would put an end to the rising mood of taxpayer distrust and discontent. Former Secretary of the Treasury Barr, in what has become a widely quoted remark, spoke of a potential taxpayers' revolt. Such a rebellion would come not from the poor but from the middle-class, and it would be in reaction to the widespread avoidance of taxes by wealthy individuals and wealthy corporations.

Those citizens earning between $7,000 and $20,000 who pay the great proportion of our taxes do not, it seems to me, expect to have their own tax burdens significantly lightened by any reforms which would impose minimum income taxes on wealthy individuals paying at present no or virtually no federal income taxes. What these people want instead is to feel that the tax laws are not instruments designed to favor the rich at the expense of middle-income earners. No right-thinking citizen can fail to condemn as unjust and wasteful a tax system which allowed 155 individuals with adjusted gross incomes in excess of $200,000 and 21 individuals with adjusted gross incomes in excess of $1 million to pay no Federal incomes whatsoever in 1968.

My minimum income tax bill is designed to close down those "tax shelters" most commonly used by wealthy individuals and wealthy corporations to avoid paying a full share of the Federal income tax burden. Yet, recognizing that these tax deduction and tax exemption provisions serve valuable economic and social functions, I believe that the minimum tax rate should be a moderate one, substantially less than the much steeper rate which would be levied on large net individual and corporate incomes under the current tax rate schedules.

Accordingly, I recommend a minimum tax rate of 20% for both individuals and corporations.

An effective minimum income tax must be a broad gauge one. The "tax shelters" which are most commonly used and most often abused by the wealthy must be brought under the jurisdiction of this minimum tax. A narrowly constructed minimum tax might serve only to drive untaxed income from one tax shelter to another tax shelter.

Accordingly, an effective minimum income tax should serve to neutralize those provisions in our tax laws which wealthy individuals and corporations utilize to avoid tax liability. These are:

1. The unlimited charitable contribution deduction.
2. The exclusion of interest on tax-exempt State and municipal bonds.
3. Charitable contributions of appreciated property where the contribution deduction includes gains which have not been taxed to the individual.
4. Percentage depletion derived from income from the extractive industries.
5. Large amounts of income taxed at capital gains rates.
6. Depreciation on real estate making use of the accelerated depreciation rates as opposed to the straight line method of depreciation.
7. Farm losses which have been offset against non-farm income by individuals or corporations only peripherally involved in farming.
8. Credits allowed individuals and corporations for taxes imposed by foreign countries.

I recommend to the Committee my own minimum income tax bill (H.R. 7744) as a bill incorporating the two ingredients most essential to any effective and equitable minimum income tax bill: a moderate tax rate and a broad income base.

II. I support the recommendations of the Treasury Department regarding individual income tax relief for persons in poverty.

Under today's law single individuals and all but the largest families may be subject to income tax even though they are living in poverty. This results from the fact that the present individual exemptions and standard deductions are lower than the poverty income levels. There is thus a clear case of the need for tax relief at these income levels. The most effective way to provide relief at low income levels and to concentrate the associated revenue loss at such levels is through an increase in the minimum standard deduction.

Accordingly, I support the Treasury recommendation that the minimum standard deduction be increased from the present $200 plus $100 for each allowable exemption to $600 plus $100 for each allowable exemption (subject to the same overall limit of $1,000 that exists under present law). Out of the 2.2 million families in poverty who are subject to Federal income tax under present law, about 1.2 million would become nontaxable and the remaining 1 million would receive tax reductions.

PRAISE FOR REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD POFF'S DAUGHTER

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

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, when the news is headlined by stories of demonstrations on college campuses, I think the recent article about Representative POFF's daughter Becky is particularly refreshing. I submit it for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from the Roanoke World-News of March 7, 1969, so that my colleagues may also enjoy it.

NO LIMELIGHT FOR BECKY POFF

(By Sandra Kelly)

"Just a politician's daughter" is the way Becky Poff, 21, likes to think of herself.

The psychology senior at Roanoke College, daughter of Rep. Richard Poff and newly engaged, prefers to "stand back and be proud of Daddy because about the only exciting thing I've done is be his daughter."

Becky says her father always tried to protect the family and keep it out of the limelight as much as possible. "We cherish our hours together and our idea of real fun is bouncing around Fairfax County in Daddy's old jeep. It's a man's jeep . . . no springs in the back . . . but we're really a family when we get those moments together."

And Rep. "Daddy" Poff has kept out of Becky's domain as much as possible too—except for fairly strict rules ("I was the only high school senior who had to be in by midnight.")

Until he accepted an invitation to speak at Roanoke College's commencement exercise this year, Rep. Poff had "never spoken anywhere" for his daughter mainly because she'd "never asked him. I wouldn't want to take credit for anything he had done."

Becky, who recently announced her engagement to Jay Marshall, descendant of Chief Justice John Marshall and a young man "who didn't impress me much at first," is a quiet young woman who sees herself as the calm, college type as opposed to the protester of today.

She has been spending her college time working at the local rehabilitation center and the Veteran's Hospital "to help with tuition" and taking part in Young Republican activities where she's "always embarrassed if I'm recognized."

Her only protest was toward fiancee Jay who confidently said the first time he spied Becky, "Someday, you're going to be mine."

