael Schwerner and Andrew Goodman, both white civil rights workers from the North, and James Chaney, a young Negro from Mississippi—dedicated themselves to advancing equal opportunity.

What did these young men do which brought about their brutal murder in Neshoba County?

They were assisting American citizens to become citizens in the real sense of the word.

They were assisting men and women to develop productive abilities of mind and hand so that they could make the world in which they live more their own.

They were assisting men and women to take responsibility for government and for a public order of things in which they would have more of a stake. They were assisting men and women to take an active part in the democratic process in order to make those in public office responsive to their rights and needs.

To those who were determined to prevent the Negro from becoming fully a citizen, these goals to which the three young civil rights workers dedicated themselves were reason enough to kill them.

The deaths of James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner demonstrated to Congress and to the country the need for Federal intervention in Mississippi and elsewhere in the South on behalf of the disadvantaged and disfranchised. By their deaths they hastened passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Where they and other civil rights workers led the way—into hostile country—Federal voter registrars have followed. Assumption by the Federal Government of direct responsibility for enforcement of the guarantee of the 15th amendment is bringing about profound change in the political life of the South.

On the date of enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, only a little more than one-fourth of adult Negroes were registered to vote in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina. By June 30, 1967, more than half of the adult Negroes in these same States were registered to vote. There are today in these States more than 1¼ million Negro voters—and the percentage of Negroes in the South who register and who vote can be expected to keep on rising.

It is a tribute to the three men whom we remember and honor today that Negroes are being elected to public office in Mississippi and in other Southern States for the first time in this century. Robert Clark is a member of the Mississippi State Legislature representing Holmes County. Wesley Liddell is mayor of Mound Bayou. Constables in six Mississippi counties are Negroes, as are the supervisors in four counties. There is a Negro chancery clerk in Claiborne County, a Negro school board member in Jefferson County, a Negro coroner in Marshall County, Negro justices of the peace in seven counties. And in other Southern States also Negroes are entering elective offices—Alabama has two Negro mayors, for example; Georgia has two Negro State senators and nine Negro State representatives. These gains are few thus far, but they constitute a beginning.

And election of Negroes to public office by a growing black electorate should not be the only consequence of enfranchisement. White candidates for elective office and white persons in positions of authority should be compelled increasingly to recognize the rights and the needs of disadvantaged black people and of disadvantaged white people in their States, and should be compelled to devote more effort to safeguarding these rights and answering these needs.

Thanks to the heroism of the three young civil rights workers whom we commemorate today, thanks to the numbers of other civil rights workers who also faced the possibility of violence and death in order to conduct voter education campaigns, thanks to the Voting Rights Act and to the Federal officials registering voters in the South—Negroes can gain and exercise political power.

James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner were killed by racial prejudice and racial hostility. Nevertheless, we are beginning to move toward realization of certain of the goals for the sake of which they died—democratic political rights, equal opportunity in education, equal opportunity in employment.

Much remains to be done before every Negro can shape a part of the world into something that he can call his own. Much remains to be done before he can cast off economic dependence on those who have for generations used that economic dependence to deprive him of an effective participation in political affairs.

How much remains to be done has been accurately gaged by the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

The Negro seeks to gain the self-respect which comes from achievement which is a genuine expression of self.

The Negro seeks to gain the self-respect which comes from recognition on the part of others of one's value as a person.

The Negro seeks to gain the sense of belonging to the American community.

These great ends of public policy are deeply personal values. They are values for which James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner traded their lives.

In this current crisis of racial relations and of public order we must be well aware that the same prejudice and hostility which killed these three young men threaten to preclude the Negro's gaining such self-respect and sense of belonging.

The Commission's basic finding, which is that white racism is the primary cause of the violence which today disrupts our national life, has incurred the wrath of many white Americans. The Commission demonstrated depth and objectivity when they presented their findings. The Commission stated:

> The record before this Commission reveals that the causes of recent racial disorders are imbedded in a massive tangle of issues and circumstances—social, economic, political, and psychological—which arise out of the historical pattern of Negro-white relations in America.
>
> These factors are both complex and interacting; they vary significantly in their effect from city to city and from year to year; and the consequencies of one disorder, generating new grievances and new demands, become the causes of the next. It is this which creates the thicket of tension, conflicting evidence, and extreme opinions cited by the President.

Despite these complexities, certain fundamental matters are clear. Of these, the most fundamental is the racial attitude and behavior of white Americans toward black Americans. Race prejudice has shaped our history decisively in the past; it now threatens to do so again. White racism is essentially responsible for the explosive mixture which has been accumulating in our cities since the end of World War II.

If white Americans refuse to recognize the truth of this finding, we will never become the kind of people we ought to be. And if we never become the kind of people we ought to be, the Negro will continue to be rent by the despair and anger which have generated the violence in our cities.

Despair and anger in the black ghettos are facts of life which must be faced. For we shall either come to understand, or else we shall continue to move—in the words of the Commission—"toward two socities: one black, one white—separate and unequal."

John Oliver Killens, the well-known author, recently published a book called "Black Man's Burden." In a chapter of this book called "The Black Psyche," Mr. Killens spoke thus to white Americans:

But white Americans are great pretenders. Millions of you wish we were invisible, and so you make believe we are. You'd like to wish us out of existence so that the whole world would not see us, because our very life in this country, as black people, gives the lie before the world to your protestations of freedom and human brotherhood. The white man's juju is powerful stuff, but it cannot wish the Negro into invisibility. So you try the next best thing, pretending you can't tell one of us from another.

White Americans, Mr. Killens says, try to wish Negroes out of existence by not seeing them. But being recognized as a person is essential to everyone's psychological welfare. The experience of being wished out of existence by not being seen, or of being regarded as merely anonymous is bound to leave scars.

Bayard Rustin, a respected civil rights spokesman, talked to young people in Watts shortly after the 1965 riot. He reported what he found in an article entitled "The Watts Manifesto." Mr. Rustin said:

If we can't read their "manifesto" in the burnt buildings and the smashed store windows in Watts, if things don't change, these young people were saying they would do it again. They wanted more than anything to be heard, to be recognized, to be listened to.

Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, the renowned psychologist, had the following to say about the motivation behind the riots:

Beneath the random and clearly destructive and irrational behavior, there remains the pathetic logic of asserting self-esteem and searching for a positive identity by exposing oneself to danger and even inviting death.

This is the quest for self-esteem of the truly desperate human being. This is the way those who have absolutely nothing to lose seek a pathetic affirmation of self even if it is obtained moments before death. (New York Times, July 30, 1967, p. 49.)

