Chun, Merton M. K., xxxxxxxx.
Courtney, William H., xxxxxxxxx.
Czechut, Mark, xxxxxxxx.
Donnelly, James H., xxxxxxxx.
Fahringer, Robert H., xxxxxxxx.
Giron, Amos D., xxxxxxxx.
Hagwood, Henry M., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Hamilton, Donald C., xxxxxxxx.
Key, Robert C., xxxxxxxx.
Kunde, Gerald R., xxxxxxxx.
Meisel, Bernard F., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Morse, Decatur W., xxxxxxxx.
Murphy, John E., xxxxxxxx.
Patterson, Gordon W., xxxxxxxx.
Peterson, Samuel B., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Robbins, Frederick E., xxxxxxxx.
Roberts, Donald A., xxxxxxxx.
Sanzotera, Robert H., xxxxxxxx.
Serwatka, Walter J., xxxxxxxx.
Soehren, Stephen E., xxxxxxxx.
Stemsley, Sylvester xxxxxxxx.
Sundstrom, Carl F., xxxxxxxx.
Thompson, Charles F., xxxxxxxx.

To be first lieutenant

Atkins, Edsel R., xxxxxxxx.
Augsburger, Grayson T., xxxxxxxx.
Banks, William C., III., xxxxxxxxx.
Barry, Russell W., xxxxxxxx.
Barta, Donald F., xxxxxxxx.
Blaylock, James R., xxxxxxxx.
Bond, Leroy M., xxxxxxxx.
Bouldin, James R. M., xxxxxxxx.
Bray, William G., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Cejka, David C., xxxxxxxx.
Coschignano, Maximill xxxxxxxx.
Cramer, Walter E., xxxxxxxx.
Findlater, John W., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Fousek, Richard J., xxxxxxxx.
Garrett, Jimmie L., xxxxxxxx.
Hallam, William H., xxxxxxxx.
Halliday, Arthur J., xxxxxxxx.
Heimericks, Leonard L., xxxxxxxx.
Herge, John C., xxxxxxxx.
Hicks, Thomas M. B. IV, xxxxxxxx.
Holcomb, Vernon A., xxxxxxxx.
Holt, Ronald J., xxxxxxxx.
Hopkins, Roger N., xxxxxxxxx.
Howe, James R., xxxxxxxx.
Hunt, Carl V., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Hunt, William O., xxxxxxxx.
Hutcheson, Marguerite, xxxxxxxx.
Kollenborn, Byron B., xxxxxxxx.
Lempke, Duane A., xxxxxxxx.
Lightner, George M., xxxxxxxx.
Long, Walter M., xxxxxxxx.
Lumpkin, William L., xxxxxxxx.
Mancini, Thomas M., xxxxxxxx.
McClaskey, John R., xxxxxxxx.
McCloy, Michael N., xxxxxxxx.
McGraw, Marvin E., Sr., xxxxxxxx.
McGurk, Francis W., xxxxxxxx.
Meador, James E., xxxxxxxx.
Mitten, John N., xxxx
Moss, Paul R., xxxxxxxx.
Muse, Frank R., xxxxxxxx.
Orell, Patrick H., xxxxxxxx.
Orr, Robert V., xxxxxxxx.
Pack, John T., xxxxxxxx.
Palmieri, Ralph A., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Person, Rodney M., xxxxxxxxx.
Pheneger, Michael E., xxxxxxxx.
Robb, John Francis, xxxxxxxx.
Sanders, Luther L., xxxxxxxx.
Scott, Billy L., xxxxxxxx.
Seymour, Richard S., xxxxxxxxx.
Shamanski, Daniel M., xxxxxxxx.
Siegrist, George E., xxxxxxxx.
Tarowsky, Edward G., xxxxxxxx.
Thompson, Marilee, xxxxxxxx.
Walters, Billy F., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Weiskopf, James D., xxxxxxxx.

To be second lieutenant

Alton, John F., xxxxxxxx.
Bale, Hugh O., xxxxxxxx.
Brownfield, John R., xxxxxxxx.
Caldwell, John E., xxxxxxxx.
Dennard, Hoyt L., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Goates, Donald R., xxxxxxxx.
Groome, Nelson S., III, xxxxxxxx.
Hansen, William W., xxxxxxxx.
Heindl, Francis J., xxxxxxxx.
Hutchinson, Craig R., xxxxxxxx.
Jeffery, David G., xxxxxxxx.
King, James C., xxxxxxxx.
Montgomery, John E., xxxxxxxx.
Oenning, Lester C., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Ott, John J., Jr., xxxxxxxx.
Padovano, Daniel J., xxxxxxxx.
Pike, Joseph L., xxxxxxxx.
Powell, Raymond F., xxxxxxxx.
Rolston, David A., xxxxxxxx.
Savage, Calvin K., xxxxxxxx.
Shadburn, Robert P., xxxxxxxx.
Sienkiewicz, Richard, xxxxxxxx.
Singer, Joseph B., xxxxxxxx.
Swinehart, Lewis S., xxxxxxxx.
Vukelich, Vincent M., xxxxxxxx.
West, Charles E., xxxxxxxx.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Ackroyd, Harry E.
Allen, Harry C.
Antu, Emilio G.
Armour, Raymond L., Jr.
Arness, Gary N.
Astheimer, Peter F.
Ball, George T.
Barker, Rodney W.
Becker, Ronald J.
Best, Robert B.
Brown, Bruce R.
Buffington, John C.
Castonguay, Cleo P.
Ceo, John J., Jr.
Chesnut, James R.
Cortes, Carlos R.
Deboer,Michael D.
Devault, Lee
Dozier, Larry H.
Fargo, Richard E.
Forte, Michael
Galloway, Arthur L., Jr.
Gibbs, James R.
Gillette, John Milton
Gladd, Edward J.
Goodson, Gerald L.
Gore, Bernard L., Jr.
Guttau, Michael K.
Hagewood, Eugene G.
Heard, Gerald M.
Hernandez, Samuel I.
Hester, Ellsworth G.
Jones, Richard B.
Jones, William W.
Jurchenko, Daniel A.
Katzmann, Steven E.
Kunzig, Michael B.
LaRue, Charles D.
Leatherman, Marlin G.
Leigh, Joseph J., Jr.
Lynn, Milton N.
Malkasian, Douglas E.
Maxwell, Frank F., Jr.
McClinton, Nathaniel
Olson, Donald E.
Peek, Robert S., II
Peterson, Michael H.
Rice, Kenneth E.
Rodriguez, Emilio
Russell, John W.
Stacy, David R.
Stevens, Vlad
Stone, Steven C.
Suir, Burton J.
Taylor, Lewis J., III
Terrell William F.
Till, Peter W.
Watson, Jesse L., III
Williams, Dwight, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, July 10, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Milton B. Crist, Metropolitan Memorial United Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Gracious Heavenly Father, from the very beginning of time the human heart has sought Thee, desiring guidance and understanding.

So, we today would bring our restless spirits into the calm strength of Thine everlasting purpose.

In the confusion of shifting ideas and principles, so prevalent in the world today, help us to hold fast to that which is eternal, because it is grounded in Thy will for mankind.

Bestow upon us the patience to seek more deeply a firm understanding of the true values in life, so that we do not drift first one way then another, but walk steadily in the path of righteousness that Thou hast set before us.

Help us to enlarge our capacity for appreciation and grant to us that waiting and receptive attitude of soul, wherein we may find the hidden springs of high endeavor and fruitful action.

May we have the courage and the wisdom to build justice into every area of our national life.

Lead us to discover the thrill of true brotherhood—when every man can trust his neighbor, because he, himself, has learned to be trustworthy.

Grant to each of us the dedication necessary to play our part in the things that matter most in our time, and thus leave the world a better place for our having been here. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11400) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate concurred in the House amendments to Senate amendments Nos. 6, 7, 8, 40, 42, and 90.

The message also announced that the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1583) entitled "An act to provide that appointments and promotions in the Post Office Department, including the postal field service, be made on the basis of merit and fitness," together with all accompanying papers.

ACTION ON DDT BY AGRICULTURE

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, it has been announced that the Department of Agriculture has suspended use of DDT and eight other "hard" pesticide compounds in its programs, pending a 30-day review.

In the face of overwhelming evidence that DDT is a menace to environment and wildlife, I feel sure that definite danger to man will be proven in relatively short order. In the meantime, getting this pesticide out of mass circulation and use is imperative, and this has been a necessary first move by Agriculture. Now individual States and jurisdictions have excellent reason to follow this example.

The other day I called for just this action, and although this is not a permanent ban, I feel hopeful that it will be extended until conclusive evidence is in.

Now that we have pushed this potential killer out of the Government's programs, we must insure that its use is not restored at the end of 30 days. I fervently hope that the Government will also see fit to consider my proposal of making the ban total on a coast-to-coast basis. This can be done by forbidding further manufacture through Executive order, and further shipment across State lines.

It would be most desirable if the Department of Agriculture will use its innumerable services to our Nation's farmers to advise them not to use DDT or other "hard" pesticides which have such long lives. Dissemination of such urgings in the broadest sense would cut their use down further. The result would be less runoff of residues into watersheds. I believe it is utterly essential to mount as broad an attack against further use of these poisons as soon as possible. All scientific opinion, including that of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, seems to point in this direction. Every further ounce of these substances poured into the environment adds to our national danger.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works may sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GLADYS SWARTHOUT

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, the world of music is poorer today because of the death of Gladys Swarthout.

Miss Swarthout, who passed away the day before yesterday, was born in Deepwater, Mo., a small community in Henry County which is in the Fourth Missouri District, which I am privileged to represent. She was a child prodigy and started her career as a member of a church choir in this little community at the age of 13, and then went on at the early age of 20 to the Chicago Civic Opera.

Not only did Gladys Swarthout thrill the world of music during the early 1930's, but also she made that a golden age of music.

Miss Swarthout was a mezzo-soprano whose good looks made her one of the Met's most glamorous stars. She slept away the other day in Florence, Italy, where for the past 10 years she has maintained her summer home. Although she was 64 she appeared at least 20 years younger.

In the 1950's she appeared in many movies including "Ambush," "Champagne Waltz," "Give Us This Night," and "Romance in the Park."

While her first radio broadcast was for General Motors in 1930, thereafter she appeared regularly on shows as the "Ford Symphony," the "Prudential Family Hour," and the "Camel Caravan."

Miss Swarthout introduced a good deal of new music and tried to get away from the stereotyped. When she was told that audiences wanted only the potboilers, she replied, "This simply isn't true."

Deepwater, Mo., and all those who remember her from her childhood grieve today because of the passing of this great star. All of west-central Missouri mourns today because those who live in that area were able to claim her as one of their own and to enjoy the reflected glory that was hers. She was a beautiful lady, who was loved not because of her beauty, but because of her talents.

I repeat, the world of music is poorer today because of the passing of the great lady of music, Miss Gladys Swarthout.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT, SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Government Procurement of the Select Committee on Small Business be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 12549 UNTIL MIDNIGHT SATURDAY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight on Saturday, July 12, to file a report on H.R. 12549, the Environmental Quality Council.

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

There was no objection.

A BILL TO BAN GLUE AND PAINT PRODUCTS CONTAINING TOXIC SOLVENTS

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

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which will give the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the authority to ban the use of solvents in paint and glue products which are used for "sniffing" by our young people.

The deliberate inhalation of vapors from these products is a serious problem in Hawaii and the Nation. While full information is still being sought on the potential toxic effects of prolonged "sniffing," it is clear that this is a highly dangerous practice. Solvents in the vapors can act as poisons, resulting in permanent damage to the nervous system and liver, and large enough doses can be fatal. Some children have died as a result of glue or paint "sniffing."