"All I could think was well, what is this?" she laughs now.

Becky is "surprised" by protesting on campuses. She's surprised that students go to such extremes. "If they really feel this that's excellent, but I don't like the way they're going about it."

"You can't swing the pendulum all the way," she says, "and you can't get to the older generation by demonstrations. Fussing, screaming and yelling get you nowhere. It's sitting down and talking that helps.

"It would frighten me," she adds, "if some of these young people (the extreme protesters) get into major offices someday."

The Radford native would never like to be "active" in politics; probably, she admits, because she is a politician's daughter. "I'd rather listen to a man than a woman politician and I could never comprehend a woman president.

"I'm going to be a homebody and raise children," Becky says.

She believes her fear of politics goes back to when she would attend debates and meetings with her father "and listen to the hecklers."

"It bothered me," she says, "and I had to grow up to accept it."

Becky believes that when you miss things you cherish them all the more when they are available. She never spent a whole year in the same school—having to move to the Washington area when Congress was in session. Her family had little time together because of Rep. Poff's busy life.

So now, she works at school and family togetherness, cares nothing for Washington's political and social life and likes a quiet date sitting at home talking.

Becky admits she's "old fashioned," and she was delighted that Jay followed an almost forgotten tradition and asked her father for permission to marry her before he asked her.

"In fact, he didn't ask me for sometime. He lost his nerve when it came to me," she says.

Becky, who holds a "senior key" giving freedom of leaving and entering the domitory at odd hours, says she has no trouble "regulating" herself. "I'm so scared I'll lose my key that I pin it to my sweater with a safety pin."

And she has no sympathy for those who are expelled from college for misuse of privileges.

Becky has now had the opportunity of casting her vote for the first time. She doesn't believe she was ready to vote at 18, but agrees that "maybe the boys who are drafted should be able to."

She is a member of Chi Omega, the Goodwin Society and was section editor for the yearbook at the college.

But Becky has had little chance to talk politics with her father. "We don't discuss issues," she explains. "He does talk to my friends about youth, trying to understand the problems of today.

"But he doesn't understand because of the generation gap," she adds. "He can say, though, that I don't know but I can tell you what the young people say."

That's one of the reasons she likes being "just Daddy's daughter."

RULE CHANGE RELATING TO INTRODUCTION OF IMMIGRATION BILLS

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

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to explain to the Congress a change in the rules of the Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which will have a substantial effect upon private immigration legislation.

This change has become necessary to protect the integrity of our immigration system. I am firmly convinced that the new rule will be welcomed by the Members as an important measure of relief from increasingly heavy pressure to in-

troduce private bills without merit and lacking in the equities necessary for ultimate enactment into law.

The new rule approved yesterday by the House Committee on the Judiciary simply provides that hereafter the introduction of private bills for visitors, exchange visitors and students, will not stay deportation. In other words, alien visitors will no longer be permitted to remain in the United States pending a final decision upon a private bill introduced to grant them immigrant status, unless the subcommittee finds justifiable grounds for an exception. I assure you Members with meritorious cases will always be able to petition the Subcommittee on Immigration for a waiver of the rule. However, thousands of aliens whose private bills have no chance for ultimate favorable decision will no longer be able to remain in the United States for long periods taking employment opportunities away from U.S. citizens, and subverting our immigration program.

The abuses to the corrected by this rule change have multiplied in the last few years. Initially, the introduction of a private bill automatically stayed deportation in all cases. In 1947, a rule was adopted that the subcommittee would not request reports from the Attorney General—thus staying deportation—on bills for stowaways, deserting seamen, and border jumpers. This rule was initially resisted by some Congressmen but soon became accepted and actually relieved Congressmen of embarrassing requests for private legislation in weak cases. In 1967, the rule was broadened to include those who entered the United States as transients enroute to third countries and illegally remain in this country.

The agreement between the House committee and the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization has been that the Immigration and Naturalization Service will stay deportation in the case of any alien—other than a stowaway, deserting crewman, border crosser, or transient—who is the subject of a private bill introduced in the House on which the committee has requested a departmental report. The stay has not applied in the case of an alien in whose behalf legislation has been disapproved by either the House or the Senate committee unless the disapproving committee notified the Commissioner that further consideration would be given to that case. Reports were automatically requested, upon receipt of information as required by rule 4 of the Committee Rules of Procedure, in all cases except those as outlined in rules 6 and 11. If a case was not reached during the Congress in which it was first introduced, the reintroduction of that bill acted as a further stay of deportation until such time as the new Congress has had an opportunity to consider the case.

In recent years the number of private immigration bills to grant immigrant status to aliens who entered the United States as nonimmigrant visitors has multiplied to such an extent that the Immigration Subcommittee has been unable to remain current. In the 90th Congress, 6,278 private immigration bills were introduced—the largest number ever introduced in a single Congress. Of this number, only 216 were found meritorious and enacted into law. A total of 5,968 private bills were introduced in the House alone and 4,846 were pending—unable to be reached for decision—when the second session ended. At least 85 percent of these bills were for visitors, exchange visitors, and students.