Will white Americans understand the despair and anger of black Americans and will the racial attitudes of white Americans be changed by such understanding? Or will the racism which murdered James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner plunge us further into division and disorder?

In commemorating the anniversary of the sacrifice of these three courageous civil rights workers, let us hope that their example will lead our Nation to a new understanding and to the achievement of full equality for all Americans.

THE ROAD LESS TRAVELED

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House the outstanding remarks made by Michael F. Stafford upon the occasion of his graduation from West Springfield High School. This young man compiled an outstanding high school career and was valedictorian of his class. In addition to being a fine student, he is a well-rounded individual. He is deeply motivated by love of his country and has chosen a career in the military service. His outstanding ability and his desire to serve his country have been recognized. Appropriately, he has received an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

The challenge that Michael Stafford makes in his speech is a challenge to which each of us should respond in an affirmative manner.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to read this challenging and inspiring address.

THE ROAD LESS TRAVELED

We are at the crossroads of life. Looking back, we see a past of hard work. The devoted efforts of our administration and faculty have ended in a finished product. For us, their job is done; our job has just begun. We are now ready to face a new challenge, a new decision, a new life. In doing so, we must look back to learn, and look forward to act. Be it pleasant or disagreeable, the past is finished. We cannot live in the past, and we must not exist on memories of it. It is our duty to advance on the road of life, prepared to meet and overcome any obstacle in our path.

As we turn to look forward, we encounter a new fork in the road. This is a truly important work, possibly the most important we will ever face. We must choose wisely, for it is here that the road splits into the two paths of life, paths which will probably never cross again. The first path is the one of passivity. It is well traveled, for it is an enticing trail. It is easy to be passive, to sit back and watch the world go by. It is easy to be satisfied with life and be resigned to its shortcomings. It is also easy to settle down in a daily routine, taking no chances and making no bold moves to avoid risk or agitation. Many students choose to be passive. They sit quietly through their daily classes, contributing nothing and getting very little in return. They do not get involved. Their philosophy is a simple one, shared by numerous Americans: "Don't get involved in the lives and problems of other people. Take no chances and you will keep out of trouble. Just live your own life and step on no one else's toes. So people have been publicly stabbed and beaten with their pleas for help unanswered because those around them didn't want to get involved.

The Bible says, "All that is necessary for evil to prevail, is for good men to do nothing." This is the folly of passivity. The hippie movement is an international cult which has ended up on the road of passivity. The hippie philosophy is beautiful, if not practical, for if the world could be rid of hatred, if brotherly love could abound, then this would be a truly wonderful place in which to live. The hippie goal of finding oneself is also fine, but there are few true hippies. Instead, the movement is riddled with parasites, using it as an excuse for their ways. Those ways are simply withdrawal, withdrawal from life as a protest against it. They make no attempt to change it, but simply depend on others to exist in their own individual world. This is the essence of passivity. Protest and criticism are invaluable to the improvement of a system when balanced with a suggested means for that improvement. But protest for the sake of protest, protest without a counter-solution, this is absurdity.

The second is the road less traveled, the one of activity. It may not be as inviting as the road of passivity, for it requires greater effort and resolution, but its rewards are much more gratifying. The person who chooses this path sets a goal for himself and works diligently for the achievement of this goal. The goal must be high, or it is useless. "Aim at the sun," says Joel Hawes, "and you may not reach it; but your arrow will fly far higher than if aimed at an object on a level with yourself."

In the last few months, a group of college students have shot their arrows at the sun, and they have made an impression that will not soon be forgotten. In New Hampshire, Wisconsin, and elsewhere, they dressed up, cut their hair, and otherwise conformed to the standards of the generation with which they were to deal. They then went out and ran one of the most inspired and exciting presidential primary campaigns in history. In so doing, they salvaged respect for the younger generation, a generation which had been labelled as hopelessly drifting, one of America's major crises. Their aim was to help carry to the Presidency a man who had captured their imagination and in the process they did much more than win a few votes. The Negro race, in particular the disciples of non-violence, established for themselves years ago a goal which seemed unattainable. Their dream was to generate a legal, nonviolent revolution in the United States, to create racial equality in a country tainted with prejudice and malevolence. Starting with their first victory in 1954 with school desegregation, they slowly and painfully integrated restaurants, public centers, and other bastions of bias. Met with force, they perservered in their non-violent methods, to such an extent that Dr. King was awarded a Nobel Prize for Peace. But racial unrest has intensified. The solution to this, America's greatest domestic problem, has not yet been found; it lies within our generation. With his increased educational and job opportunities, the Negro will, in the near future, be working and studying at the side of the white American more than ever before. By accepting him and his challenge, by judging him on his talents rather than his color, by setting an example of friendship and justice, we can do much to ease racial tension and eliminate bigotry. The Negro goal still seems far away, but it no longer seems unattainable. The possibility is ours to make great advances for the cause of human rights and give the moral equality of all men a large boost toward universal acceptance.

In setting his goal, one must look to the future, but in working toward achievement of this goal, he must act in the present. Existing on dreams of the future is no less erroneous than existing on memories of the past. One who sets a high goal for the future and works simply for the future will not succeed. He must work in the present to improve the present and then the future will

take care of itself. For when one works diligently, using every moral and legal means in his power, there is little that he cannot accomplish.

Now it is time for us to make the decision which we alone must make, to decide the course of our lives. Will we take the road of passivity or the road of activity? Will we be an indifferent or driving element in this changing world? Will we discuss the achievements of others, or will we make our own mark on society? To answer is imperative: act we must, drive we must, mark we must. I dare you to set a high goal and work for its accomplishment. I dare you to make a place for yourself in the advancing ranks of this country. I dare you to learn from the past, plan for the future, and act in the present. I dare you to take the road less traveled, and someday when you look back on your life, it won't be with regret. And so proceed, heeding the words of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow: "Look not mournfully to the past—it comes not back again; wisely improve the present—it is thine; go forth to meet the shadowy future without fear and with a manly heart."

A PRESCRIPTION FOR ENDING LAWLESSNESS AND VIOLENCE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, lawlessness and violence on the streets of America's cities and towns have increased in recent years to the point that today responsible citizens in many areas of the country hesitate to walk where they once took their safety for granted.

A look at the statistics on crime clearly shows that our people have reason for their fears. While it is said that statistics do not always tell the true story, Congress itself need look no farther than outside this Capitol Building to see large congregations of police; gathered because of the threat of what is loosely called "civil disobedience." Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues that the beginning of the tragic April rioting here in the Nation's Capital was labeled as a "civil disobedience," but it was crime and lawlessness by any man's standards or statistics.