Children take up the "sniffing" habit in search of "thrills" or "kicks." A 1962 report by the National Clearinghouse for Poison Control Centers noted that "such inhalation can cause a syndrome resembling acute alcoholic intoxication." A study of young boys using these products showed that all became "drunk," "dizzy," or euphoric.

The 1962 report said:

> A number described vivid dreams, often in color, or hallucinations. . . . There was some evidence that these feelings either could or did lead to impulsive or destructive behavior, possibly even more frequently than in persons acutely intoxicated by ethyl alcohol.

Because of the seriousness of the problem, various efforts have been made to combat glue and paint "sniffing"—but so far, none have succeeded. Drs. Edward Press and Alan K. Done, in the journal Pediatrics, reported in 1967:

> Thousands of adolescents and teen-aged youngsters in many cities throughout the United States and other countries are deliberately inhaling vapors of a wide variety of organic solvents in order to induce repeated states of inebriation. Although the practice itself is not new, its occurrence in epidemic proportions in many areas and the passage of legislation prohibiting the act in many cities and States in the United States have brought the problem into nationwide prominence.

My own State of Hawaii, where the "sniffing" problem is particularly acute, is among those which have outlawed the practice. Other States acting in this field include New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Illinois, and Maryland. Yet making "sniffing" a crime merely punishes the victims, our children, and it does not really prevent the practice since law enforcement authorities cannot reasonably be expected to find and arrest all of the thousands of children who may be secretly seeking thrills in this reckless and dangerous manner.

Other possible methods of solving the problem include finding substitute solvents which will not produce intoxicating effects, or including obnoxious substances during the manufacture of glue and paint so as to discourage deliberate inhalation of the fumes. While these solutions may seem reasonably easy to achieve, manufacturers have failed to act. It is difficult to say whether this is because of technical problems or simply the failure to assign enough importance to the "sniffing" syndrome.

The fourth conference on inhalation of model airplane glue solvents was held in Berkeley, Calif., on January 17, 1963. It included representatives of industry, law enforcement, and health agencies. At this meeting it was reported that of 94 additive compounds which were under investigation in 1962, 48 were selected and further investigation narrowed the field to 17. To date, however, it appears that no acceptable substitute has been found.

The Hobby Industry Association of America, Inc., has helped coordinate the efforts of manufacturers to find a solution. Prior to 1964, a leading biochemical laboratory was retained to develop a substance which could be added to model glue to produce sneezing, nausea, or other unpleasant effects if purposely inhaled in excessive concentrations, and/or a substitute solvent for model glue.

In response to my inquiry this year, the association stated:

> The findings of the biochemical laboratory retained by our Association were forwarded to each of our adhesive manufacturers several years ago. Considerable testing and additional research has and is being done in the laboratories of our manufacturers. As of this date, we have nothing specific to report regarding an acceptable additive.

Later, the association's counsel informed me:

> More recently we have some indication that a solution may have been found . . . An effort is now being made to check out the preliminary findings which appear to be favorable.

I hope that the industry will indeed find a solution, but the years of delay are not cause for optimism. Nor is the association's stated position that legislation outlawing "sniffing" will provide the tools needed to control the social problem.

It seems far more likely to me that the inclusion of an obnoxious substance would end "sniffing." As long as they believe that glue or paint "sniffing" is fun and can produce a "kick," children are not going to be able to resist the temptation to experiment—regardless of the existence of a law against it. Thus, it is up to our scientific and technological brains to come up with a solution. In a time when we are sending men to the moon, it is difficult to believe that such a substance cannot be found.

The potential solution seems so simple that I believe it can be required by law. My bill would simply give the Secretary authority to ban glue and paint products used for "sniffing" under the Hazardous Substances Act. This would place the responsibility squarely on the shoulders of the manufacturers to substitute nontoxic solvents, include nauseating substances, or prove that either solution is impossible.

I am interested in hearing the evidence supporting the industry's position when hearings are held on my bill.

Finally, to give indication of the seriousness of the "sniffing" problem, I am including at the close of my remarks an article from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of June 23, 1969, analyzing a study of Hawaii's young "sniffers." The study shows that in the past 4 years the number of Oahu youngsters referred to the family court for drug offenses has registered an astounding increase of 1,449 percent. As the article states, while the national emphasis is on the marihuana problem, "we in Hawaii must pay much more heed to the increasing rate of paint sniffing."

Solvent sniffing is a deadly problem to the young people of Hawaii and the rest of the Nation, and I urge my colleagues to give full consideration to this legislation to protect our young people from its dangers.

The Star-Bulletin article follows:

ISLE YOUNGSTERS TURN TO DRUGS IN GROWING NUMBERS

(By Tomi Knaefler)

The number of Oahu youngsters referred to the Family Court for drug offenses during the past four fiscal years represented a startling upsurge of 1,449 per cent.

This is revealed in the first definitive study of a sample of Hawaii's young drug users just completed by Dr. Christopher E. Barthel III, mental health consultant to Hawaii's Family Court System.

The psychologist stresses that the study is confined to youngsters, who have been arrested and referred to the Family Court.

For interpretations of the data, therefore, he warns that "there are probably large numbers of young people in the community who use drugs of various sorts who are never arrested . . ." They and users already under court supervision were not included in this study.

His survey shows that drug referrals here totaled 59 in 1964–65 and soared in this way during the succeeding years: 109, 297 and 907.

The tally for the first three months of this year is already at 218 and Barthel estimates that the number for sniffing arrests alone will likely spill over 1,000 by the end of this year.

Four out of five of those studied were males coming from a wide range of racial and income groups. While most of them lived in Honolulu, cases reflected a widespread geographical scattering.

Half of the youngsters were from families where one or both of the original parents were absent.

According to Barthel, the referrals "consist almost entirely of arrests for use of marijuana or glue or paint inhalants" and that the latter far outweighs the former.

Therefore, "while rather severe maladjustments undoubtedly occur" among both types of users, the psychologist points out that sniffing of toxic substances "constitutes a problem worthy of considerably more attention in Hawaii than does the use of marijuana."

He states that locally as nationally, much more emphasis has been placed on pot smoking. "Today, however, we in Hawaii must pay much more heed to the increasing rate of paint sniffing among our youth" for these reasons:

1—Four times more sniffers than smokers pass through the court.

2—Sniffers tend to have used their drug more frequently in the past, while marijuana users profess more experimentation.

3—Of even greater concern is that sniffers tend to come from a younger age group, usually in the pre-teens or early teens.

Barthel's study indicates "clear-cut differences" between the youthful pot and paint users. He considers findings in that realm as "the most meaningful results."

"Sniffers," he states, "are often the 'have-nots' of our society. They have less material wealth, fewer tangible signs of success and fewer traditional channels open to them via school or employment. They are generally youngsters who face a bleak reality each day."

The data show that a sizable number of sniffers, compared with pot smokers, come from environments characterized by lower income and larger family size, welfare assistance, public housing, attendance at schools with a high juvenile crime rate.

Two-thirds of the youngsters referred for marijuana use came from four large Oahu high schools. They are, in order of frequency, Kalani Radford, Kaimuki and Kailua high schools.

Two-thirds of sniffers, on the other hand, came from 11 Oahu intermediate and high schools, indicating a wider spread and less concentration of inhalant abuse among the schools.

They are, in order of frequency: Kalakaua Intermediate, Farrington High, Dole Intermediate, Stevenson Intermediate, Waianae High, Washington Intermediate, Kaimuki High, Waipahu High, McKinley High, Central Intermediate and Roosevelt high schools.

While sniffers seem to come from larger families often on welfare and in public housing, Barthel found that a far greater proportion of marijuana users come from families with incomes exceeding $12,000 a year.

The sniffer, he noted, is "decidedly from a non-Caucasian ethnic background, the majority being from Hawaiian, part-Hawaiian and Oriental families.

Seventy-four per cent of pot smokers were Caucasians.

"Interestingly," the psychologist notes, "there is a very clear-cut difference in the manner in which parents of the two groups of young drug offenders explain their child's drug behavior."

Parents of sniffers see the use of inhalants as a result of external factors, with explanations such as that their child "hangs around with the wrong crowd and is a follower."

Parents of pot smokers, on the other hand, attribute the cause to internal factors, such as that their child is "curious and wants to experiment or that he is lonely and seeks security in drug use with friends."

Barthel found that a third or fourth of the drug users showed "definite negative adjustments in various spheres—home, school or with their peers."

His survey shows that a significantly higher number of youngsters arrested for pot than for sniffing denied their offenses. This may be because of greater anti-authoritarianism or legal sophistication on the part of pot smokers.

The researcher believes that "one of the most important hypotheses that can be drawn from this study is that if a youngster in Hawaii tends to come from an environment that is relatively impoverished, the exchanges of his using inhalants are augmented."

He points out that sniffers and their families "often hold an 'I-am-a-pawn-of-fate' attitude about their lot in life; feel powerless to better themselves and feel controlled by outside forces."

He notes that this impotent quality is more tangible and measurable in terms of economics or social alternatives, while the deprivation of the pot smoker is "perhaps more subtle . . . more abstract and more internalized." Barthel stresses that "a sizable decrease in the rates of sniffing among Hawaii's youth would occur if the problems (housing, employment, recreation, education and others) of this State's 'socially disadvantaged' persons . . . were more thoroughly understood and vigorously attacked."

Further, he states, "a high statistical relationship exists between sniffing and the incidence of juvenile crime.

"Trying to develop means of solving the problems which give rise to juvenile crime, therefore, might also lessen the incidence of sniffing. Such would not seem to be the case in terms of marijuana use, however."

Barthel concludes that the drug problem is not the responsibility of just one agency and urges a coordinated effort among the legal, school and social agencies, along with the general community and the youngsters and their families as well.

In noting treatment needs, he states that many sniffers "will not respond to the hopeful future-oriented approach of middle class counselors and teachers because these youngsters don't feel that they have the power to bring change or to modify the future.

"Thus, to expect these youngsters to control themselves easily or to exercise in-

ternalized responsibility for future behavior . . . would reflect blindness on the part of a counselor or education.

"Such control and responsibility must be taught, not expected," he said.

To place the drug problem in proper perspective, Barthel comments that drugs have been used for other than medical purposes for thousands of years—probably ever since man's appearance on earth."

AMERICA'S SHORELINES

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

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure for me to cosponsor legislation designed to help solve a costly and grievous problem along America's shorelines. The bill, introduced with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SCHADEBERG) and others, will allow Federal assistance, in the form of matching grants, for the construction of devices and facilities to protect against shoreline erosion. Existing law limits Federal matching assistance to publicly owned property.

The need for this legislation is perhaps most apparent in my own district, where in recent years the high water in Lake Superior has resulted in millions of dollars of damage to shoreline property and dwellings. For the individual homeowner, the cost of constructing protective breakwaters and abutments is often prohibitive. Their only recourse is collective efforts with matching Federal assistance.

Mr. Speaker, one might ask why the Federal Government should assist in the protection of private shoreline. I believe that there is ample justification. First, we know that shore erosion pollutes our waters and this contamination affects all our citizens. Secondly, in many areas of the Nation, water levels are directly controlled to some significant degree. For example, Lake Superior's water level is regulated by the International Joint Commission established in 1917. The American operation for the maintenance of prescribed water levels is conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. For the past 2 years, heavy precipitation has brought about extremely high water in the lake, which the corps has not been able to effectively control. The resulting damage all along the Lake Superior shoreline has been severe, and the prospects for relief are not good.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Congress to correct the act of August 13, 1946, to allow Federal matching funds to be used for the protection of private as well as public shoreline.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Friday, July 11, to file certain reports.