Hundreds of those bills were first introduced in the 89th Congress and consequently the subjects have been permitted to remain in the United States for as much as 4 years under the protection of the bill—in most cases after approximately 1 to 2 years of temporary residence in this country prior to introduction. In almost all cases, they are separated from the closest members of their family. Many have wives or husbands and children residing abroad. Others, single beneficiaries, have parents abroad as well as brothers or sisters both here and abroad.

As you can see, the introduction of such large numbers of private immigration raises questions and has significant consequences.

First, with a total immigration of 170,000 per year authorized by general law—outside the Western Hemisphere which had unlimited immigration until July 1, 1968—to have over 6,000 private bills—many involving more than one person—in a 2-year period is a rather high number of proposed exceptions to the general law.

Second, unfortunately, it has become increasingly obvious that a large number of aliens are coming to this country under the false claim that they are nonimmigrant visitors when, in fact, they intend to seek employment and remain here permanently. When they are detected violating their visitor status by overstaying their authorized stay, and by taking employment, they importune Congressmen to introduce a private bill to grant them immigrant status.

The fact is that, except for a very, very few, these bills are of a nature that could not possibly receive favorable action under almost any circumstances. You may be interested to know that the 90th Congress enacted private immigration bills benefiting only 10 persons in the categories of nonimmigrant aliens affected by the rule change.

Most bills merely buy time for beneficiaries to stay in the United States and build up equities or qualify administratively for admission while the subcomittee falls further and further behind in its docket. That is, a large proportion of the bills have no chance for ultimate favorable consideration under established policies—but by reason of their introduction they permit some aliens to stay in the United States, marry U.S. citizens and take employment, raise U.S. children, and as a result, gain preferred positions for admission under general law. A situation exists where the introduction of private bills is being used primarily as a delaying tactic to prevent deportation—bills with no chance of favorable action but which, by their introduction, buy time during which the beneficiary may qualify under the general law. The subcommittee has always looked with disfavor upon such bills since they would benefit those who violate the law over aliens who apply for immigrant status in the home country under the general law and patiently wait their turn for admittance.

A final unhappy consequence of the huge volume of private immigration bills is that the Immigration Subcommittee is delayed and obstructed in its consideration of the good and meritorious private bills and the important task of dealing with needed changes in the general law.

I suggest that the reasons for the rule change are obvious and new policy has been long overdue. Members need have no fear that the new rule will prejudice them with respect to private immigration bills of merit. The rule can be waived upon showing a good cause. Thus, if an alien, by reason of an unusual set of circumstances, has valid and equitable grounds justifying a private bill, the subcommittee has procedures whereby deportation can be stayed and the member heard. I can assure you that for my part, and I am confident I speak for all minority members, the rights of every member will be fully protected.

BILL TO LIMIT FARM PAYMENTS

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to redirect toward more constructive uses some of the tax money now being invested in farm program payments.

My bill has three sections:

First, a provision limiting to $20,000 the aggregate annual payments under the various farm programs which can be made to any single farm, and limiting to $10,000 the annual payment for any single program.

According to a study completed in the final months of his administration by Agricultural Under Secretary John A. Schnittker, these limitations would achieve budget savings of about $300 million a year "without serious adverse effects on production or on the effectiveness of production adjustment programs."

Second, a provision increasing by $100 million annually the authorization for food stamps. The present ceiling is $340 million, and my proposal would bring the total to $440 million for fiscal year 1970 under a comparable increase for the first 6 months of 1971.

Third, a provision increasing by $100 million annually the authorization for water and sewer system grants to rural communities under the Farmers Home Administration. The present ceiling is $50 million annually, and my proposal would bring the total to $150 million.

If my district is typical, and I believe it is, every congressional district with rural areas has many small towns and villages where water and sewer facilities are substandard. In fact, several in my district have been declared by health authorities to be unfit, but because of the financial position of the population, and rising construction costs, modern fa-

cilities simply cannot be built without some grant money.

In effect, my bill would take some of the money now going to millionaire farmers and spend it in ways more constructive to the economic health of rural America. The money invested in food stamps would not only help to meet the nutritional needs of low-income people throughout the United States. It would benefit farmers by creating additional cash markets for their produce.

The money invested in rural communities through grant assistance in water and sewer improvement would help meet basic needs for people living in those communities—many of whom are elderly and attempting to survive on social security income. Equally important, it would make these smaller communities more attractive as places for younger people to live and work, and hopefully attract industrial growth, which in turn will help to reverse the trend which concentrates people in explosive big-city circumstances.

The diversion of funds by the testimony of no less an authority than former Under Secretary Schnittker will not impair seriously the effectiveness of existing commodity programs. At the same time it will eliminate the anomoly under some farming interests have collected annual payments as high as $1 million a year.

Last year, in connection with my efforts to establish a $20,000 limitation on payments, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—page H8362, September 9, 1968—a list of each farmer in the United States receiving in 1967 payments exceeding $20,000.

Under my bill, these farmers would continue to be eligible for $20,000 a year but no more. In my view, it makes sense to shift some of the above $20,000 in payments from these individuals to Food Stamps and rural community development.

My proposal also provides relief for the U.S. Treasury and the citizens who support it. The limitation would yield a budget saving of about $300 million, and after $100 million each is diverted to Food Stamps and rural community development, approximately $100 million a year would remain for net budget reduction.