Just consider the fact that busdrivers in Washington, D.C., refuse to carry money to make change at night because of the high incidence of crime; crime which cost the busdrivers the life of one of their coworkers and led to a scrip system after sunset so they would not invite holdups.

Taxicabs are scarce on the streets after dark because of the threat of crime. Fires, called "mysterious," continue to plague Washington, D.C., night after night. And, heavy amounts of tear gas were used just this week to disperse growing mobs police had reason to believe were intending to rekindle the April rioting.

And, around the Nation the lawlessness continues to increase. New names are added to the growing roster: Richmond, Calif., Durham, N.C.

But, here in the city which the President has continued to label as a "model" for American cities, felonies and misdemeanors more than doubled between 1960 and 1967. Felonies alone almost tripled in the same period of time.

Mr. Speaker, there is a solution to this lawlessness gripping our Nation. It was demonstrated here in Washington, D.C., when police force was ordered to firmly halt criminal force following the closing of Resurrection City. But, this was only a first step. It must be repeated and repeated until those with criminal design are made to understand that our society is based on order, not lawlessness. They must understand that their minority will not be tolerated by the majority.

But, equally important, the courts also must be made aware that the decent, law-abiding American has "had it." It was shocking to learn following the recent murders of five Washington, D.C., businessmen and the busdriver that 11 of the 13 suspects charged with the murders had been arrested previously, and that five were free on probation or personal bond from previous convictions or arrests. One of them was free on personal bond awaiting a robbery trial that had been delayed 15 months in the U.S. district court.

Only a broad front attack on crime from every branch of government, coupled with strong citizen support will return our Nation to law and order. The age of leniency must end. Permissiveness must halt.

Members of Congress are being swamped by letters and telegrams concerning gun legislation at the present time. We also heard in great numbers regarding similar legislation following the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. But the passage of more laws on guns, no matter how much they may or may not be needed, will do little or nothing to halt the criminal. This is an attack that can come mainly from the law-abiding citizen himself; an attack by his voice saying emphatically that he will no longer stand for court coddling of criminals, that he is impatient with a President, a Congress, and a Supreme Court that permit permissiveness toward criminals at a time when anarchy is threatening the welfare and existence of our people.

Mr. Speaker, 130 years ago, in 1838, such a case was cited in these words:

> There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law. . . . Passion has helped us, but can do so no more. It will in future be our enemy. Reason, cold, calculating, unimpassioned reason must furnish all the materials for our future support and defense.

Abraham Lincoln, speaking in Springfield, Ill., undoubtedly would be moved to the same words again in 1968.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX INCREASE

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion by some in the Congress concerning whether or not a Member voted correctly on the President's tax increase. I voted against the tax increase not because of my political future, but because I felt it best for the country. Many in my congressional district have written to express their agreement with my judgment since the House made its decision.

Others, including the Wall Street Journal in a recent article have commented on the President's tax-spending package by stating:

> Perhaps the greatest peculiarity about the newly enacted tax-spending law is the way it has been successfully oversold as an economic curative—by the Administration, by some in the Congress, and by many businessmen. It's not just a matter of academic interest; in the near future there could be bitter disappointment at the measures unfulfilled promises.

Some events which have occurred in the last few days cause these comments to be almost prophetic. Since passage of the legislation the White House has made two announcements. The first was that the President had just discovered that there would be an increase in the deficit of another $5 billion. This theoretically means that the $6 billion spending cutback which the President reluctantly agreed to has already been decimated to only $1 billion.

The second announcement, and the most fantastic, is that the White House was reported Tuesday as starting that it may be "months" before President Johnson reaches any "decision" as to what cuts he intends to make in fiscal year 1969 appropriations. This kind of irresponsibility on the part of an administration which already has its fiscal credibility in question is the main reason that I voted against the tax bill. The Congress passed the President's tax increase with the assurance from him that spending cuts would be made. However, it appears that it is business as usual in the White House.

Looking ahead, therefore, it appears that the action taken by the Congress will not be an effective counter to inflation. Instead, it raises the families cost of living by reducing the amount of money it can keep, in a period when purchasing power is already eroded by inflation and taxes of all sorts which are going up at a staggering rate locally. It raises a company's cost of doing business in a period when costs are already skyrocketing. Thus still higher prices are in the future for buyers of the company's products. For example, the major utilities announced that they plan a rate increase to offset declines as a result of the 10-percent tax surcharge.

The spending reduction side of the bill offered more hope for stopping inflation. Part of the trouble here is that $6 billion is a small cut out of a $186 billion budget. It is also going to be difficult to see it realized in light of the President's recent announcements.

In view of all this, it is difficult to understand the near naivete with which so many discuss the supposed wonders of the tax-spending scheme. I suspect it stems partly from a feeling of despera-

tion, and a sense that the whole government's financial structure is in fact so dangerously out of control that something, practically anything should be done.

I still believe that serious cuts must be made in the largest budget in the Nation's history before the dollar will be sound again. Unfortunately, from the President's statements, it appears that those who voted for the tax bill have just given the administration another $8 billion to spend. I am sure that some of my colleagues who supported this bill in the hope of reducing expenditures feel just as frustrated as do the people who must pay the new taxes in light of the President's recent announcements.

ROBERT BAUMAN RESIGNING

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, having learned that Mr. Robert Bauman is resigning from his position as manager of the House Republican cloakroom, I wish to express my sentiments concerning this fine young man.

Bob, as he is affectionately known by those of us on this side of the aisle, has not only been a faithful and competent employee, but also a good friend during the 15 years he has been employed in the U.S. House of Representatives.

He also has an Indiana background which is another reason that we Hoosiers in the House hold him is such high regard.

Married to the daughter of the late Gene Dawson, Bob and his wife Carol now have a fine family consisting of a son and two charming daughters. Incidentally, Gene Dawson was a prominent Indiana newspaperman and had served on the staff of Senator Homer Capehart before his tragic death in an automobile accident.

Bob will be missed after he leaves his position in the Republican cloakroom. I certainly wish him well as he ventures into the legal profession. As a lawyer he will be practicing in his home State of Maryland.

I know I speak for his many friends and my Republican colleagues when I say we have been delighted with his energetic devotion to his duties and the service and cooperation he has extended at all times. He has an excellent record of personal attention and in promptly assisting whenever called upon.

Finally, as a dedicated Republican with a sound conservative attitude, I am confident that we will hear from Bob in the future. He has my warm good wishes for his success in the years ahead.

ACA MARKS 10TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, since its founding on June 27, 1958, the Americans for Constitutional Action has performed an important and vital role in promoting sound principles of constitutional government.