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

There was no objection.

TO CREATE A COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RESTAURANT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 472 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 472

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the "Committee on the House Restaurant," which shall be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, not more than three of whom shall be of the majority party, and one of whom shall be designated as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) On and after July 15, 1969, until otherwise ordered by the House, the Architect of the Capitol shall perform the duties vested in him by section 208 of Public Law 812, 76th Congress (40 U.S.C. 174k) under the direction of the select committee herein created.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up this resolution for immediate consideration. The resolution is to create a select committee to supervise the House Restaurant. It will be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker.

The function of this committee will be to establish rules and regulations for the management and the operation and control of all food facilities under control of the House of Representatives, and effective on July 15, 1969. The Architect of the Capitol shall manage the House food facilities under the direction of this select committee.

Mr. Speaker, I understand, the restaurant has been going in the red deeper and deeper, as time marches on, and the food situation down there, according to some of the Members, is not of the standard it should be. So for the betterment of the health and welfare of the Members, and also the improvement of the eating facilities of the House of Representatives, I believe that it is the desire of the Congress that this select committee should be appointed.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would ask him if he thinks that this will provide more food for less money, or less food for more money?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that I believe he has narrated the situation in a correct and practical way, and that the proposed committee will provide better food for less money.

I know that the Speaker will appoint a committee who undoubtedly have been experienced in the art of producing and selling food. We have some outstanding successful purveyors of food among the Members of the House who are certainly well qualified to conduct all of the restaurant and food facilities here in the House of Representatives.

I think under this resolution, when this committee is appointed it will function so that every Member of the House will be happy for improvement and operation of our House restaurants.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give us any assurance that this will not mean another huge staff to go into this matter or can we expect this to operate without too much expenditure of money when the select committee is appointed?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. In response to the question of my friend, the gentleman from Iowa to the gentleman from Indiana, I would like to assure my friend that as I conceive what this bill means, there will not be any staff and there will not be any expenditure of money.

This committee will function in a purely supervisory way, somewhat like the Select Committee on Parking.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman I will rely on his assurance, and I am sure that it is underwritten by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN), these two gentlemen being the two chief assurers on the majority side of the Committee on Rules, and I would like to rely on them at all times. I thank both gentlemen and have no further questions.

Mr. COLMER. In response to that, may I say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, I am always glad to see him on his feet looking after the taxpayers—and the gentleman knows I am very sincere when I say that.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman wants any further assurance, I can assure him that the gentleman from California, the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Rules (Mr. SMITH) can give him further assurance from that side of the aisle if he so desires.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, may I simply say that this resolution has been adequately explained.

The purpose of it is to improve, if possible, the conditions in connection with the operation of the House restaurant.

The main reason why it is handled in this way is because the law actually provides that this is under the charge of the Architect. This is a House resolution and upon its adoption, a committee is created.

If we were trying to change it to set up a select committee where we would have employees and all such things as that, then we would actually have to change this law, section 28, Public Law 812.

So we are doing it in this way and they will function until otherwise ordered by the House.

The distinguished Speaker of the House was extremely kind and courteous and came before the Rules Committee and explained the purpose of this and

expressed his desire to improve the conditions—and I am more than pleased to assure the gentleman from Iowa that we hope this will be a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution, House Resolution 472.

Mr. MADDEN. 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.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 472, 91st Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the House Restaurant the following Members of the House: Mr. KLUCZYNSKI of Illinois, chairman; Mr. STEED of Oklahoma, Mr. CABELL of Texas, Mr. COLLIER of Illinois, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 11702, MEDICAL LIBRARY ASSISTANCE EXTENSION ACT OF 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 464 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 464

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11702) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or 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.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 464 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 11702, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities, and for other purposes. The resolution also makes it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The purpose of H.R. 11702 is to extend for 3 years—from June 30, 1970, to June 30, 1973—the current programs providing financial assistance for: construction of medical library facilities; training of biomedical librarians and information specialists for service and research; and expansion and improvement of health library resources. Federal assistance would also be continued for projects of research, development, and demonstrations in medical library science and health communications, and related special scholarly scientific projects for development of regional medical library programs and for biomedical scientific publications projects.

The authorizations contained in the bill total $21 million for each year, broken down as follows: For construction of facilities, $10 million; for training in medical library science, $1 million; for special scientific projects, $0.5 million; for research, development, and demonstrations in medical library science and related fields, $3 million; for improving and expanding the basic resources of medical libraries and related instrumentalities, $3 million; for regional medical libraries, $2.5 million; and for support of biomedical publications, $1 million.

The committee substitute incorporates a number of technical and clarifying amendments to existing law to facilitate the programs as extended.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11702 deserves our unanimous support, and I urge the adoption of House Resolution 464 in order that the proposed legislation may be considered and passed.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statement just made by my friend from Hawaii.

The purpose of the bill is to extend for 3 years, through fiscal 1973, the Medical Libraries Assistance Act. Authorizations for the 3 years are at the same level as for fiscal year 1970. Programs covered include, for each fiscal year:

Facilities construction	$10,000,000
Training in medical library sciences	1,000,000
Scientific projects funding	500,000
Research and development in medical library sciences	3,000,000
Improvement and expanding medical library resources	3,000,000
Regional medical libraries	2,500,000
Support for biomedical publications	1,000,000

The total authorizations in the bill is $63 million for the 3 fiscal years at $21 million per year.

Most of the bill consists of technical amendments to the existing act to insure that the administration and operation of the programs conforms with the original intent of the Congress first expressed in 1955.

The need to expand facilities and research, manpower and technological assistance for improving health sciences information, and medical libraries is well documented. The magnitude of the needs for improving medical libraries and related health communication services requires continuation of the 1965 act.

Among the amendments included in the bill are several which require that, in making construction grants, priority be given to the effectiveness and potential of the facility for meeting local and regional needs.

With respect to the program for construction grants, the Federal contribution may not exceed 75 percent of the construction costs. Currently, nine medical schools, one school of optometry, and one school of veterinary medicine are participating in this program. To qualify under the program, a library must be part of a construction project which is to a substantial degree for teaching purposes since eligibility is primarily designed to increase student enrollment in the medical library sciences.

Grants for training of students enrolled in medical library sciences are also available under the act. This program authorizes continuing education and retraining for librarians in the health fields as well as assistance to train students for new careers in these fields.

The committee report estimates that for the period 1971–75 there is a need for up to 8,200 trained medical librarians and other health communications specialists.

The bill authorizes $2,500,000 for the next 3 fiscal years for grants to develop regional libraries to serve as backup libraries assisting those at the local level in large geographic areas and to provide superior informational services at the local level.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND RECREATION, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

This has been cleared with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), the ranking minority member.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4284, AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE STANDARD REFERENCE DATA ACT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 446 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 446

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4284) to authorize appropriations to carry out the Standard Reference Data Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and 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.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 446 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 4284 a bill to authorize appropriations for the Standard Reference Data Act.

The purpose of H.R. 4284 is to authorize an appropriation for the Department of Commerce such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 1970 and 1971, but not to exceed a total of $6 million, to carry out the Standard Reference Data Act.

The act, which became Public Law in July 1968, established within the Department of Commerce a standard reference data system to be administered by the National Bureau of Standards. It declared as the policy of the Congress the making of critically evaluated reference data readily available to scientists, engineers, and the general public. To carry out this policy, the Secretary of Commerce was directed to provide or arrange for the collection, compilation, critical evaluation, publication, and dissemination of standard reference data.

The system seeks to deal with one aspect of the broad science information problem, by producing and disseminating compilations of critically evaluated data on the physical and chemical properties of materials. This includes, for example, measurements of the amount of energy released when chemical elements combine to form new compounds, or the ability of various substances to conduct electricity or heat under certain conditions. The system would save countless hours and dollars by making it unnecessary for scientists seeking certain information to repeat experiments already conducted successfully by others.

The information now provided by the system is used daily as basic reference material by scientists and engineers in Government, industry, and universities, and is necessary in such diverse fields as transportation, electronics, construction, and the manufacturing of commercial goods, medicines, and other products.

The recommended authorization of $6 million includes $2.4 million for fiscal year 1970 and $3.6 million for fiscal year 1971. These funds will permit the continued support of ongoing efforts of the standard reference data system and the orderly expansion of existing data projects, together with the initiation of new projects to fill gaps in important areas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 446 in order that H.R. 4284 may be considered and passed.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from Hawaii has explained the rule and the bill in very fine detailed manner.

House Resolution 446 does provide for a 1-hour open rule.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize for 2 years the continued operation of the standard reference data system, administered by the Bureau of Standards, in the Department of Commerce.

The sum of $6,000,000 is authorized for the 2 years. The report states that $2,400,000 is for 1970 and $3,600,000 is for 1971.

Under Public Law 90–396, a standard reference data system was authorized, to be operated by the Bureau of Standards. Its purpose was to collect and disseminate compilations of critically evaluated scientific data on the physical and chemical properties of materials. This is of vital interest to science, industry and government.

There are no minority views. The Department of Commerce supports the bill as does the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule and passage of the bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDICAL LIBRARY ASSISTANCE EXTENSION ACT OF 1969

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 (H.R. 11702) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities, and for other purposes.

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. 11702, with Mr. EDWARDS of California 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 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is an important bill in the health field. It was ordered reported by the committee unanimously, and we urge its passage.

The bill is a 3-year extension of the program of assistance to medical libraries initially established for a 5-year period in 1965. At the hearings, the administration presented its own recommendations, which were for a 1-year extension, with a few revisions in the program primarily clarifying existing authorities.

The committee voted to adopt minor modifications recommended in the administration's proposal and extend the program at existing authorization levels for 3 years. This means $21 million a year for 3 years.

In the 1950's, the Congress started substantially increasing the amounts made available to medical schools and other research organizations for the conduct of medical research programs, leading to a very substantial increase in the number of scientific papers published, together with an increase in the number of publications. This flood of new information was more than the existing medical libraries at medical schools, hospitals, research institutions, and the like were able to handle. Unfortunately, new construction in the library field, and new means of handling this flood of information, were not developed, so that by the early 1960's medical libraries had more information to handle than they could possibly take care of.

For example, in the 1965 hearings it was estimated that the medical schools in the United States alone needed over $100 million in new construction of medical library space, and they were an additional $100 million behind in obtaining needed publications. These figures are without regard to the substantial needs of the other approximately 6,000 medical libraries in the United States which had comparable needs. In the field of personnel, it was estimated that there were only 3,000 trained medical librarians available to staff over 6,000 libraries.

The 1965 legislation was designed to take some steps in the direction of meeting these needs, but in a relatively modest fashion. Total authorizations over the 5-year period amounted to $95 million, but appropriations have only amounted to approximately $41 million. Because of increasing needs in recent years again rising out of the flood of new information and new discoveries, we have done no more than just about hold our own since the 1965 legislation, and the reported bill will hopefully help make some dent in the needs for the future.

The full committee was unanimous in recommending the bill to the House, and we urge passage of the bill.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 11702, a bill introduced by my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER), because of the great importance of the bill to my district in Montana.

The health sciences library of Columbus Hospital in Great Falls, Mont., is an extremely valuable resource in eastern Montana. It is used by doctors and other medical personnel, as well as by both secondary and college students. A reference index from the library is located at the College of Great Falls.

Columbus Hospital now has on file an application for Federal funding. It is impossible to know when the application will be approved, and it is essential that the Medical Library Assistance Act be extended so that this hospital can receive funds.