Information concerning the USDA study of the effect of payment limitations and the attitude of Dr. Schnittker are set forth in the attached articles, the first being an Associated Press report dated Monday, and the second an article by Burt Schorr which appeared in the March 3 issue of the Wall Street Journal:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 3, 1969]

BATTLE ON LIMITING U.S. FARM PAYMENTS LIKELY TO BE REVIVED BY AGENCY PROPOSAL

(By Burt Schorr)

WASHINGTON.—The ceiling on Government payments to farmers could be set as low as $5,000 per crop program and $10,000 per farm "without serious adverse effects on production or on the effectiveness of production adjustment programs."

That's the gist of a proposal worked up by Agriculture Department Democrats a few weeks before they left office. It's likely to revive a heated wrangle over limiting Government payments to farmers.

The proposal never got beyond a draft policy statement polished by then Under Secretary John A. Schnittker. The reasons: White House enthusiasm for a payment-ceiling study apparently evaporated after the November election, and Mr. Schnittker's boss, Secretary Orville Freeman, found it difficult to reverse his prior public position that payment limitations would destroy the supply-management effectiveness of major crop programs.

But the draft is currently being read with interest in Congressional and Executive Branch offices here and seems to offer the sharpest blade yet for Capitol Hill liberals bent on cutting back big crop payments to well-off farmers. The case for payment lids seems likely to get far wider attention if, as expected, Mr. Schnittker is called as a Congressional hearing witness later this year.

BREAKDOWN BY CROPS

For one thing, a table appended to the draft statement supplies the department's first payment breakdown on producers getting $10,000 or more under each of the cotton, feed-grain and wheat programs. Federal payments to individuals of $5,000 and up from all the programs combined have been available for two years. But a breakdown by crops—considered an essential step in limitations planning—had been lacking.

In 1967—the year on which the Agriculture Department's calculations were based—cotton payments exceeding $10,000 each went to nearly 8,200 growers, who accounted for almost half of total U.S. cotton production. The overall cotton payments in excess of the hypothetical $10,000 ceiling amounted to $262 million, or more than five times the excess for wheat and feed grains combined. Among the recipients was Sen. Eastland; the Mississippi Democrat and members of his family collected a total of $211,000 in crop payments that year, mostly for cotton-program participation.

By comparison, only 850 wheat growers, producing a mere 1% of total U.S. wheat in 1967, received more than $10,000 each in wheat payments. Similarly, fewer than 4,600 producers of feed grains (primarily corn and grain sorghums), with about 10% of overall U.S. production, got more than $10,000.

Based on the findings of this new computer analysis, the Schnittker draft concludes that a payment ceiling as low as $5,000 per program and $10,000 per farm could be imposed. But it suggests that a limit of $10,000 per program or $20,000 per farm is a more realistic objective.

Budget savings of perhaps $300 million annually could be expected on the more than $3 billion Uncle Sam currently pours into direct farm payments, the Schnittker draft contends. Advocates of payment limitations envision money saved in this manner being reallocated to fatten Government food aid to the poor or to job training and land retirement for low-income farmers.

As might be expected, top Republican newcomers at the Agriculture agency are reserving judgment until the Nixon Administration has time to investigate payment ceilings on its own; nonetheless, one of them confides that if limitations worked as touted, "we could all be heroes." Even if benefits from such a program don't live up to expectations, one department economist believes a limit on payments would be an important transitional step toward reduced Government intervention in commodity marketing—a long-term objective of the new Administration.

A HANDY TARGET

Whatever the practical arguments, fat Federal payments, particularly to big cotton and sugar planters, clearly have become a handy target for those who charge that farm subsidies make the rich richer and dont do enough for poor rural residents. There already is a $2,500 ceiling on conservation payments, while the sugar program has a sliding scale weighted to smaller growers, but no top limit. Of the five payees receiving more than $1 million from Uncle Sam in 1967, two were in the sugar program and three in cotton.

Last summer, liberal Republicans and Democrats in the House joined forces to tack a $20,000 payment ceiling on the bill extending major crop legislation for one year. The amendment later was eliminated from the final House-Senate version, but leaders in the ceiling fight made it plain they will raise the issue again. When they do, the Schnittker draft policy and the crop-by-crop payments breakdown it discloses are bound to be wielded as one of their biggest weapons.

Supporters of the Schnittker draft contend a $10,000 ceiling would affect so few wheat farmers that there wouldn't be any significant harm if some of them dropped out of the program to produce their crop without regard to Government acreage restrictions. The threat of a surplus buildup resulting from ceilings for feed-grains payments is somewhat greater, but proponents of the $10,000 limit contend this can be offset by sweetening acreage-diversion inducements for smaller growers.

To make payment limitations as painless as possible under all three programs, the draft suggests imposing them gradually over a three-year period. Wheat and cotton producers also might be allowed increases in their acreage allotments commensurate with their payment decrease, while feed-grain producers could be permitted similar reductions in land diversion required under the Government program.

Mr. Schnittker believes that, given such an opportunity, producers of high-quality cotton in the Mississippi River delta, Arizona and California, where farms tend to be big and efficient, would elect to expand acreage.

This is sharply disputed by payment-ceiling foes. Horace D. Godfrey, former Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service administrator who now is Washington representative for domestic sugar cane growers, asserts total cotton production costs simply are too high for this to happen.