These are times when it is often difficult to tell the players without a scorecard, but thanks to ACA, it is possible for the American voter to tell where his or her Representative and Senator stands on legislative issues. If he believes in preserving the Constitution, in restraining the heavy hand of big government, and if he believes in maximum freedom of the individual, commensurate with an orderly society, he will surely rate high on the score card which ACA keeps for every session of Congress. I have often said, the genius of our Constitution is the three ways of change from within.

If on the other hand, he votes to concentrate more and more power in the hands of fewer and fewer Government leaders; if he votes to spend tax dollars as though they were pennies from heaven; if he votes to make the separate States little more than administrative extension of the Central Government; and, if his vote on key issues is more closely attuned to pacifying special interest groups than to strengthening America, he is not likely to rate very high on the ACA scoresheet. I commend ACA, its board of directors, and staff, for an outstanding performance, and for their dedication to the cause of sound principled government. I hope the Americans who share the conservative philosophy and who wish to regain for America the greatness that has been dissipated through modern-day "liberalism" will support ACA and help make it a more effective voice in the mainstream of good government in the United States.

ACA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for 10 years I have followed the progress of the Americans for Constitutional Action in working for responsible, economical government. Its record of progress is impressive.

In my opinion, ACA performs a valuable service in clearly and sensibly reporting the voting records of Members of the Congress and evaluating the merits of their records on a nonpartisan, constitutional basis.

The ACA has faced and overcome several crucial trials since its founding 10 years ago. I recall in particular that in 1963 it was subjected to a barrage of attacks labeling the organization a rabid, rightwing extremist group. An unimpeachable record and intelligent leadership overcame these vicious attacks and ACA emerged stronger and more united than ever.

I have been proud to accept the organization's Distinguished Service Awards, for I consider ACA to be a model of responsible and effective constitutional conservatism.

All Americans owe the ACA a debt of gratitude for its untiring efforts to uphold constitutional government.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but express my keen disappointment at the rejection of an amendment to provide $5 million for the bilingual education program. I would like to urge my colleagues to reconsider and restore the modest appropriations request. The appropriation of at least $5 million for this new and imaginative program is not asking too much.

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot increase the funds for bilingual education let us at least not eliminate the program.

The new program would provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary programs designed to meet these special educational needs.

These programs would be designed to impart to students a knowledge of the history and culture associated with their languages and will hopefully establish closer cooperation between the school and the home. Efforts would be made to improve the potential for profitable learning activities by children and also to provide adult education programs for their parents.

My congressional district consists of Riverside and Imperial Counties and a portion of San Bernardino County. A large number of residents of my district are Mexican American. The State of California has close historical and cultural ties with Mexico. There are over 1,500,000 Mexican Americans in California. Many lag seriously behind in education, jobs, and income. They have been displaced from their farming and laboring occupations of the past and are among the hard core unemployed in many areas. They are not adequately prepared, through no fault of their own, to move into new employment occupations. Automation and technological change is having a particularly severe effect on our Mexican-American population. Statistics show that over 50 percent have not gone beyond the eighth grade.

The bilingual education program will help to reduce the number of Mexican-American children who are actual or potential dropouts. The program will hopefully give children who speak a foreign language an equal opportunity for advancement.

The most promising method of insuring the economic and social progress of the Mexican-American community or any other group is adequate education. With education comes the hope of new and better opportunities for self-improvement. The bilingual education program would hasten the day when all Americans have an equal opportunity to help themselves.

Let us not eliminate the hope for a better future for Mexican American and other bilingual children.

CONSERVATIVES HAVE POINTED OUT THE INADEQUACY OF OUR PRESENT WELFARE SYSTEM

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it was not too many years ago that any person, especially any public official, who might be classified as a conservative was considered to be some kind of "oddball"—a person still living in the 19th century and completely unable to comprehend the problems and difficulties confronting a modern 20th century society.

Fortunately, that image has been proven to be totally erroneous and misguided, and thus we see the adoption of conservative methods and approaches to problem solving being adopted by many in public life who have heretofore been strongly identified in the past with a so-called liberal philosophy. I am speaking of a growing trend, for example, toward the view that the Federal Government does not have all the answers and that we must return responsibility for problem solving to the local and State level. Conservatives for some time have pointed out the inadequacy of our present welfare system and how it only serves to trap families from one generation to another into the welfare pit, and now this same view is heard from the liberal platform by individuals who formerly ridiculed such proposals as not being responsive to the needs and wishes of our people.

There are many reasons for this improvement in the image of conservatives and not the least has been the tremendously effective contribution by the Americans for Constitutional Action, which today is celebrating its 10th anniversary. Through its literature and other educational materials it has consistently presented the conservative viewpoint in a responsible and effective fashion and the organization has come to be regarded as an important tool in promoting constitutional government by helping the American people to become more concerned and more aware of their duties and obligations to their country.

An outstanding group of Americans serves as the officers and trustees of the Americans for Constitutional Action and I would just like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations and felicitations to the ACA on their 10th anniversary and also express my hope that they will continue to have success in their future efforts.

TEN YEARS OF VITAL SERVICE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 10th anniversary of an organization which has contributed greatly toward maintaining that form of government which our forefathers had bequeathed to us many years ago. That organization is Americans for Constitutional Action, a nonpartisan, nonprofit, nationwide, political action group whose first goal is to reelect Members of both the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives whose voting records reflect the original spirit and principles of the Constitution. To further the principles of constitutional government, ACA also assists in recruiting and electing other candidates who will strengthen the ranks of constitutional conservatives in Congress.

The founders of ACA fully realized that Congress is where the action is. They were aware that the legislative body is the keeper of the Federal purse strings, oversees the administration of the executive branch and has the powers to restrict the operation of the Supreme Court. To provide a guideline on which to judge the efforts of Members of Congress, ACA devised a system of analysis and statistical evaluation of the voting records of Members which is now known as the ACA index. The seven criteria of constitutional conservatism upon which the index evaluations are made are:

First. The ACA consistency index: For safeguarding the God-given rights of the individual and promoting sound economic growth by strengthening constitutional government; against group morality, a socialized economy, and centralization of Government power.

Second. For sound money and fiscal integrity; against inflation.

Third. For a private, competitive market and individual freedom of choice; against Government interference by price fixing and controls.

Fourth. For local self-government and the citizen's right to be let alone; against Central Government interferences in local government and private affairs.

Fifth. For private ownership and control of the means of production and distribution; against Government ownership and competition with private competitive enterprise.

Sixth. For individual liberty, rights and responsibilities; against coercion of individuals through Government regulation.

Seventh. For strengthening our national sovereignty; against surrendering control of our foreign or domestic affairs or our national security to any other nation or to any international organization.