Likewise, other hospitals in eastern Montana will eventually require funds for medical libraries. We are far from the Nation's major medical centers in Montana, and for this reason, it is important that we provide the best possible medical services right in the State.

Montana hospitals have also benefited greatly from use of the Pacific Northwest Regional Health Sciences Library in Seattle, and there is fine interlibrary cooperation between the College of Great Falls, Columbus Hospital, the Great Falls Public Library, and the Seattle Library. For this cooperation to continue, it is necessary that full funding be made available for those libraries which come under the provisions of the Medical Library Assistance Act.

I would like to mention the widespread support in Montana for this kind of program. I have letters from the health sciences librarian and directors of Columbus Hospital, as well as from ordinary citizens who are interested in this important service.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate the chairman on this excellent program.

Mr. Chairman, the Medical Library Assistance Extension Act of 1969 is worthy of our most sympathetic consideration. It extends for 3 years current programs providing financial assistance for a series of programs in the medical field. These are:

Construction of medical library facilities;

Training of biomedical librarians and information specialists for service and research;

Expansion and improvement of health library resources;

Projects of research, development, and demonstrations in medical library science and health communications, and related special scholarly scientific projects;

Development of regional medical library programs; and

Biomedical scientific publications projects.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that this House act favorably upon this extension. At this moment, America plunges deeper into what can be easily called a far-reaching medical crisis. On every hand the cost of any service connected with medical care is skyrocketing. We have a major, deepening shortage of doctors and nurses. Pay for almost all medically connected personnel besides doctors is appallingly low. Facilities require upgrading and hospital beds are in increasingly short supply.

It is imperative that the Government of our Nation act to alleviate this situation and end the medical service imbalance which grows daily. This act is but one portion of the massive program which is needed.

There is no reason in the world why this country cannot act to insure a proper supply of doctors and nurses. There is no reason why we cannot have adequate hospital facilities and beds.

Dozens of different types of medical specialists and supporting personnel from nurses, on, should have their professional status and pay upgraded to adequate levels. Research facilities can and should be expanded, adequately equipped, and staffed.

It is the shame of our Nation that we have reached a point where we are poised to place a man on the moon, but deny adequate treatment to millions of citizens and adequate compensation to nurses, medical technicians, and other aides.

Blame can be placed squarely upon inaction by the Government. If there is hesitation and unwillingness to take bold, decisive action, we shall see our medical crisis deepen and medical tragedies multiply. When doctors are unavailable and nurses leave the profession in droves; when there is inadequate research or facilities are lacking; when a few make small fortunes at expense of the many; when there is a remarkable gap between medical services available to various income groups; then America is at fault and must correct this situation.

It is my hope that we shall act today to extend this assistance act to these facilities and programs, and go on beyond it.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to present a brief but pointed statement in support of the Medical Library Extension Act of 1969, H.R. 11702.

I shall begin by underscoring the committee's interpretation of "medical library" to embrace the full and functional meaning of health information and communications. Little do we realize in the context of today's information explosion how much of that information is in the health field, how difficult it is to retrieve that information, and how important such retrieval is to the lives of all of us. The latest advancement in diagnosis and treatment, the latest precaution in the use of a drug, a simple innovation in surgical procedure, the analysis of a forthcoming viral epidemic, a new idea in preventive medicine—may not be lost to those seeking health service in or near the large medical centers of the Nation. However, what a pity it is when such advances cannot be applied to the broader population and when health service is less than optimum because of gaps in information and communication.

If we are to keep up with the output of the billions of dollars invested in biomedical research over the past 20 years, if we are to make medical literature available to all medical and paramedical practitioners throughout the country, and if the lifesaving intent of the regional medical programs and hospitals are to be more fully realized, then informational sources and materials must be increased in number and in availability.

H.R. 11702 and the committee's report thereto recognizes the need and makes provision for the informational problems arising from the rapidly accelerating demands for high-quality health care and services. It points to the growing number of new medical institutions and to the emphasis on continuing education in relation to the delivery of health care. The flow of biomedical information is crucial to these developments.

If there is to be equal opportunity for health there must be equal access to health information, there must be prompt and easy access to the information, and there must be wide dissemination and application of information in crucial health documents.

Mr. Chairman, the movement of knowledgement from the laboratory and clinic to the bedside will not be accomplished by what the busy physician and nurse retain from their formal training, nor will it be accomplished by the duplication of specialized medical textbooks in library collections around the Nation. Important as these medical monographs are, what is more important is the organization, preservation, and dissemination of the information which they contain in a form applicable to immediate use for the family physician and for consultations on specialized cases. H.R. 11702 correctly provides funds for improving and increasing library manpower for this purpose, as well as for specific training in medical library science, medical information demonstration projects, health library construction projects, and for scholarly studies of medical and community health problems.

Mr. Chairman, the greatest advances in the Nation's health at the moment can be made by the application of existing knowledge to those in need of health care and service. That knowledge can be applied only if it is made available to all of those in the health professions, urban and rural locations alike. The focal points of information and communication as envisioned by the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 have already begun to bring order to medical literature and documents and up-to-date health information service to hundreds of practitioners and institutions. The path ahead is the proposed extension of that act. I support that extension under the provisions of H.R. 11702.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished chairman of the committee yield to me?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce yielding to me.

I want to say immediately that I commend the committee and the subcommittee for bringing this legislation and this extension to the floor within the

budget, and thus continuing a truly worthwhile program. I wish it could have limited the authorization to the expected appropriation and expenditure.

I have just two questions I would like to ask as points of information. The first is a result of my thorough reading of the committee report, including the Ramseyer portion thereof.

Has it been the general intention of the committee to change the granting of grants, the establishment of fellowships, and funds for bricks and mortar for medical library services and the advancement of data and dissemination thereof from the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or not?

Mr. STAGGERS. I might say that under Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1966 the functions of the Surgeon General are now with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HALL. Do I understand that in spite of the existing law the powers lie with the Secretary and not the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service? I know full well, Mr. Speaker, that the U.S. Public Health Service and the Commissioned Officer Corps thereof, including the Office of the Surgeon General of the United States, has been placed in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and I do not care to argue that point at this time. But, I cannot determine the full intent from the Report and the amendments and the Ramseyer print here, although I can see from the original clarifying and technical amendments in the bill that it was the intent to change from the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, all of these powers to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Do I understand the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to say that this is because of an Executive order under the Reorganization Act which simply makes this in conformity to the law?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. I would say, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, that I accept this original set of conforming amendments to make it in compliance with the Executive order, but I would again sound a warning as I did some 3½ years ago before the distinguished gentleman's committee that we are in danger of conforming to the point where we have appointees of social workers assigning these grants in highly technical fields of a scarce category of medical knowledge, rather than the professionals who know best how to do it.

In fact, I have previously predicted the demise of the Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service. But I would hope that some reasonable changes in administration might protect and prolong it at least until after study of this distinguished committee can determine whether that is the best course to follow, or not.

I happen to be one who believes we should keep the Public Health Service for many, many reasons and, particularly, the Commissioned Corps and, indeed, aid and abet them by a Reserve Corps which could be called upon to perform duties of a Public Health Service emergency or part-time nature from time to time.

Be that as it may, however, I would hate to see the carte blanche elimination of the Surgeon General, but to make conforming amendments when he is, indeed, according to the encoded statutes of the United States "the Surgeon General of the United States," regardless of what department he is in, or assigned. He has served in the Department of the Interior long before the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare existed. The original law establishing the Public Health Service intended that it be a separate agency such as exists with reference to a lot of our commissions in the present-day governmental operations, directly responsible to the President; and, indeed, that is why he was so identified in the Public Health Service, rather than the Surgeon General of the Army or the Surgeon General of the Navy or the Air Surgeon General, for example.

So, I wonder as to whether or not these technical amendments are going to be interpreted to mean that these positions will be filled by social workers, political appointees, or otherwise—or whether they are going to be filled by professionals and more properly and wisely selected personnel. The Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service has served well from the time of its earliest inception, with the merchant marine, quarantine service, customs, preventive medicine, interstate and international quality health care and coordination. I do not wish to have aborted these and other functions which they have performed with pride.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this distinguished committee will look into this in some detail before we blot out by fiat and decree the responsibility of the Surgeon General of the United States.

Mr. STAGGERS. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that I agree with the gentleman and that the committee intends to do this. I share with him his views about the Public Health Service. Further, I might say that it is one of the oldest agencies of the Government, being created in 1798. It has performed yeoman service to the Nation since that time. Therefore, I do agree with the gentleman in what he says as to the service they have rendered the Nation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement made by the gentleman. It is an honorable service, and it has rendered great professional service in all areas of quarantine and many others mentioned and unmentioned, and if we are going to the moon next week, it may be even more important than we had ever deemed it before to be.

Mr. Chairman, my second question, if the gentleman will yield further, is the question of coordination of the libraries and communications data in the regional medical areas with the regional medical programs themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to commend the committee for its report, and in their recorded perception, decision, and wisdom, have decided not to change the term "medical library," but to enlarge its horizons and scope to include communications facilities pertaining to medical data, and so forth. This is very important and, as I am sure the gentleman's committee knows, we are setting up under the regional medical programs responsible data systems in realtime for the reading of electrocardiograms, of X-rays, of consultation on networks in intensive care units—and of course we hope and pray there will be found in it additional reporting media for the scope of cancer and stroke, similar to that which has already been set up for the heart.

My concern is if we set this up under the Library Extension Act that there might be a little question of jurisdiction granting of funds, or unnecessary duplication. I hope it is the intent of the committee to see that these communications and these data predicated on the library, or translation and transmission of excerpts, abstracts, and reprints of the library, whether it be the National Library of Medicine through the networks or other, be in assistance to, not necessarily subservient to, the regional medical program which is also under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. STAGGERS. I might say to the gentleman that I do not see there will be any question about any jurisdictional dispute. These programs are intended to be coordinated and operate with everyone working together. This bill does not supersede activities under the regional medical programs.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman if there is anything in this bill that would require every hospital, regardless of its size, to have a registered medical librarian?

Mr. STAGGERS. I believe I have answered that question already. The answer is "No."

Mr. KAZEN. If the gentleman will yield further, is there anything in this bill that would require that every hospital, regardless of size, before they can get any type of grant, should maintain a medical library?

Mr. STAGGERS. I would say, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Texas, that the answer is "No"; there is none.

Mr. KAZEN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER).

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

Mr. Chairman, during the last several years the Congress has enacted many laws dealing with the subject of medical facilities and programs. Some have been aimed at the lack of facilities for medical treatment of various kinds, from general hospitals to community mental health centers. Some have been aimed at manpower problems in the attempt to provide more doctors and all other kinds of health professionals. To do this the laws have helped to build and otherwise create more schools for the training of health manpower, and then provision has been made to encourage and assist those who

would follow a health profession to acquire the education and pursue the calling.

Still other laws have been aimed at the more subjective aspects of health services by providing new and improved approaches to the organization of health services in the attempt to deliver the best of services to all communities and all citizens. Among these has been the partnership for health program which is gradually consolidating the previously scattered and diverse public health activities. Yet another program, first known as the heart, stroke, and cancer program and eventually as the regional medical program, was designed to encourage entirely new arrangements among all of the elements of the health services to make the best possible use of the knowledge and medical skills available and to become available.

At the heart of all this progress is the collection, dissemination, storing and recall of medical knowledge. Nothing will work if the necessary scientific information is not available when and where it is needed. That is the medical library complex.