The counter argument for some department economists is that such calculations are distorted by inflated cotton land values; they say operating costs, which include fertilizer, seed and labor, would be a better guide—a view bolstered by continuing pressure from Western growers for increased cotton acreage allotments.

What both sides agree on is that intensive computer studies are needed to determine what cotton growers would do when faced with a ceiling—turn to livestock, perhaps causing still more rural unemployment; switch to alternative crops like soybeans or vegetables, and maybe soften prices for those commodities; or remain in cotton.

One Government cotton expert believes there would be a tendency for big landowners to lease or sell their cotton tracts to bring payments within any ceiling. Others predict more troublesome methods of avoiding the ceiling's effect would develop. Even a $20,000 limitation would produce an "absolute administrative monstrosity," warns Mr. Godfrey, who as ASCS chief oversaw compliance with crop programs. One of his predictions: Landowners who lease cotton acres to tenants and take the Federal payments as rental might instead opt to give each tenant the Government cash—thus keeping individual payments within the ceiling—and take all fiber raised as rental.

The Schnittker draft acknowledges that ceiling-evasion tactics would present "serious administrative problems." Any ceiling "would need to be backed up by a firm policy against such farm-splitting," it adds. "There would need to be strict, uniformly administrated regulations to back up the law. As much as

one-third to one-half of the potential savings might otherwise be lost," the draft warns.

Even without such calculated evasion, farmers who serve on the ASCS committees in each county might be hard-pressed to determine bone fide changes in family farm partnerships and small corporations. "It would be impossible for Washington, for a state administrative committee, and especially for a farmer-elected county committee to distinguish changes for causes other than those which would be a direct result of payment limits," the draft states.

But the draft concludes that such problems aren't decisive and "are not good reasons for opposing payment limits."

SCHNITTKER WOULD LIMIT FARMER AID

Dr. John A. Schnittker, former Under Secretary of Agriculture, says he favored some type of limitation on Government payments to farmers during the later years of the Johnson Administration. But he said he kept silent because it would have been against Democratic policy to speak out.

Johnson farm policies, spearheaded by former Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, were strongly opposed to any ceilings on direct farm payments, which last year totaled about $3.5 billion.

Schnittker, an agricultural economist, is now with the Alfred P. Sloan School of Management at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

He said in a telephone interview yesterday that when large surpluses of major crops such as wheat, cotton and feed grains existed in the early 1960s "there was some merit in opposing payment limitations," but that after 1964 or so when stockpiles were reduced "that's when I came around to having some thoughts about limitations."

Schnittker said he dissented privately with the Johnson Administration on this subject, but now, he said, there is need for a public airing. He said he would be glad to testify at any Congressional hearings if asked.

Schnittker said that for the first time Congress has enough facts to determine the question and that he "would try to show that limitations would not wreck farm programs."

Freeman and other Johnson farm leaders contended that restricting payments would force large-scale farmers from Federal production control programs.

SENATOR MILTON YOUNG MARKS HISTORIC ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1945, MILTON R. YOUNG, of LaMoure, N. Dak., was appointed to the U.S. Senate by Gov. Fred G. Aandahl to fill the vacancy caused by the death of John Moses.

Prior to that time, he served on the school township and on his county AAA boards and was elected to the State house of representatives in 1932, the State senate in 1934; was elected president pro tempore of that body in 1941, and majority floor leader in 1943.

"Mr. Wheat," as he is affectionately referred to by the Members of the other body and by our fellow farmers in North Dakota, was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1946 and relected in 1950, 1956, 1962, and 1968, each time by a large majority reflecting the love and respect his fellow North Dakotans have for him.

He is now the second ranking Republican in the Senate in terms of seniority, ranking minority member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and second ranking on the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, as well as secretary to the Republican conference.

Today, on his 24th anniversary in the Senate, MILTON YOUNG has now served North Dakota in Congress longer than any other man in the history of our State.

I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues MILTON YOUNG's distinguished record of service to our State and to the Nation.

ANTITRUST LAWS MUST BE AMENDED TO PROVIDE FOR NEW COMPETITION

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

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is the purpose and intent of the antitrust laws to foster and preserve competition wherever possible. This admirable goal has been perverted, however, in the application of the antitrust laws to newspapers, and more particularly to joint operating arrangements. Newspapers have entered into joint operating arrangements, that is a merging of their commercial functions, when there is not enough of a market to support commercial competition between them. By entering such an arrangement, the two papers are able to preserve two separate news and editorial voices for the cities involved.

Obviously, the ideal would be to have both commercial and editorial competition. We must recognize, however, the economic facts of life as they apply to newspapers. In city after city across the country newspapers have died and are dying. They compete for advertising with TV, radio, weekly shopping guides, magazines, and billboards. There just is not enough of a market to support full commercial competition by two papers in all but a very few cities. This economic law can be neither repealed nor amended.

We still have the opportunity of providing competition in news and editorial services. Through the use of joint operating arrangements, 22 cities today have such competition, and the "newspaper preservation bill" would assure that this competition will continue.

This Nation can ill afford to have a news voice stilled. Yet, the clear result of the Supreme Court's decision in the Tucson newspaper case would be to still 22 such voices. Such a result is contrary to the intent and purposes of the antitrust laws, which must be amended to provide for news competition.