In addition to the ACA index, ACA provides conservative candidates with statistical research, speech material, art layouts, personalized news releases, counseling of new candidates, news releases designed to refute "smears" and ACA published materials. Other assistance during the actual campaign includes professional manpower recruited, when possible, from within the candidate's own State or district and working directly under the supervision of the candidate.

At the grassroots level, ACA chapters, chartered by national headquarters for action in local, State and National elections, function in direct support of approved candidates while adhering strictly to the basic principles, policies, and code of conduct governing ACA.

On the ideological level ACA emphasizes the divinely motivated tenets of the Declaration of Independence. In the mundane world of politics, this reassertion of our moral and religious heritage returns the complex business of government to the foundation demanded by our forefathers in the conduct of governmental affairs. For instance, in this age of defiance of law, more emphasis must be placed on the balance between civil rights and civil responsibilities as enunciated in ACA's "A Credo for Concerned Americans":

> For every right there is a collateral responsibility. The rights with which an individual is endowed by the Creator impose on him a duty to use those rights in conformity with the moral law as derived from such statements as the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount and the golden rule.

Thus it can be seen that ACA's contribution to the science of good government includes both the ideological and practical approaches. The members and officers of this organization can justly be proud of their efforts in the civic arena. May the next 10 years greet Americans for Constitutional Action with increased success in preserving, reemphasizing and expanding those principles and virtues first propounded by the founders of our Nation.

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Washington Irving, one of our outstanding American authors, wrote:

> With every exertion the best of men can do but a moderate amount of good; but it seems in the power of the most contemptible individuals to do incalculable mischief.

In no area is this more obviously true than in the current controversy over gun legislation. Very few people violate the laws and commit violent acts with firearms but yet all that the "best of men can do," as Irving puts it, seems to hang in jeopardy.

My position on this matter is very clear and has been stated many times over the years. There are legitimate uses and le-

gitimate users of firearms and I strongly resist efforts to unduly hinder these legitimate uses in attempting to get at the abuses. I oppose registration of firearms.

The best example of the emotionalism which is currently being generated can be seen in a statement of Attorney General Ramsey Clark. After the slaying of Reverend King, a headline in the Associated Press wire stories proclaimed: "Clark Ties King Slaying to Gun Law." The article said:

Attorney General Ramsey Clark, urging strong laws to spike gun sales, said yesterday the sniper slayer of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, might not have been able to buy the death weapon if Congress had acted in the past.

The Senate Judiciary Committee recently approved a measure to outlaw shipping hand guns across state lines after spurning a broader ban the day Dr. King was shot to death in Memphis, Tenn.

Clark told newsmen Dr. King's slayer "may not have been able to have bought that rifle at that time with impunity" if there had been strong Federal laws on the books controlling the interstate shipment of both rifles and pistols.

How ridiculous can you get? This kind of observation tends to cloud the issues in the gun-control debate and is nothing more than deceitful. Among the 20,000-odd laws on the books relating to criminal use of firearms and firearm control is title 15 of the United States Code, section 902(f). It states:

It shall be unlawful for any person who has been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year or is a fugitive from justice to receive any firearm or ammunition which has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce, and the possession of a firearm or ammunition by any such person shall be presumptive evidence that such firearm or ammunition was shipped or transported or received, as the case may be, by such person in violation of this chapter.

Now to tell the American people that Dr. King's slayer "may not have been able to have bought that rifle at that time with impunity" if there had been strong Federal laws on the books is either the height of naivete or grossly deceitful. It is currently thought that James Earl Ray is the slayer. This man is not only a fugitive from justice but has been convicted more than once of crimes punishable by imprisonment for terms exceeding more than 1 year. He violated the law, he should be prosecuted and I am certain that he had no feeling of "impunity," as Attorney General Clark put it when he acquired his firearm.

This is a typical example of the effort to create mass hysteria. A better reason for our difficulties comes in the climate of our society which currently condones criminal activities. Criminal statutes denied their proper enforcement give more impetus to crime, in my judgment, than any availability of guns.

An "expert" on guns and their acquisition recently wrote about the gun laws and how they would affect his circle of friends. Charles Lee Howard, No. 122-595 at Ohio State Penitentiary, comes up for parole hearing in May 1975. He does not plan to return to a life of crime and recently wrote that disarming the honest citizen will make it easier for criminals. He stated:

It's baffling that the people who want to prevent criminals like me from getting hold of guns expect to accomplish this by passing new laws. Do they forget that the criminal makes a business of breaking laws? No criminal would obey a gun law while committing a crime of equal or greater seriousness.

To illustrate the lack of law enforcement—note that well, law enforcement, for those statutes already on the books—it is startling to note that only recently did an U.S. attorney obtain a Federal grand jury indictment for violating the Federal Firearms Act of 1938. This would not be newsworthy except for that fact that this marked the first time that an indictment had ever been achieved in 30 years. Where has the Justice Department been all of these years?

RIOTING AND LOOTING

Mr. Speaker, the same Attorney General Clark looked the other way when mobs were ransacking stores in Washington earlier this year. Condoning looting, roiting, sniping, and blackmail has been commonplace in our big cities during these past few years. The liberal-oriented politician just cannot cope with this type of permissiveness in the permissive society he has worked so hard to build. He looks for excuses in society's deficencies rather than enforce the laws already on the statute books.

The continual socialistic assault on private property has run counter to our historic trend of respecting person and property. The main solution to our dilemma lies within the institutions, public and private, that can promote or tear down this respect for person and property. Attorney General Clark and other liberals simply scoff when rioting and looting occurs. "It is only property," they say. This attitude has produced many results.

The criminal is led to believe he can riot and pillage. The honest citizen, on the other hand, has sought the security he formerly knew by acquiring his own weapons to protect himself. A government that chooses not to govern, a government that looks the other way when rioting and looting occur, a government which does not protect the innocent has been the hallmark of the past few years. Our President now wants to blame all of this on guns. I, for one, will not fall for this phony emotionalism.

LAW BREAKING IS CONDONED

I have served on a committee investigating riots in our major cities. Aside from the conspiratorial element which has fanned these rebellions and the "hate the police" campaign which has been promoted for years, you have the very real problem of inadequate law enforcement. From the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, New York Times edition, you can see what I mean on page 339. It is stated:

In Detroit, 26 persons were charged with assault with intent to commit murder (those alleged to be snipers). Twenty-three of those charges were subsequently dismissed. As of September 30, 1967, one out of seven homicide arrests had resulted in a conviction; two were still pending. Of 253 assault arrests only 11 convictions were produced; 58 were still pending. Twenty-one out of 34 arson arrests, and 22 out of 28 inciting to riot arrests, had been dropped by the prosecution.[2]

DEMAGOGS WORSE THAN GUNS

Attorney General Clark's attitude on the incendiary statements of Stokely Carmichael and Rap Brown is indicative of his double standard. How can a law-abiding person with a firearm be the threat that these demagogs are? They go throughout the country exhorting to violence, threatening to burn this Nation down and urging young men to refuse to serve in the Armed Forces. This is illegal conduct and should be prosecuted. Instead, the Attorney General turns his attention in the opposite direction and wants to infringe on the rights of the peaceable American who is in no way a threat to his fellow citizen.