Recognizing the absolute need for a system of library facilities, Congress first provided for a National Medical Library as a part of the National Institutes of Health. That gave the research material somewhere to go. It was quickly realized that one central library facility would be wasted unless the same information, or certain parts of it, were quickly available at regional and local levels. University and hospital libraries can and do carry out such work. They will continue and are the basic framework upon which the system has to be built. This program is designed to help them. It is designed, however, to do several other things such as research new methods.

The bill before us today is an extension of a 3-year-old program which has had a history of support but which can and should contribute much to the improvement of medical service. Under the current act $40 million was authorized for construction but only $11.25 million was actually appropriated and none of this was for renovation or alteration. We can add to that the desired information centers in hospitals where less than 20 percent have adequate professional health library facilities. This bill does not attempt to cure everything at once. It maintains the fairly modest authorization of $10 million per year for this construction purpose for a 3-year period. It is to be hoped that greater proportions of the authorization find their way to actual appropriation and by way of grants to construction.

As previously mentioned, there is a great deal more to collecting and disseminating medical knowledge than building structures. Not just anyone can come in off the street and handle specialized scientific information. So the training of qualified careerists in biomedical information is important also. The bill authorizes $1 million per year for grants to individuals and institutions to support such training. By 1975 we will need 8,200 medical librarians and health communications specialists, and the number now is in the hundreds.

As the delivery of health services changes and improves so must the use of medical information. This requires constant probing for better ways to handle it. The answer is research and demonstration. Try new ways and find the best. For this purpose the bill authorizes $3 million per year. From this we can hope to have vastly improved techniques, systems, and equipment to store and retrieve scientific information relating to health.

Many libraries already trying to upgrade their materials and services find that many of the books and periodicals are beyond their means. Some find that material which is available cannot be adequately indexed. Grants to improve basic resources of the medical libraries have been included in the law which is here being extended. The bill before the House includes $3 million per year for the purpose. It also expands the measure to allow use of the funds to assist in the initial stocking of resources material where a library comes into being, as well as to uplift the materials made available by existing institutions.

It is a long way from the National Library of Medicine to the local hospital medical library at Bremerton, Wash., for example. When scientific medical information is needed, it is needed quickly. No local or school library can ever hope to be complete and offer every bit of medical information which might ever be needed. It can do its job, however, if it has access to larger collections close by. The answer seems to be in the establishment of several regional libraries. Seven have been approved and started since the program began. A few more may be desirable, and the bill provides $2.5 million per year for that purpose. To make the projects more useful to others and to assure thorough preliminary work, this part of the law is being amended to allow use of the funds for data gathering and for planning activities. Some of these funds can also be used by regional libraries to help other local programs build up source material and either get underway or become more effective.

The provisions outlined here are the basic components of a good medical library program. A good system for gathering and using medical knowledge is vital to solving the complex problems in the delivery of medical services throughout our country. So the bill before us looks small and possibly even insignificant in comparison to many other massive and popular health programs brought before the House for attention. But it is, in fact, an extremely important link in that chain. We provide here for overall authorizations of $21 million per year for 3 years. Some parts of the program may then be done, others may have to continue further. We shall examine that possibility when the progress made in this field, and in all of the other health efforts, is again examined by our committee. I recommend that the House approve H.R. 11702 as reported by the committee.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. What was the actual appropriation for the fiscal year 1969?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is $6.287 million.

Mr. GROSS. That is the same as you expect will be appropriated for the 1970 fiscal year?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, the figure I gave was for the fiscal year 1970. The figure I gave you was for that year.

Mr. GROSS. What was the actual appropriation for this purpose in fiscal year 1969?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am sorry I cannot give that to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think it is more than $6 million, or was it less?

Mr. SPRINGER. I have no way of knowing what it was in 1969. I have the figure only for the fiscal year for which we are now projecting.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me to propound a question to the Members on the other side of the aisle, if they know what the actual appropriation was for this purpose for the fiscal year 1969?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. It was $5,789,000.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. This bill would authorize a tremendous increase from the $5 million plus of last year, and a proposed expenditure of $6.287 million for the fiscal year 1970. Then it is proposed to jump to $21 million a year for each of the next 3 years or a total of $63 million.

Mr. SPRINGER. I can very easily tell the gentleman the reason for the jump.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I would like to hear the reason.

Mr. SPRINGER. The authorization for 1970 was exactly the same as for 1971, 1972, and 1973. Now there is only $6.287 million this year, because there was nothing for construction of medical libraries but only for training.

In 1971, 1972, and 1973 there is $10 million authorized for each year for construction. That is the jump—and that is why we exepect something near $21 million to be appropriated if we are to go forward with the program. Of course, that is up to the Committee on Appropriations. If they do not appropriate for that purpose, we are not going forward with it. They are in charge and we only authorize.

Mr. GROSS. This is a question that occurs to me. Do not the hospitals have some responsibility for providing their own librarians? Why should the Federal Government undertake to inject itself into a huge library construction program?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think we might as well abandon the medical program unless you have some sources of information for the program, such as were dismissed by the gentleman from Missouri, Dr. HALL, involving informational activities under this program and under the regional medical programs.

Mr. GROSS. What is the responsibility of the hospitals and the medical profession generally in the matter of providing library facilities?

Mr. SPRINGER. I would say that this question could be argued, but it was the belief of this committee that this bill is the best way to approach it.

I understand what the gentleman is talking about. I presume he thinks his own hospitals in Iowa should supply this information. We just came to the conclusion that there were not the resources there to do that and that is why we did it this way.

This bill also has to do with training. For instance, there are at the present time only 600 qualified medical librarians in the hospital libraries throughout the country and there are several thousand hospitals in the country. They have to have the training and I do not know where you are going to get that training done unless we do it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and I appreciate the time he is giving me on this matter. I am concerned—yes, my concern is that I think there is some responsibility at least upon the hosptials themselves to provide the facilities for medical libraries.

The gentleman has said that this authorization of $63 million is approved in the Nixon budget. My response is that apparently it is going to be up to Congress to save the Nixon administration from itself. Altogether too many bills are coming to the House authorizing tremendously increased expenditures. This Congress only a few days ago approved a 10-percent surtax. For what purpose? To haul another $10 billion to Washington to be spent?

If the gentleman will indulge me further and briefly, the only way to stop inflation is to cut down expenditures. Yet here we are confronted today with another ballooned request. I would not mind going along with a bill to continue as we have in the past, but to jump this to $21 million per year for 3 years seems to me to be pretty unconscionable.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the gentleman that we are continuing at exactly the same authorization figure we did in 1967, 1968, 1969, and 1970—$21 million authorization.

Mr. GROSS. But the door is wide open to the Appropriations Committee by this authorization to go to $21 million.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is exactly correct. However, it seems to me the Appropriations Committee has acted with due discretion. They apparently felt that they could not spend $21 million, or at least they thought they should not spend $21 million, so they authorized the expenditure of only $6.287 million. The Appropriations Committee has just as big a duty in this matter as we do. But we heard the evidence as it came from representatives of the administration that they felt $21 million was not excessive if we are to have any construction, and carry out the other activities under the program.

The Appropriations Committee came to the conclusion that there should not be construction. I do not know whether they will come to that conclusion again in 1971, 1972, and 1973 or not. But we did authorize what we felt was not exorbitant. We felt it was a modest sum. I do not know how you are going to construct a whole lot of facilities for as many hospitals as we have in this country with $10 million, but that amount can serve as a starter.

Mr. GROSS. I do not want to hamstring in any way the availability of medical knowledge to those who need it. Not at all. That is not my purpose. But somewhere along the line, I will say to my good friend from Illinois, we are going to have to put the brakes on expenditures and cut them back.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that the Appropriations Committee apparently took somewhat the view of the gentleman in relation to appropriations for 1970. But that is not a matter that we have any jurisdiction over. We merely authorized what we felt was needed under the circumstances; it was requested and it is within the budget.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason I recommend passage of the bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield whatever time he might require to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. JARMAN). I wish to commend him and the members of the subcommittee for the work they did in preparing the bill and getting it to the full committee. I yield now to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. JARMAN).

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare, on which I have the honor to serve as chairman, considered this bill carefully and unanimously recommended its passage, as amended, to the full committee, which unanimously ordered it reported to the House. The principal purpose of this bill is to extend the current program of grants to support the provision of biomedical information. It extends for 3 years the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 which provides for the expansion and improvement of health library resources, the construction of medical library facilities, the training of biomedical librarians and information specialists, projects of research, development, and demonstrations in medical library science and health communications, the development of regional medical library programs, and the support of biomedical scientific publications projects. The bill would authorize support in the amount of $21,000,000 a year for each of the 3 years of the extension.

The need to expand and improve facilities and resources, manpower and technological assistance for processing health sciences information was well documented in information presented before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in hearings in 1965. It was apparent at that time that unless major attention was directed to the improvement of our national medical library base, the continued and accelerating generation of scientific knowledge would become increasingly an exercise in futility.

Impressed with the magnitude and verity of the needs for improving the status of medical libraries and related health communications services, the Congress passed the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965. As the preamble to that act stated:

> Much of the value of the ever-increasing volume of knowledge and information which has been and continues to be developed in the health science field will be lost unless proper measures are taken in the immediate future to develop facilities and techniques necessary to collect, preserve, store, process, retrieve, and facilitate the dissemination and utilization, of such knowledge and information.

I think that we are all aware that we are living in a new era with respect to health in this country. The focus is on providing health care of the highest quality to all citizens, regardless of their income or where they may live. We must be sure that the wonderful advances of health research reach the patients who can benefit from them and the students in all our health schools receive the best possible training. These things cannot be accomplished if knowledge is not transmitted rapidly and completely from the medical explorer to the physician at the bedside. The goal of this act is to help ease the inequity, the injustice of the timelag between the discovery of new scientific knowledge and the application of this knowledge in ordinary practice.

Efficient and effective dissemination and utilization of medical knowledge is essential to the objective of bringing the best possible care to the patient's bedside. Improvement of the Nation's health can advance only as dissemination and utilization of knowledge advances. The establishment of new medical schools and the expansion of continuing education programs require new health science libraries and information facilities. The benefits of new hospitals, increased health manpower, regional medical programs, medicare, and other efforts can be gained only if there is effective access to medical knowledge. The magnitude of the information problem has a direct bearing on patient care.

The Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 made a good beginning to the solution of the problems of health information. Unless these programs of assistance for medical libraries and health communications are continued and expanded, as proposed under this act, major programs for health services, education, and research will be jeopardized and the development of better health care retarded. There are no other programs which are addressed directly to health information; these programs are both unique and effective.

The initial assistance provided has been highly effective as a stimulant and catalyst. The momentum developed with the assistance of this act must be utilized and continued.

Approximately $42 million will have been appropriated during fiscal years 1966–70 under the Medical Library Assistance Act. Eleven new health sciences libraries will have been constructed, providing seating for over 15,000 students, faculty, and practitioners. The 11 schools will be able to provide space for more than double their current collections as well as to inaugurate new and innovative services. In addition, resource grants will

have been awarded to 392 health science libraries to allow them to improve and expand their services to users. Grants totaling $5 million have also been awarded to five institutions allowing them to institute regional library services. These cooperative regional partnerships will provide for more efficient and economical use of the Nation's biomedical information resources.

In 1965, the country had 6,000 medical libraries, but less than 3,000 trained librarians to staff them. With just under $4.5 million appropriated under the Medical Library Assistance Act, some 20 graduate and postgraduate training programs have been initiated, and 309 persons will have received training through 1970. These programs have highlighted the application of modern concepts and innovative technology to problems of information processing.