CHANGES IN RULES OF PROCEDURE AFFECTING PRIVATE IMMIGRATION BILLS

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the rules of procedure for Subcommittee No. 1, Immigration and Nationality, were adopted yesterday by the Committee on the Judiciary. There is a significant change in the rules which I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of the House.

Prior to the adoption of the new rules, rule 6 of the rules of procedure stated:

The Subcommittee shall not address to the Attorney General communications designed to defer deportation of beneficiaries of private bills who have entered the United States as stowaways, in transit, or deserting seamen, or by surreptiously entering without inspection through the land or sea borders of the United States.

Rule 6 has now been amended to include visitors, exchange visitors, and students within the purview of this rule. Consequently, the introduction of private immigration legislation in behalf of a visitor, exchange visitor, and student, will no longer automatically stay deportation of an alien who has violated the terms of his admission to the United States.

This change in the rules was necessitated by the increasing number of private immigration bills obviously lacking in merit and introduced merely to stay deportation. The subcommittee unanimously agreed that it cannot condone the actions of nonimmigrants who violate their status and then exert every possible pressure on Members of Congress to have private legislation introduced to stay their deportation.

At this point, let me assure the House that the rules of procedure furthermore provide for an exemption from this rule if the subcommittee determines that the consideration of a private bill is solely designed to prevent an extreme hardship. As we have in the past, we shall continue in the future to give every possible consideration where the author submits evidence establishing a need for private legislation to alleviate or avoid extreme hardship.

The private immigration bill, as an extraordinary remedy, should be resorted to only after every possible administrative remedy has been exhausted and there still remains sufficient hardship or unusual circumstances to justify action by the Congress. During the 90th Congress, 6,278 private immigration bills were introduced—the largest in any Congress—and of this number only 216 became private law, 915 were adversely acted upon for lack of merit or because they were unnecessary, and 4,846 bills were left pending.

Eighty-five percent of the private bills introduced in the last Congress were in behalf of students, exchange visitors, and visitors.

The committee has consistently adhered to the policy of not acting favorably on private bills designed to take one intending immigrant out of turn for permanent residence to the obvious detriment of other immigrants who are patiently waiting abroad for the issuance of a visa. If there are more aliens desirous of immigrating to the United States than the law provides, the only orderly procedure is to get a place in line and await the proper turn.

The overload of private immigration bills, although the committee has diligently considered private bills week after week, makes it impossible to consider every bill introduced during the session

of Congress and delays consideration of worthwhile private bills which the committee is prone to approve. The consideration of dilatory private bills sacrifices valuable time of the subcommittee, the full committee, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Department of State as well. The delay in deportation that a private bill might have given to a visitor who has violated the terms of his admission is not justified by the great expense both in time and money.

Private bills have over the course of the years demonstrated a need to amend the general law. The committee has responded to the need and legislation has been recommended to Congress. Examples of public legislation enacted as a result of private bills have been waivers of the grounds of excludability based upon tuberculosis, convictions of crime, mental retardation, misrepresentation, and the admission of adopted children.

Such examples have perfected the general law and carry out the policy of reuniting families. Bills designed to take an alien out of turn circumvent the law and violate the basic immigration policy of first come, first served.

The committee is ever cognizant of the fact that there are areas in the Immigration and Nationality Act which may require amendment. The committee has studied these areas and will continue to hold hearings on possible amendments to the law.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, exactly 10 years ago, on March 12, 1969, by an overwhelming vote of 323 to 89, this great House of Representatives approved "an act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union." The Senate had approved the same measure on the previous day by a 76-to-15 vote.

How vividly I can recall that momentous occasion. The Hawaii Territorial Legislature was then in session. In expectation of a final vote in the U.S. House of Representatives, the Hawaiian legislators had declared a recess and gathered in the throne room of Iolani Palace, which was then serving as the house chamber. I was the majority leader of the house at that time. The Honorable John A. Burns, Hawaii's Delegate to Congress, was in direct telephone communication with us from the cloak room and was relaying to us a blow-by-blow description of the events on the floor of this House. The receiver at the other end of the line was hooked up to an amplifying system in the throne room of Iolani Palace.

When the final vote was announced, there followed a spontaneous deafening cheer which must have lifted the rafters of the throne room—but only for a moment, for a strange and almost unbelievable thing happened. Every member of that tumultuous gathering suddenly found himself gripped by a mystic silence, and, as if guided by an unseen hand, all present joined in silent prayer, with heads bowed, some kneeling, many with tears welling in their eyes, to thank God for the great blessing He had seen fit to bestow upon Hawaii's citizens and to ask Him for His divine guidance in their new and heavier responsibilities. I can never forget the excitement and the gaiety, topped by the overpowering solemnity of that great occasion.

Mr. Speaker, when we of Hawaii were knocking at the congressional door, asking to be admitted into the Union, we contended that as a State we could make greater contributions to the Nation than as an incorporated territory; that we would serve as a showcase of American democracy in the vast Pacific region; that we would help to bridge the gap of understanding between the East and the West; that we would develop a viable State economy and become an asset rather than a liabiilty to the Nation as a whole.

After only a decade of statehood, we believe we can now safely ask "Did we not tell you so" and expect an unconditional affirmation.