The whole sordid affair shows one elementary fact: Laws are not self-executing. They must be enforced and prosecutions must be advanced by the constituted legal authorities. Failures in this area probably pose more of a threat to domestic tranquility which is insured in the Constitution than the possession of any firearm, even possession by a criminal. General amnesty granted as a matter of political expediency after rioting and looting can only serve to license arson, looting, and rioting. In these areas our leaders should offer some leadership, not in emotional pleas to legislate against firearms.

It is vitally important that the distinction between the gun and the user be observed in all gun proposals. The gun enthusiast, the sportsman, or the person who wants a gun for his self-defense should not be placed in the same class as the criminal. Much of the legislation we see before the Congress makes the gun the target instead of the unlawful use of the weapon.

MANDATORY PRISON SENTENCE

In 1965, I introduced H.R. 9574 which provided for 25-year sentences for use of a firearm in the commission of any robbery, assault, murder, rape, burglary, kidnaping, or homicide. I now have introduced a more stringent measure which should be an even more formidable deterrent to crime. My H.R. 18159 calls for a mandatory 1-year sentence for any conviction of a felony in which the accused was armed with a firearm or destructive device. I added the words "destructive device" because our hearings have made it crystal clear that many extremists in our country are advocating the use of Molotov cocktails and dynamite in their terrorist activities. Certainly these destructive devices are more dangerous than any ordinary gun.

In Ohio, it cannot be argued that the mandatory 3-day jail sentence for con-

[2] In the 1965 Watts riot, of seven persons arrested on homicide charges, five were subsequently released. None has yet been convicted. A total of 120 adult arrests for assault produced only 60 convictions; 27 adult arson arrests; seven convictions. In Newark, one homicide indictment and 22 assault indictments (none for sniping) have been returned.

viction for drunken driving has not served as a deterrent. To use the mandatory prison sentence for felonious use of firearms or destructive devices will serve as a strong deterrent if enforced.

My legislation provides additional prison sentences for up to life for use of a firearm or destructive device in the commission of a felony. This is the type of legislation we need, not registration of firearms. The word must go out to every hood and punk as well as every hardened criminal that using a firearm in the commission of a crime means a mandatory 1 year sentence with no possibility of probation or suspension. More than that, the possibility of life imprisonment is also there.

I believe in and have voted for firearm controls. I will not, however, support oppressive or vindictive legislation such as the President is now suggesting. Increasing the penalties for misuse of firearms seems to be the preferable action.

NO REGISTRATION OF FIREARMS

I categorically oppose registration of firearms. Proposals which provide for orderly regulation of sale of firearms and prohibitions against acquisition by criminals or mental deficients will receive my support. I read into the current legislative drive the effort to reject self-defense as a legitimate use of firearms. This is totally improper, particularly in light of the tendency of Attorney General Clark and other high administration officials to condone rioting, looting, and lawlessness when perpetrated by minority or so-called disadvantaged groups.

It is said that Switzerland, England, and other countries do not have the problem with firearms which supposedly exists in this Nation. Maybe the general public apathy, the liberal trend toward a permissive society, the condoning of Reverend King's lawlessness guised as civil disobedience from thousands of pulpits in America, the Supreme Court's tendency to coddle criminals and the "anything goes" nature of our society have something to do with it. I am inclined to think that these reasons are closer to the mark than the absence of restrictive gun laws.

No one knows all there is to know about the phenomenon of crime. I would venture to say, however, that any community that will support its police and law-enforcement officers, insist on punishment that fits the crime, become indignant at corruption and practice brotherly love in its everyday activities will have a minimum of crime. The Federal Government is not going to abate the crime wave by passing a strict gun law. In fact, exactly the opposite might happen.

Before responding to the demands to impose unnecessary restrictions on the sale of firearms, America needs to return to the type of justice that dissuades lawbreaking through adequate prosecution and proper punishment. Lawlessness has abounded in the Great Society because it has been pampered.

Ben Franklin once said:

Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.

In this case, we need to preserve both liberty and safety and it can be done by generating public opinion against lawlessess not against an inanimate object, the firearm, which is the wrong target, against the lawbreaker not the law-abiding citizen and against the misuse not the proper use of firearms.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert the text of my bill, H.R. 18159 and urge its support by the Members of this body:

H.R. 18159

A bill to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms or destructive devices in the commission of certain crimes of violence

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after chapter 115 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 116.—USE OF FIREARMS AND DESTRUCTIVE DEVICES IN THE COMMISSION OF CERTAIN CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

"Sec.
"2401. Use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence.
"2402. Definitions.

"§ 2401. Use of firearms and destructive devices in the commission of certain crimes of violence

"Whoever, while engaged in the commission of any offense which is a crime of violence punishable under this title, is armed with any firearm or destructive device, may in addition to the punishment provided for the crime be punished by imprisonment for an indeterminate number of years up to life, as determined by the court. Upon a conviction under this section, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the court shall not suspend the first year of the sentence of such person or give him a probationary sentence but shall impose, as a minimum, a mandatory one-year sentence.

"§ 2402. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

" 'Crime of violence' means any of the following crimes or an attempt to commit any of the following crimes: murder; voluntary manslaughter; Presidential assassination, kidnaping, and assault; killing certain officers and employees of the United States; rape; kidnaping; assault with intent to kill, rob, rape, or poison; assault with a dangerous weapon; robbery; burglary; theft or looting; racketeering; extortion; and arson.

" 'Firearm' means any weapon (including a starter gun) which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive; the frame or receiver of any such weapon; or any firearm muffler or firearm silencer; or any destructive device.

" 'Destructive device' means any explosive, incendiary, or poison gas bomb, grenade, mine, rocket, missile, 'molotov cocktail' or similar device; and includes any type of weapon which will or is designed to or may readily be converted to expel a projectile by the action of any explosive and having any barrel with a bore of one-half inch or more in diameter."

(b) The analysis of part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the last item the following:

"116. Use of firearms and destructive devices in the commission of certain crimes of violence ---------- 2401".