While I am impressed with the accomplishments which have been made through the 1965 act, I am more impressed by the magnitude of the problems which remain. Testimony presented before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare indicated that there are still grossly inadequate facilities, resources, and manpower for health information services in the face of rapidly increasing demands on health libraries and related facilities. The volume of information to be assimilated is growing at an astronomical rate and the cost of processing this information is skyrocketing.

This act will extend for 3 years the current programs of grants authorized by the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965. At the hearings of the Public Health and Welfare Subcommittee on May 22, 1969, all witnesses who appeared testified in favor of continuation of the current legislation. Among the witnesses testifying for the bill were the American Library Association, the Medical Library Association, the Association of Research Libraries, and the American Optometric Association. Statements of support were also submitted by the American Association of Dental Colleges, the American Medical Association, and the Association of American Medical Colleges, as well as a number of other institutions and individuals. All of the witnesses who testified at the May hearings spoke of the need to continue the programs authorized under the Medical Library Assistance Act.

I am personally convinced that the need to improve and expand facilities and resources, manpower and technology which were documented when the original bill was passed in 1965, continue and that, in fact, the deficits have grown since that time. It is my opinion that the passage of the bill before us today will effectively help to correct these deficiencies. That act, which created a coordinated program of support, provided unique authorities for many of the programs to aid medical libraries and I regard its extension as vital.

The act which I propose would also incorporate a number of technical and clarifying amendments to facilitate the programs administration.

I therefore urge the House give favorable consideration to this bill to extend the Medical Library Assistance Act for 3 years.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11702, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities.

The legislation would extend for another 3 years the current program begun in the act of 1965 to provide financial assistance for construction of medical library facilities and general overall improvement in medical library resources.

This act has applied, and will continue to apply, to all of the fundamental and applied sciences related to health, including medicine, dentistry, optometry, pharmacy, osteopathy, veterinary medicine where relevant to human health, nursing, public health and other health-related fields.

For the 5 years that this program has been authorized, $21 million per year has been authorized, or a total authorization of $105 million, but thus far only approximately $41 million has been appropriated. This legislation would continue the existing authorization of $21 million per year for 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, the testimony before the committee and experience indicates that the need is far greater than the authorization or appropriations under this program. Although approximately $41 million has thus far been appropriated under this program, in 1965 testimony revealed that construction needs alone were more than $100 million and collection needs another $100 million or more.

If we are to fully realize the benefits of new information, practices and achievements in the area of patient care and treatment, then we must be able to transmit this information to the physician, dentist, nurse and others in related health professions in order that they may better care for the patient.

This legislation will enable us to continue our efforts to improve patient care through increased knowledge of new dimensions of medical science, and I hope the House will act favorably on this bill.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the principal purpose of the reported legislation is to extend for 3 years the current programs providing financial assistance for construction of medical library facilities; training of biomedical librarians and information specialist for service and research; expansion and improvement of health library resources; projects of research, development, and demonstrations in medical library science and health communications, and related special scholarly scientific projects; development of regional medical library programs; and biomedical scientific publications projects.

The need to improve and expand facilities and resources, manpower, and technological assistance for processing health science information was well documented in information presented at hearings held before the committee on September 14, 1965.

The committee was impressed with the magnitude of the needs identified for improving medical library and related health communication services in the United States, and accordingly reported favorably on the bills which subsequently led to the passage of Public Law 89-291, the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965.

At the May 22, 1969, hearings held before the committee in behalf of the proposed 3-year extension of this legislation, the witnesses who testified unanimously spoke to the need to continue the programs initiated under the Medical Library Assistance Act. The committee agrees that major health library deficits continue to exist and have in fact increased since 1965 as demands for health information services continue to expand. The committee concludes that the programs implemented under the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965, with minor modifications, can effectively help to correct these deficiencies.

The Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 provides unique authorities for many of these programs. The committee regards as essential the extension of the legislation which provides for these coordinated programs of support. The legislation reported is designed to assist in meeting the needs for expanded health information services in the United States by continuing for 3 years the programs under the Medical Library Assistance Act with amendments.

In the September 1965 hearings held before the committee, witnesses for the Medical Library Association and others reported construction needs for medical school libraries in excess of $100 million, and medical library collection needs based on suggested standards of over $100 million.

Witnesses this year report that these startling deficits in health library space and equipment materials and staff have not been significantly met. The committee agrees with the testimony of the supporting witnesses and the evidence cited, that further expansion and improvement of health information services and resources are essential in the face of rapidly accelerating demands for high-quality health care and related health services. The committee particularly wishes to recognize and underscore the importance of health information services in helping to transmit medical advances from the laboratory to the bedside.

Mr. Chairman, the above constitutes a brief résumé of the conclusions of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I join with them in this analysis and urge passage of the legislation. It can also be stated that, among others, the following organizations have expressed strong support for this bill: American Medical Association, American Library Association, Medical Library Association, Association of Research Libraries, American Optometric Association, and American Osteopaths Association.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of a bill which, on the surface, may appear somewhat less glamorous, less dramatic than most legislation relating to the health of this Nation. But I believe that upon thoughtful reflection my colleagues will agree the Medical Library Extension Act of 1969 would constitute one of the soundest in-

vestments the Congress could make in the Nation's health at this particular time.

This bill, H.R. 11702, would improve and carry forward what we began under Public Law 89-291. Through this bill we can continue to expand or renovate existing health science libraries or construct new ones. Through this bill we will have the means to add much-needed manpower in health information specialities and communication research. We can provide assistance for special scientific projects on documentation, evaluation, and the analysis of advances in health sciences, or we can support projects dealing with health communications problems. Through this bill, too, we can assist in enlarging and improving library collections, as well as—through regional medical libraries—expand our resources and/or facilities to encourage better geographic access to biomedical information. And finally, through this bill we can further the preparation and production of publications on information of interest, first, to scientists, practitioners, educators, or medical librarians and, in turn, to all of us.

I wish to commend the Honorable JOHN JARMAN, my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, who presided over the excellent Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as well as the members of that subcommittee on their thorough examination of the various facets of this proposed legislation.

Through their efforts we are reminded that when the Congress passed the original Medical Library Assistance Act in 1965 we had only 6,000 medical libraries in the country. We are reminded that those libraries, more often than not, were in deep trouble from lack of funds for staff or for housing book collections. We had only 3,000 trained librarians to staff those facilities. That was a half a person for each.

The book collections were often highly inadequate, and what books or journals there were were bogged down in backlogs in cataloging and classification, or there was no space to make them readily accessible to the potential users. Indexing systems were often outmoded—so much so that some witnesses testified before the subcommittee that it was easier, and less expensive, to duplicate research than to dig through the outmoded and inadequate libraries to determine whether the research had already been performed. Now, we know research is not inexpensive—in terms of dollars, time, or scarce manpower—and we can ill afford duplication.

This was the framework within which our otherwise dynamic scientific programs in the health field had to work in recent decades when we have been anxious to make available billions of dollars to further health research. This is the framework within which medical practitioners have worked who need desperately to know the latest medical advances coming from the dynamic research programs. This is the framework that still existed when President Johnson emphasized the need to apply the wonderful results of the research we have been supporting these many years. And it was within this framework that we created the regional medical programs to help expedite the transmission of new medical knowledge to those whose lives depend upon it.

For years scientists, physicians, librarians, and even Congressmen have been alarmed at the well-named "information explosion." The Senate Government Operations Committee, for example, concerned itself, many years ago, with the great need for better coordination and communication in the biomedical sciences. The Office of Science and Technology also earnestly studied the problem of information explosion. None could escape the truth that we were outrunning ourselves so badly that much of our investment in research and training in the biomedical and health science fields was going down the drain because we could not begin to keep up with the medical literature.

So, at long last, in 1965, Congress began to put a plug in the dam—through the Medical Library Assistance Act—not by decreasing the medical literature, but by organizing it and making it more readily accessible to the users. It is not surprising that it took some time to get people and facilities trained and organized once we had determined to alter this woeful situation. In fact, only a portion of the original authorizations have been spent, even now, simply because it takes time to get things untangled and to clear the path ahead. Meanwhile, the literature has continued to explode; librarian turnover has continued at an alarming pace; and many other age-long problems have continued to increase the pressures upon the libraries and librarians.

Despite this, a commendable start has been made in relieving these pressures—made possible through the Medical Library Assistance Act. As one witness before the House Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare put it:

> The appropriations made thus far have paid great dividends, but they need to be at least doubled if we are to catch up in anywhere near reasonable time with the current deficiencies built up over decades of neglect.

That this issue is crucial to all facets of medical advancement is clear from the uniformly favorable testimony on behalf of H.R. 11702 by physicians, dentists, representatives of medical teaching facilities and hospitals, librarians, paramedical personnel, and so on—all insisting on the importance of strengthening this base upon which their efforts may succeed or fail.

Today we are conscientiously tightening our money belt, even in regard to the health efforts of the Nation. No one denies that we must give careful consideration to priorities. But I submit that this bill warrants a particularly high priority because without its passage not only will our original investment in it prove a waste, but so will much of our investments in biomedical research, training, and medical care administration.

In closing, I think of the many times medical specialists and health officials have testified before congressional committees that while much research is needed in the medical and health fields, nonetheless much could be accomplished in improving the Nation's health, in removing and preventing medical disasters—for example, mental retardation—if we but applied what we already know.

Mr. Chairman, I, for one, am convinced that the Medical Library Assistance Extension Act of 1969 is mandatory if we are to apply what is already known, or if we are to continue to move forward in search of new knowledge. To me, this legislation is not unglamorous; it is not undramatic. This legislation is a major supporting beam in the health of our Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, pursuant to the rule the Clerk will read the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Medical Library Assistance Extension Act of 1969".

THREE-YEAR EXTENSION OF EXISTING PROGRAMS

SEC. 2. The following provisions of the Public Health Service Act are each amended by striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973":

(1) Subsection (i) of section 393 (42 U.S.C. 280b-3(i)) (relating to assistance for construction of medical library facilities).

(2) Subsection (a) of section 394 (42 U.S.C. 280b-4(a)) (relating to grants for training in medical library sciences).

(3) Section 395 (42 U.S.C. 280b-5) (relating to assistance for compilations or writings concerning advances in sciences related to health).

(4) Subsection (a) of section 396 (42 U.S.C. 280b-6(a)) (relating to research and development in medical library science and related fields).

(5) Subsection (a) of section 397 (42 U.S.C. 280b-7(a)) (relating to assistance to improve or expand basic medical library resources).

(6) Subsection (a) of section 398 (42 U.S.C. 280b-8(a)) (relating to grants for establishment of regional medical libraries).

(7) Subsection (a) of section 399 (42 U.S.C. 280b-9(a)) (relating to assistance for biomedical scientific publications).

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL LIBRARY FACILITIES

SEC. 3. Section 393 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b-3) is amended—

(1) by amending clause (B) of subsection (b)(1) to read as follows: "(B) sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing the facility, and";

(b) by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively; and

(3) by striking out in subsection (c) (as so redesignated by this section) ", and shall give priority to applications for construction of facilities for which the need is greatest".

GRANTS FOR SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS

SEC. 4. (a) Section 395 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b-5) is amended—

(1) by striking out in the second sentence "for the establishment of special fellowships to be awarded to physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health and scientists" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "to make grants to physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health, to scientists, and to public

or nonprofit private institutions on behalf of such physicians, practitioners, and scientists"; and

(2) by striking out in the third sentence "In establishing such fellowships" and inserting in lieu thereof "In making such grants", and by striking out in such sentence "fellowships are established" and inserting in lieu thereof "grants are made".