That Hawaii continues to be, as Mark Twain described it, "the loveliest fleet of islands anchored in any ocean," is obvious to anyone who has enjoyed its eternal spring climate, its swaying palms, its white beaches, and emerald lagoons. Our lovely hula maidens beckon to our shores peoples from all parts of the world—over a million of them last year. Fortunately, statehood has not changed this.

The people too have not changed, for they have continued to assume their responsibilities as full fledged American citizens. We of Hawaii realize that Hawaii today represents a bridge between the East and the West for international cooperation and world peace, and we accept that responsibility.

Working together in harmony and in concert toward their own social, political, economic, and cultural betterment, the people of Hawaii, people of diverse cultural origins, have proven that Hawaii is indeed the showcase of American demoracy. All the anthropologists, sociologists, poets, and romanticists who have written about Hawaii agree on this point.

In delivering his first major civil rights speech on June 8, 1963, our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy, stated that he had chosen to speak in Hawaii, because "Hawaii is what the United States is striving to be."

In our struggle to maintain our friendship with the Afro-Asian nations, we must as a nation, exploit Hawaii's offerings to the fullest. We must take full advantage of Hawaii's great human resource. One of the greatest investments we have ever made in peace is represented in the East-West Center, brought into being by the principal efforts of the then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, the then Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, John A. Burns, and Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY, of New York. At this great institution Asians and Americans have been granted, and continue to have, an opportunity to meet one another in an academic and social environment which lends itself to a dynamic program of interchange in which the participants begin better to understand one another's problems, and to work out mutually acceptable solutions. How much better this is than deciding issues on the battlefield. That most Americans realize this, is evidenced by the nationwide support which the East-West Center has received. We must continue and expand this support if we are to retain our leadership in man's quest for international cooperation and world peace.

Mr. Speaker, on this 10th anniversary of the passage of the Hawaii statehood bill by the Congress, I rise to thank those 147 Members who voted to approve that measure and who are still Members of this august House. I wish to thank also those who voted against Hawaii's admission, but who have since realized their mistake and helped in different ways to make Hawaii the great State that it is today. As one of Hawaii's Representatives to Congress, I assure you that the people I represent are a truly grateful people. They are resolved to continue to prove to their fellow Americans that their gratitude is only exceeded by their willingness to contribute their full share toward a greater America in a better world.

In the words of Hawaii's able Governor, John A. Burns, in its first decade of statehood:

> Hawaii has become the young living, throbbing Heart of the Pacific—no longer merely the inanimate hub, or step-stone, or bridge, or tropical resort—but an example of vibrant life at its best, and an inspiration for millions. In this Heart—small in size but pulsating with the vitality of many Pacific, Asian, American and European races and cultures—there lies a deep empathy for the many moods of the world and an intuitive appreciation of the yearnings and desires of all mankind.

I yield to my colleague, the Congresswoman from Hawaii, Mrs. MINK.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate an historic event that occurred in this House 10 years ago. On the morning of March 12, 1959, this House passed the bill granting statehood to the American Territory of Hawaii. The vote was overwhelming—323 to 89—the bill having passed the Senate the previous night. Three hundred and twenty-three Members of this House voted to make Hawaii the 50th State of the American Union, and many of them had worked hard toward that goal for a long time before that final vote.

On behalf of the people of my State, I wish again this year to offer our commendations and expressions of great gratitude to those 323 Members who voted in our favor, though not all are still here. They placed a great confidence in the people of Hawaii, and the people of Hawaii have fully justified that confidence.

The first decade of Hawaiian statehood has been dynamic years of great accomplishment and progress. Statehood created a new awareness of Hawaii by the people of the mainland States, and many more came to visit our shores than ever before. Ten of thousands who came as visitors to the new State fell in love with it and stayed; they are there now—the new citizens of Hawaii.

The decade of statehood has seen Hawaii grow in every way that a State can grow. We have more people, and so, more homes and schools, more business activity and more new industries that have been attracted to the newest State.

The decade of statehood has been a story of continuing success, year after year. This is clearly indicated by all the indices used to measure economic activity. Population, employment, personal income, construction, agricultural product, retail sales, manufactured product, retail sales, manufactured product, foreign trade, and government expenditures have all increased yearly during the last glowing decade. And all the economic prognosticators agree that the Hawaii boom has but begun. Many of the country's most astute businessmen seem to agree, for they are investing in Hawaii in increasing numbers and in growing dollar volume. The people of Hawaii have reason to feel economically secure.

But business activity is not the only measure of a comunity's life, and in Hawaii, there is much more to be proud of. The cultural and political life of our State is vibrant and exciting. The University of Hawaii is a vigorous and growing institution with an enrollment of nearly 20,000. The East-West Center shares the university campus and attracts students and scholars from all over the world; and the cultural and intellectual exchange at the center is most stimulating to all involved. The Honolulu Symphony Orchestra has attained such stature that Igor Stravinsky was recently a guest conductor, and Van Cliburn, Mischa Elman, and Leonard Pennario have appeared as featured artists.

Hawaii has come a long way since the advent of statehood, and we are pleased with our accomplishments. But we are not resting on them, we have pledged ourselves to the continuing pursuit of excellence.