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the President's message with reference to 18-year-old voters.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be granted 5 days' leave of absence in order to attend to certain problems which exist in my congressional district, for the period of July 1 to July 5, inclusive.

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

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MINISH (at the request of Mr. DENT), for Monday, July 1, through Tuesday, July 9.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. SAYLOR, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. REUSS, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. SIKES, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RANDALL, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

Mr. HALL and to include extraneous material.

Mr. YATES during general debate on H.R. 18038 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama (at the request of Mr. STEED) to revise and extend his remarks on H.R. 18038 and include extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. HUNGATE following the President's message on the 18-year-old voter and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include an editorial.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.
Mr. GURNEY.
Mr. ROUDEBUSH.
Mr. DUNCAN in three instances.
Mr. TALCOTT.
Mr. BUCHANAN in three instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.
Mr. BERRY.
Mr. GARDNER.
Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. ZWACH in two instances.
Mr. HUNT.
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. UTT.
Mr. BROCK.
Mr. LUKENS in two instances.
Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.
Mr. SMITH of California.
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.
Mr. PRICE of Texas.
Mr. DOLE.
Mr. WYMAN in three instances.
Mr. CLEVELAND in three instances.
Mr. MICHEL in two instances.
Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.
Mr. DEL CLAWSON.
Mr. SCHADEBERG.
Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts.
Mr. MCDADE in three instances.
Mr. BRAY in two instances.
Mr. KUPFERMAN in five instances.
Mr. BUSH.
Mr. DERWINSKI.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD.
Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

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

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of California in five instances.
Mr. RESNICK.
Mr. BRINKLEY.
Mr. PODELL in two instances.
Mr. FULTON of Tennessee in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in six instances.
Mr. CORMAN.
Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
Mr. PICKLE in two instances.
Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in two instances.
Mr. JONES of North Carolina in two instances.
Mr. ABBITT.
Mr. DE LA GARZA.
Mr. GALLAGHER.
Mr. PEPPER in three instances.
Mr. STEPHENS.
Mr. PATTEN.
Mr. HATHAWAY.
Mr. GATHINGS.
Mr. TENZER in five instances.
Mr. ASHMORE.
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. HANNA in five instances.
Mr. CABELL.
Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.
Mr. PUCINSKI in 12 instances.
Mr. DANIELS in two instances.
Mr. PATMAN.
Mr. MCCARTHY in 10 instances.
Mr. ICHORD in two instances.
Mr. KYROS.
Mr. ROSENTHAL in three instances.
Mr. FEIGHAN in five instances.
Mr. WAGGONNER in two instances.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.
Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1514. An act relating to the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1628. An act to authorize suits in the courts of the District of Columbia for collection of taxes owed to States, territories, or possessions, or political subdivisions thereof, when the reciprocal right is accorded to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3931. An act to amend the act of April 3, 1952;

H.R. 8581. An act to amend section 11-341 (b) of the District of Columbia Code which relates to the sales price for the reports of the opinions of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; and

H.R. 13373. An act for the relief of Richard C. Mockler.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5783. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 37, United States Code, to provide for confinement and treatment of offenders against the Uniform Code of Military Justice;

H.R. 10480 to prohibit desecration of the flag, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13050 to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize an increase in the numbers of officers of the Navy designated for engineering duty, aeronautical engineering duty, and special duty;

H.R. 13593 to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the number of congressional alternates authorized to be nominated for each vacancy at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies;

H.R. 15789 to amend section 2306 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize certain contracts for services and related supplies to extend beyond 1 year;

H.R. 16819 to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend the authorization of grants to States for rehabilitation services, to broaden the scope of goods and services available under that act for the handicapped, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17024 to repeal section 1727 of title 18, United States Code, so as to permit prosecution of postal employees for failure to remit postage due to collections under the postal embezzlement statute, section 1711 of title 18, United States Code; and

H.R. 17320 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant an easement over certain lands to the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 1, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1979. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 30, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a cooperative beach erosion control study and an interim hurricane survey of Dade County, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented, and authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 335); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1980. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 7, 1968, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Alhambra Creek, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 1, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 336); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1981. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 4, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Licking River and tributaries, Ohio, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 3, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 337); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1982. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 3, 1968, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the report on Detroit River, Trenton Channel, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 29, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

1983. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 11, 1968, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on St. Francis River, Mo., and Ark., with reference to flood control on Belle Fountain ditch and tributaries, Missouri, and within drainage district No. 17 of Mississippi County, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted June 7, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 339); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1984. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 26, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on southwestern Jefferson County, Ky., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 18, 1964, and June 23, 1964 (H. Doc. No. 340); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1985. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the elective franchise of citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1196. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 179; with amendment (Rept. No. 1591). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1198. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on Agriculture; with amendment (Rept. No. 1592). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 11233. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 970. Resolution to extend the greetings of the U.S. House of Representatives to the Congress of the Philippines in commemoration of the arrival of the Thomasite teachers (Rept. No. 1594). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 15045. A bill to extend certain expiring provisions under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLAND: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 18188. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 163. A bill to prevent vessels built or rebuilt outside the United States or documented under foreign registry from carrying cargoes restricted to vessels of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 18188. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 18189. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations and volunteer rescue squads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 18190. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 18191. A bill to amend section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 18192. A bill to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 18193. A bill to clarify the application of section 1073 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 18194. A bill to provide for U.S. participation in a free trade association and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 18195. A bill to disarm lawless persons and assist State and Federal enforcement agencies in preventing and solving gun crimes by requiring registration of all firearms and licenses for purchase and possession of firearms and ammunition and to encourage responsible State firearms laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 18196. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to make aliens admitted for permanent residence eligible for appointment as commissioned officers in the service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 18197. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect the people of the United States against the lawless and irresponsible use of firearms, and to assist in the prevention and solution of crime by requiring a national registration of firearms, establishing minimum licensing standards for the possession of firearms, and encouraging the enactment of effective State and local firearms laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 18198. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to establish certain qualifications for persons appointed as judges or justices of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma:

H.R. 18199. A bill to authorize the use of funds from a judgment in favor of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 18200. A bill to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 18201. A bill to authorize a study for a waterway connecting the Savannah and Tennessee Rivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 18202. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to release restrictions on the use of certain real property conveyed to the city of Redmond, Oreg., for airport purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAREY (for himself, Mr. DANIELS, and Mr. SCHERLE):

H.R. 18203. A bill to increase the size of the board of directors of Gallaudet College, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 18204. A bill to permit the administrative adjustment of certain wheat acreage allotment reductions resulting from action taken by farmers prior to 1965 in good faith reliance upon representations or advice of authorized representatives of the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 18205. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 18206. A bill to promote the economic development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GETTYS:

H.R. 18207. 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 South Carolina State Commission of Forestry so as to permit such commission, subject to a certain condition, to exchange such lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARSH (for himself and Mr. ABBITT):

H.R. 18208. A bill to provide specific and additional penalties for the use or carrying of firearms in the commission of crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 18209. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to provide for loans to supplement farm income and to provide for additional recreation loans, extend the period for water and sewer grants prior to completion of a comprehensive plan, increase the amount of unsold insured loans that may be made out of the fund, raise the aggregate annual limits on grants, remove the annual ceiling on insured loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 18210. A bill to regulate the granting of permits for private use of publicly owned lands within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 18211. A bill to regulate the granting of permits for private use of public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 18212. A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, to authorize a study of essential railroad passenger service by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEED (for himself, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. BURLESON, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. HENDERSON):

H.R. 18213. A bill to provide continuing authority for maintaining farm income, stabilization of prices and assuring adequate supplies of peanuts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 18214. A bill to disarm lawless persons and assist State and Federal enforcement agencies in preventing and solving gun crimes by requiring registration of all firearms and licenses for purchase and possession of firearms and ammunition, and to encourage responsible State firearms laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. KUYKENDALL, and Mr. COWGER):

H.J. Res. 1370. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the confirmation and reconfirmation of Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. DENT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. AYRES, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. BELL, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. SCHERLE, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, and Mr. ASHBROOK):

H.J. Res. 1371. A Joint resolution to provide that it be the sense of Congress that a White House Conference on Aging be called by the President of the United States in 1971, to be planned and conducted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DORN:

H.J. Res. 1372. Joint resolution proposing

an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.J. Res. 1373. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to terms of Judges of the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.J. Res. 1374. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution requiring that Justices of the Supreme Court be reconfirmed by the Senate every 6 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE (for himself and Mr. FINDLEY):

H.J. Res. 1375. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States making citizens who have attained 18 years of age eligible to vote in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.J. Res. 1376. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Robert Francis Kennedy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Res. 1230. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States enter into an agreement with the Government of Israel for the sale of military planes, commonly known as Phantom jet fighters, necessary for Israel's defense to an amount which shall be adequate to provide Israel with a deterrent force capable of preventing future Arab aggression by offsetting sophisticated weapons received by the Arab States, and on order for future delivery, and to replace losses suffered by Israel in the 1967 conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H. Res. 1231. Resolution to amend rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action by the House of Representatives on general appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 1232. Resolution amending the rules of the House to prohibit a single appropriation bill from carrying appropriations for more than one executive department; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H Res. 1233. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States enter into an agreement with the Government of Israel for the sale of military planes, commonly known as Phantom jet fighters, necessary for Israel's defense to an amount which shall be adequate to provide Israel with a deterrent force capable of preventing future Arab aggression by offsetting sophisticated weapons received by the Arab States, and on order for future deliver, and to replace losses suffered by Israel in the 1967 conflict; 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. ADDABBO:

H.R. 18215. A bill for the relief of Dominico Fodera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 18216. A bill for the relief of Elie Louis Charalabopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18217. A bill for the relief of Bartolome A. Federico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18218. A bill for the relief of Caterina Grimaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 18219. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ena Mocega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18220. A bill for the relief of Miss Esther Mocega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 18221. A bill for the relief of Ludovic But and his wife, Leontina But; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 18222. A bill for the relief of Naim Nissem Ben-Zur, Elana Ben-Zur, Liora Ben-Zur, Orna Ben-Zur, and Mayer Ben-Zur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18223. A bill for the relief of Odilia Kwang Wook Han; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18224. A bill for the relief of Hagop Dikran Krakozian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 18225. A bill for the relief of Dr. Arturo de Jesus de Leon and Dr. Rose Mary de Leon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 18226. A bill for the relief of Yock Shan Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18227. A bill for the relief of Pasqua Porzia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 18228. A bill for the relief of Juliet G. Mudzinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 18229. A bill for the relief of Domenico Mammana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 18230. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Lita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 18231. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Nelson C. Mah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18232. A bill for the relief of Norma M. Sasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 18233. A bill for the relief of Anna Di Lauro and her minor daughters, Maria and Vincenza Di Lauro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 18234. A bill for the relief of Rubenstein D. Landreth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18235. A bill for the relief of Eric Richard Scotte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 18236. A bill for the relief of Baij Nath Verma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18237. A bill for the relief of Chu Ying Yeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 18238. A bill for the relief of Olivera Milivojevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 18239. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sing San Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 18240. A bill for the relief of Fotios George and Evangelia Metaxas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

357. By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia: Petition of Mrs. R. H. Ligon, Mechanicsville, Va., and others, concerning aid to Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

358. By Mr. FISHER: Petition of B. L. Bradford, Houston, Tex., and others, to have this administration stop, promptly and completely, giving aid in any form, directly or indirectly, to our Communist enemies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

359. By Mr. LONG of Louisiana: Petition of Delia B. Harris, Martinville, La., and others, relative to trading with the enemy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

360. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Josephine Scarminaci, Brooklyn, N.Y., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CORREGIDOR MEMORIAL SHRINE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 26, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from an approximately 20,000-mile round trip to the Philippine Islands, where, with other distinguished Americans, I was privileged, indeed honored, to witness the turnover ceremony whereby the Corregidor Memorial Shrine is now the official function of the Philippine Government.

This shrine commemorates, for all time, the memory of those who gave their lives in the South Pacific during World War II; and particularly those Americans who gave their lives during the gallant fight on Bataan and Corregidor 26 years ago.

It would be fitting, then, that we examine only one portion of that now infamous death march of Bataan with a firsthand report from one of its survivors, Dr. David Brown, of Bellaire, Ohio.

The report follows:

SUNSET AT CAMP O'DONNELL

Ours was the first group to arrive at Camp O'Donnell. We had been picked up by a convoy near Cabcaben in the late afternoon of April 10, 1942. The narrow road was jammed with heavy traffic. The Japanese were taking advantage of the silence of Corregidor's guns (to allow the removal of the Filipino—American prisoners from Bataan) to move in their own men and equipment for the final assault against the island fortress. Tanks, artillery, grim-faced veterans of the Singapore campaign, truckloads of American food "requisitioned" in Manila moved into Bataan, while in the opposite direction, lines of haggard Filipinos and Americans stumbled heavily toward their destiny.

The road out of Bataan led through towns and villages that had been devastated early in the war. Abucay, Hermosa—leveled by repeated bombing and shelling—were now a mass, a rubble. The sweet sickening smell of burnt flesh still emanated from the charred ruins. Groups of Japanese soldiers, naked