(b) Subsection (b)(3) of section 390 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 280b) is amended by striking out "the awarding of special fellowships to physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health and scientists" and inserting in lieu thereof "grants to physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health, to scientists, and to public or nonprofit private institutions on behalf of such physicians, practitioners, and scientists".

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN MEDICAL LIBRARY SCIENCE AND RELATED FIELDS

SEC. 5. (a) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 396 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–6) is amended by striking out "research and investigations" and inserting in lieu thereof "research, investigations, and demonstrations".

(b) Subsection (b)(4) of section 390 of such Act is amended by striking out "research and investigations" and inserting in lieu thereof "research, investigations, and demonstrations".

GRANTS FOR BASIC RESOURCES OF MEDICAL LIBRARIES

SEC. 6. (a) Section 397 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–7) is amended—

(1) by striking out in the first sentence of subsection (b) "for the purpose of expanding and improving" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the purpose of establishing, expanding, and improving";

(2) by amending paragraph (2) of subsection (c) to read as follows:

"(2) In no case shall any grant under this section to a medical library or related instrumentality for any fiscal year exceed $200,000; and grants to such medical libraries or related instrumentalities shall be in such amounts as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe with a view to assuring adequate continuing financial support for such libraries or instrumentalities from other sources during and after the period for which Federal assistance is provided."; and

(3) by striking out in the heading of such section "IMPROVING AND EXPANDING" and inserting in lieu thereof "ESTABLISHING, EXPANDING, AND IMPROVING".

(b) Subsection (b)(5) of section 390 of such Act is amended by striking out "improving and expanding" and inserting in lieu thereof "establishing, expanding, and improving".

GRANTS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL MEDICAL LIBRARIES

SEC. 7. Section 398 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–8) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended (A) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (4), (B) by redesignating clause (5) as clause (6), and (C) by inserting after clause (4) the following new clause:

"(5) planning for services and activities under this section; and".

(2) Subsection (c)(1) is amended by striking out "(A) to modify and increase their library resources so as to be able to provide supportive services to other libraries in the region as well as individual users of library services" and inserting in lieu thereof "(A) to modify and increase their library resources, and to supplement the resources of cooperating libraries in the region, so as to be able to provide adequate supportive services to all libraries in the region, as well as to individual users of library services."

(3) Subsection (c)(2) is amended by striking out clause (A) and by redesignating clauses (B) and (C) as clauses (A) and (B), respectively.

(4) The following new subsection is added at the end thereof:

"(f) The Secretary may also carry out the purposes of this section through contracts, and such contracts shall be subject to the same limitations as are provided in this section for grants."

FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF BIOMEDICAL SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS

SEC. 8. Section 399 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 380b-9) is amended—

(1) by striking out in the second sentence of subsection (a) "public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education and individual scientists" and inserting in lieu thereof "public or nonprofit private institutions and organizations and individual scientists"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of subsection (b) the following: ", except in those cases in which the Secretary determines that further support is necessary to carry out the purposes of this section".

REDESIGNATIONS

SEC. 9. (a) Title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating part I as part J;

(2) by redesignating the part H entitled "PART H—NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE" as part I; and

(3) by redesignating sections 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, and 378 as sections 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, and 388 respectively.

(b)(1) Subsection (c) of the section of such Act redesignated as section 382 is amended by striking out "section 373" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 383".

(2) The section of such Act redesignated as section 385 is amended by striking out "section 373" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 383".

(3) Section 391(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 373(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 383(a)".

(4) Section 392 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out in subsection (a) "section 373(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 383(a)",

(B) by striking out in such subsection "section 373" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 383",

(C) by striking out in subsection (d) "section 373(d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 383(d)", and

(D) by striking out in such subsection "part H which deals with the National Library of Medicine" and inserting in lieu thereof "part I".

(c)(1) Section 395 of such Act is amended—

(A) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 395.",

(B) by striking out in the second sentence "under this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "under this subsection", and

(C) by amending the section heading to read as follows: "ASSISTANCE FOR SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS, AND FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN MEDICAL LIBRARY SCIENCE AND RELATED FIELDS".

(2) Section 396 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "SEC. 396. (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(b)",

(B) by striking out in the second sentence of subsection (a) "under this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "under this subsection",

(C) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c), and

(D) by striking out the section heading.

(3) Sections 397, 398, 399, 399a, and 399b of such Act are redesignated as sections 396, 397, 398, 399, and 399a, respectively.

MEANING OF SECRETARY

SEC. 10. As used in the amendments made by this Act, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to appropriations for fiscal years ending after June 30, 1970.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments?

There being no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. EDWARDS of California, 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. 11702) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 464, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

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.

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. SPRINGER. 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 370, nays 3, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—370

Abernethy	Belcher	Broomfield
Adair	Bell, Calif.	Brotzman
Adams	Bennett	Brown, Calif.
Addabbo	Betts	Brown, Mich.
Albert	Bevill	Brown, Ohio
Alexander	Biaggi	Broyhill, N.C.
Anderson, Calif.	Biester	Broyhill, Va.
	Bingham	Buchanan
Anderson, Ill.	Blackburn	Burke, Fla.
Anderson, Tenn.	Blanton	Burke, Mass.
	Blatnik	Burleson, Tex.
Andrews, Ala.	Boland	Burlison, Mo.
Annunzio	Bolling	Bush
Ashley	Brademas	Button
Ayres	Brasco	Byrne, Pa.
Baring	Bray	Byrnes, Wis.
Barrett	Brinkley	Cabell
Beall, Md.	Brooks	Caffery

Carter	Henderson	Pettis
Casey	Hicks	Philbin
Cederberg	Hogan	Pickle
Celler	Holifield	Pike
Chamberlain	Horton	Pirnie
Chappell	Hosmer	Poage
Chisholm	Howard	Podell
Clancy	Hull	Poff
Clark	Hungate	Pollock
Clawson, Del	Hunt	Preyer, N.C.
Clay	Hutchinson	Price, Ill.
Cleveland	Ichord	Pryor, Ark.
Cohelan	Jacobs	Pucinski
Collins	Jarman	Purcell
Colmer	Johnson, Calif.	Quie
Conable	Johnson, Pa.	Railsback
Conte	Jonas	Randall
Conyers	Jones, N.C.	Rarick
Corbett	Jones, Tenn.	Rees
Corman	Karth	Reid, Ill.
Coughlin	Kastenmeier	Reid, N.Y.
Cowger	Kazen	Reifel
Cramer	Kee	Reuss
Culver	Keith	Rhodes
Cunningham	King	Riegle
Daddario	Kleppe	Roberts
Daniel, Va.	Kluczynski	Rodino
Daniels, N.J.	Koch	Rogers, Fla.
Davis, Ga.	Kuykendall	Ronan
Davis, Wis.	Kyl	Rooney, N.Y.
de la Garza	Kyros	Rooney, Pa.
Delaney	Landgrebe	Rosenthal
Dellenback	Landrum	Rostenkowski
Denney	Langen	Roth
Dennis	Latta	Roudebush
Devine	Leggett	Ruppe
Donohue	Lennon	Ruth
Dorn	Lipscomb	Ryan
Dowdy	Lloyd	St Germain
Downing	Long, La.	St. Onge
Dulski	Long, Md.	Sandman
Duncan	Lowenstein	Satterfield
Dwyer	Lujan	Schadeberg
Eckhardt	McCarthy	Scherle
Edmondson	McClory	Schneebeli
Edwards, Calif.	McCloskey	Schwengel
Edwards, La.	McClure	Scott
Eilberg	McCulloch	Sebelius
Erlenborn	McDade	Shriver
Esch	McDonald, Mich.	Skubitz
Eshleman	McEwen	Slack
Evans, Colo.	McFall	Smith, Calif.
Evins, Tenn.	McKneally	Smith, Iowa
Fallon	McMillan	Smith, N.Y.
Farbstein	Macdonald, Mass.	Snyder
Feighan	MacGregor	Springer
Findley	Madden	Stafford
Fish	Mahon	Staggers
Fisher	Mailliard	Stanton
Flood	Marsh	Steed
Flynt	Martin	Steiger, Ariz.
Foley	Mathias	Stephens
Ford, Gerald R.	Matsunaga	Stokes
Ford, William D.	May	Stratton
Foreman	Mayne	Stubblefield
Fountain	Meeds	Stuckey
Friedel	Melcher	Sullivan
Fulton, Pa.	Meskill	Symington
Fuqua	Michel	Taft
Galifianakis	Mikva	Talcott
Gallagher	Miller, Ohio	Taylor
Garmatz	Mills	Teague, Calif.
Gaydos	Minish	Teague, Tex.
Gettys	Mink	Thompson, Ga.
Giaimo	Minshall	Thompson, N.J.
Gibbons	Mize	Thomson, Wis.
Gilbert	Mizell	Tiernan
Gonzalez	Monagan	Udall
Goodling	Montgomery	Ullman
Gray	Moorhead	Utt
Griffin	Morgan	Van Deerlin
Griffiths	Morse	Vander Jagt
Grover	Morton	Vanik
Gubser	Mosher	Vigorito
Gude	Moss	Waggonner
Hagan	Murphy, Ill.	Waldie
Haley	Murphy, N.Y.	Wampler
Hall	Myers	Watkins
Halpern	Natcher	Watson
Hamilton	Nedzi	Watts
Hammer-schmidt	Nelsen	Weicker
Hanley	Nichols	Whalen
Hanna	Obey	Whalley
Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara	White
Hansen, Wash.	O'Konski	Whitehurst
Harsha	Olsen	Widnall
Harvey	O'Neill, Mass.	Williams
Hastings	Ottinger	Wilson, Bob
Hathaway	Passman	Wilson, Charles H.
Hawkins	Patman	Winn
Hébert	Patten	Wold
Hechler, W. Va.	Pelly	Wright
Heckler, Mass.	Pepper	Wyatt
Helstoski	Perkins	Wylie
Henderson	Pettis	Wyman
Hicks	Philbin	Yates
Hogan	Pickle	Young
Holifield	Pike	Zablocki
Horton	Pirnie	Zion
Hosmer	Poage	Zwach
Howard	Podell	
Hull	Poff	
Hungate	Pollock	
Hunt	Preyer, N.C.	
Hutchinson	Price, Ill.	
Ichord	Pryor, Ark.	
Jacobs	Pucinski	
Jarman	Purcell	
Johnson, Calif.	Quie	
Johnson, Pa.	Railsback	
Jonas	Randall	
Jones, N.C.	Rarick	
Jones, Tenn.	Rees	
Karth	Reid, Ill.	
Kastenmeier	Reid, N.Y.	
Kazen	Reifel	
Kee	Reuss	
Keith	Rhodes	
King	Riegle	
Kleppe	Roberts	
Kluczynski	Rodino	
Koch	Rogers, Fla.	
Kuykendall	Ronan	
Kyl	Rooney, N.Y.	
Kyros	Rooney, Pa.	
Landgrebe	Rosenthal	
Landrum	Rostenkowski	
Langen	Roth	
Latta	Roudebush	
Leggett	Ruppe	
Lennon	Ruth	
Lipscomb	Ryan	
Lloyd	St Germain	
Long, La.	St. Onge	
Long, Md.	Sandman	
Lowenstein	Satterfield	
Lujan	Schadeberg	
McCarthy	Scherle	
McClory	Schneebeli	
McCloskey	Schwengel	
McClure	Scott	
McCulloch	Sebelius	
McDade	Shriver	
McDonald, Mich.	Skubitz	
McEwen	Slack	
McFall	Smith, Calif.	
McKneally	Smith, Iowa	
McMillan	Smith, N.Y.	
Macdonald, Mass.	Snyder	
MacGregor	Springer	
Madden	Stafford	
Mahon	Staggers	
Mailliard	Stanton	
Marsh	Steed	
Martin	Steiger, Ariz.	
Mathias	Stephens	
Matsunaga	Stokes	
May	Stratton	
Mayne	Stubblefield	
Meeds	Stuckey	
Melcher	Sullivan	
Meskill	Symington	
Michel	Taft	
Mikva	Talcott	
Miller, Ohio	Taylor	
Mills	Teague, Calif.	
Minish	Teague, Tex.	
Mink	Thompson, Ga.	
Minshall	Thompson, N.J.	
Mize	Thomson, Wis.	
Mizell	Tiernan	
Monagan	Udall	
Montgomery	Ullman	
Moorhead	Utt	
Morgan	Van Deerlin	
Morse	Vander Jagt	
Morton	Vanik	
Mosher	Vigorito	
Moss	Waggonner	
Murphy, Ill.	Waldie	
Murphy, N.Y.	Wampler	
Myers	Watkins	
Natcher	Watson	
Nedzi	Watts	
Nelsen	Weicker	
Nichols	Whalen	
Obey	Whalley	
O'Hara	White	
O'Konski	Whitehurst	
Olsen	Widnall	
O'Neill, Mass.	Williams	
Ottinger	Wilson, Bob	
Passman	Wilson, Charles H.	
Patman	Winn	
Patten	Wold	
Pelly	Wright	
Pepper	Wyatt	
Perkins	Wylie	
	Wyman	