When this House voted on the question of statehood 10 years ago, the vote was overwhelming, but not unanimous. Today I believe it would be.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her contribution.

I yield now to the great majority leader, a friend of Hawaii and one who voted for the admission of Hawaii.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I congratulate the gentleman from Hawaii on his fine speech, and I congratulate the gentlewoman from Hawaii on her fine speech. I congratulate Hawaii on the outstanding representation it has in the House of Representatives. I also congratulate the State of Hawaii on its 10th birthday, and above all, I congratulate our country for being able to number Hawaii as one of the 50 States. It is truly one of our greatest States.

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep satisfaction that I recall my support 10 years ago of the bill which when passed admitted Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union. With that action we strengthened the United States beyond our power to measure. I believe that of all Americans, Mark Twain would find greater joy in the success story of this wonderful land that stretches 300 miles across the Pacific. Written long years ago, these are words he used to describe it:

> No alien land in all the world has any deep, strong charm for me but that one; no other land could so longingly and beseechingly haunt me, sleeping and waking, through half a lifetime, as that one has done.
>
> Other things leave me, but it abides; other things change, but it remains the same.
>
> For me its balmy airs are always blowing, its summer seas flashing in the sun; the pulsing of its surfbeat is in my ears; I can see its garlanded crags, its leaping cascades, its plumy palms drowsing by the shore, its remote summits floating like islands above the cloud rack; I can feel the spirit of its woodland solitudes; I can hear the plash of its brooks; in my nostrils still lives the breath of flowers that perished twenty years ago.

And now that beautiful chain of islands has become an integral part of our great Nation espousing and defending its ideals of freedom and of liberty.

Several things make Hawaii a distinct and different State. Outside of Oklahoma, when it was admitted to the Union, its people existed in greater number than any other territory. As a territory and a State it has peacefully integrated the races of the earth. Eugene Fodor is authority for the statement that no less than 64 possible racial combinations can be found in Hawaii. It might also be noted that Hawaii is the only American State that is entirely tropical. Again I quote from Mr. Fodor:

> The islands have a tropical beauty of dazzling flowers, bright red soil, pineapples and wind swept storms that cannot be matched in the other 49 States. It serves an unparalleled function as America's gateway both to the South Pacific and to Asia.

When we admitted Hawaii as a State we partially repaid its heroic warriors of World War II. They were soldiers of which this Nation is immensely proud. They became the most decorated units in American military history. No Americans were braver. None were more steadfast. None were stronger in the teeth of adversity.

Now, after 10 years of statehood, Hawaii is making superb progress. Its people live in peace and in prosperity. Each passing year marks the increase of its wealth. At the end of its first decade, we can all rejoice in this great State, and as we welcomed her 10 years ago, we proudly recognize her greatness and her growth. All hail Hawaii, our gem in the west, the "paradise of the Pacific"—the 50th star in Old Glory.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Hawaii yielding on this very auspicious occasion, the 10th anniversary of statehood for the State of Hawaii. I share all of the views expressed by the gentleman from Hawaii and the gentlewoman from Hawaii. I consider it one of the best votes I ever cast when I supported statehood for Hawaii—and also statehood for Alaska. It seemed to me that both, on the basis of all criteria, fully warranted and deserved statehood.

I might add there has been no disappointment from my point of view. The quality of the representation in both the other body and in this body has been excellent, although, of course, I have differed with Hawaii's Representatives at times. I naturally have wanted more representation on our side of the aisle, and we are hopeful that might materialize at some future date.

I say again, however, as I said a moment ago, that those who serve Hawaii in the other body and those who serve her here have done an outstanding job in representing the viewpoints that exist in the 50th State.

May I wish for all the residents of the State of Hawaii the very best in the future. They have had 10 grand and glorious years, and I believe all Americans are happy and delighted that Hawaii became a State and has been such a great State in its first decade.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the minority leader. I appreciate his words, especially in view of the fact that we have two on the opposite side of the aisle from him. But statehood was a bipartisan matter, and I thank the gentleman for his vote 10 years ago.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute today on this 10th anniversary of Hawaiian statehood. I remember well the day, the debate, and the vote.

I certainly should like to join the others in saying it was one of the finest votes I have ever cast, and one I am always proud of.

There is no question that in the 10 years the people of Hawaii have proven time and time again how well deserving they were of statehood and the honor and glory they bring to this great Republic of ours.

I am particularly grateful to the people of Hawaii for the good judgment they have demonstrated in sending us the two outstanding and gifted legislators, the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) and the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

It is my great pleasure to work on the Education and Labor Committee with Mrs. MINK, and I never cease to be amazed at the thorough knowledge she has of the educational needs of her own State and of this country.

So we are grateful to the people of Hawaii for sending us these excellent legislators.

I might add one postscript. The State of Hawaii has a particularly warm spot in my heart, because when the 50-star flag became official on July 4, 1960, I made arrangements to have the Federal official flag flown over the Nation's Capitol for every school, every church, and every hospital in my district. I believe some 240 flags were flown on that day and night. Throughout my district today many of those institutions preserve these historic flags as beautiful mementos of the day when America became a Republic of 50 States.

I wish you well, and I wish the people of Hawaii well on this very auspicious occasion of her 10th birthday.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. His State has given