NAYS—3

Camp	Gross	Saylor

NOT VOTING—59

Abbitt	Diggs	O'Neal, Ga.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dingell	Powell
Arends	Edwards, Ala.	Price, Tex.
Ashbrook	Fascell	Quillen
Aspinall	Flowers	Rivers
Berry	Fraser	Robison
Boggs	Frelinghuysen	Rogers, Colo.
Bow	Frey	Roybal
Brock	Fulton, Tenn.	Scheuer
Burton, Calif.	Goldwater	Shipley
Burton, Utah	Green, Oreg.	Sikes
Cahill	Green, Pa.	Sisk
Carey	Hays	Steiger, Wis.
Clausen, Don H.	Joelson	Tunney
Collier	Jones, Ala.	Whitten
Dawson	Kirwan	Wiggins
Dent	Lukens	Wolff
Derwinski	Mann	Wydler
Dickinson	Miller, Calif.	Yatron
	Mollohan	
	Nix	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Don Clawson.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Derwinski.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Scheuer.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Joelson with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Flowers.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Yatron.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Robison.

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. STAGGERS. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE STANDARD REFERENCE DATA ACT

Mr. DADDARIO. 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. 4284) to authorize appropriations to carry out the Standard Reference Data Act.

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

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. 4284, with Mr. EDWARDS of California 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 Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

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

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 4284 is to authorize appropriations for the continuation of standard reference data activities at the National Bureau of Standards in fiscal years 1970 and 1971. This would involve authorization of $2.4 million for fiscal year 1970 and $3.6 million for fiscal year 1971.

The standard reference data bill was first considered and passed by the House in August 1966, and signed into law in July 1968. When first proposed to the House, the Bureau of Standards wanted a rapidly expanding program which would grow from $1.86 million the first year to $4.8 million the second year. Because of the budget situation and the war in Vietnam, the House recommended a less accelerated program and required that the program be reauthorized this year.

In keeping with congressional intent, the Bureau did scale down its program, and the bill now before us represents, we believe, a reasonable level of effort.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the standard data system is to make critically evaluated quantitative data on the physical and chemical properties of substances readily accessible to scientists and engineers throughout the country. This includes, for example, measurements of the amount of energy released when chemical elements combine to form new compounds, or the ability of various substances to conduct electricity or heat under certain conditions. It also shows how various metals or compounds react to different stresses and strains, or temperature changes.

This type of information is urgently needed not only for the efficient conduct of our national research and development effort, but is required in the commercial sector of our economy as well. It is used as basic reference data in such diverse fields as transportation, electronics, construction, and the manufacturing of commercial goods, medicines, and other products.

The raw data from which standard reference data are developed result from property measurements produced through research conducted by millions

of scientists and engineers throughout the world, and are published in the many thousands of scientific journals and reports. Therefore, while these data theoretically are available to anyone who is prepared to search the literature to find them, it is quite often difficult to locate a specific number or value in the millions of pages of scientific literature. Of equal importance is the fact that once the number or value is located, it is difficult to determine just how reliable such information is. Only a specialist in the field can tell which number is most likely to be correct, and it is these specialists who, working with the National Bureau of Standards, select a single value or range of values as the best or "standard" value to be incorporated in the standard data system. The data may then be used with confidence, and scientists and engineers may depend upon the reliability of the measurements without having to again conduct the experiments.

During the past year, the Bureau has continued to gather and evaluate data in the seven broad areas covered by the program. These are nuclear properties, atomic and molecular properties, solid state properties, thermodynamic and transport properties, chemical kinetics, colloid and surface properties, and mechanical properties.

In fiscal year 1969, the Bureau published a total of 15 standard data compilations dealing with such subjects as molten salts, thermal conductivity, reaction kinetics, and electron impact.

The publication on molten salts, for example, contains data on the properties of 174 salts gathered from 256 references in several languages which has been evaluated to determine a consistent set of values. Without this book, scientists and engineers requiring this information would be faced with the task of doing their own search of the literature dating as far back as 1904. Data on molten salts have increasing industrial and scientific importance because most metals are prepared or purified by electrolytic or chemical processes involving molten salts. In addition, molten salts are used in a variety of batteries and fuel cells, and the so-called molten salt reactor is one of the most promising of the new generation of nuclear power reactors under development.

In fiscal years 1970 and 1971, the Bureau will continue to place primary program emphasis on the fields of thermodynamic and transport properties and upon atomic and molecular properties. In determining program priorities, the Bureau considers first, the need for critically evaluated data in a given field; second, the present level of activity; and third, the "ripeness" of the field for critical evaluation—that is, whether the measurement techniques appear to be sufficiently stabilized that the data will remain current for a reasonable period.

In the field of nuclear data, for example, there is a clear need for the data, but the Atomic Energy Commission has been able to satisfy most of the demands, and the Bureau has not become heavily involved in this area. However, in fiscal years 1970 and 1971, the Bureau will be supporting, in conjunction with the Atomic Energy Commission, data relating to radioisotopes. This data is of great value to physicists involved in basic nuclear research, as well as to engineers concerned with nuclear reactors. Nuclear chemists engaged in isotope tracer studies and analytic chemists who are developing sensitive means of chemical analysis must have such data. There are also increasing demands in the medical and biological fields, and in fact almost every scientist or engineer who uses radioactive isotopes has some need for this data.

Unlike the situation existing in the nuclear field, in atomic and molecular and thermodynamic and transport data there is no single Government agency or private group that has been active in the field, and since the need is still great, the Bureau has made a substantial effort in this area. Generally speaking, this type of data cuts across conventional disciplinary lines, and is used by most scientists and engineers. Engineers, for example, require information relating to the thermal conductivity, heat capacity and viscosity of the materials with which they are working.

In addition, the entire chemical industry rests upon a base of thermodynamic data since the efficiency of every chemical process is governed by the thermodynamic properties of the substances involved.

Mr. Chairman, the increasing complexity of Government and industry leads to demands for a greater variety of data and for data of higher accuracy. The data compilations used in the past are insufficient in scope and accuracy for modern needs, and the standard data program at the Bureau must be continued.

As I view it, Mr. Chairman, this program can be considered an effort to promote efficiency of operations and to avoid duplication of effort in our entire research and development effort. It is an important program and it deserves the support of the House.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should point out that this program has the approval of the Nixon administration, and while the overall budget of the Bureau of Standards was reduced from $41 million to $38 million, the President did not change the amount requested for the standard data program.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to answer any questions the Members may have.

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

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentlemna from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I was anxious not to interrupt his statement, but still I would like a little information.

As I understand the bill, it will merely authorize to be appropriated sufficient funds to carry out Public Law 90–396. That law is already in effect, and the merits of the bill, so far as collecting the data, collating it, and using computers, and so forth, so that it will be universally available, is not under discussion, although at the time of the discussion it might have been considered that was a function of industry, or of the using industries of the data rather than the Federal Government. Is that a correct assumption to start with?

Mr. DADDARIO. It is a correct assumption except in regard, I might say, to the idea that industry could in fact compile this information on its own or that the using agencies could in fact do it. Over a period of time it was found that this was not being done. For the past decade or so this information was not being compiled. We found a need to put the data together in this way, and that recommendation was in fact made and followed by this House last year.

Mr. HALL. Therefore, because it is the law of the land at the present time, all we are doing is authorizing the appropriation?

Mr. DADDARIO. That is correct, sir.

Mr. HALL. I can understand how this data is being collected at such a rapid rate in so many different languages from so many different sources and notions, and that there might be a need for collation and proper portrayal.

But, getting down to the bill itself, as I understand it, the committee will mark out the open-ended feature by striking—

and such sums as may be necessary for succeeding fiscal years

And limiting it to a $6 million ceiling for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971.

Mr. DADDARIO. That is correct. That is the way the bill came to us from the administration.

Mr. HALL. The bill has been approved by this administration, although it was submitted by former Secretary of Commerce Smith, just prior to the inauguration; is that correct?

Mr. DADDARIO. It has been approved by the Nixon administration.

I should like to add that the administration supports this in this amount of $2.4 million for fiscal 1970, even though the Bureau's overall budget request was reduced.

Mr. HALL. Therefore, it is budgeted and it was approved by the Bureau of the Budget as I determined from the committee report.

Mr. DADDARIO. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. What I am leading up to, Mr. Chairman—and I appreciate the gentleman's statements—is that this $6 million is the sum total of $2.4 million which is expected to be expended by the department in fiscal year 1970, and the $3.6 million in 1971. In other words, this is not an authorization of $6 million for each of the fiscal years 1970 and 1971?

Mr. DADDARIO. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DADDARIO. I certainly do.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is there any charge made for the information collected through this process?

Mr. DADDARIO. There is a charge being made, I might say to the gentleman, to the users of the data. At first it had been expected that the return would be something on the order of 25 percent of the overall costs, but this, as we have been able to review it, was an optimistic figure. It is expected that the users will

repay something along the line of 10 to 15 percent of the overall cost.

Mr. GROSS. They are presently paying 10 to 15 percent or will be in the future?

Mr. DADDARIO. It is expected that they will.

Mr. GROSS. But it is not the 25 percent which, as the gentleman said, was a little overoptimistic?

Mr. DADDARIO. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. How does this compare with the expenditure for fiscal year 1969 for this purpose? We have had enough experience now, I presume, to judge that.

Mr. DADDARIO. The estimate is based on a long-range study of this particular situation. We really have not had that much experience from what we have done since 1969. Rather, this estimate is based on a review of the overall situation and how it looks for the future.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I am not talking now about the percentage return or the fee charged as a percent of the cost—the fees paid to the Government.

May I ask this question: Do these funds go to the General Treasury or are they returned to NASA?

Mr. DADDARIO. This is not a NASA activity; this is the National Bureau of Standards. The funds go back to the General Treasury.

Mr. GROSS. The money then goes to the Treasury of the United States or to the Department of Commerce?

Mr. DADDARIO. It is my understanding that it goes back to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I see. Did you have a full year's appropriation last year?

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. In 1969?

Mr. DADDARIO. There was an authorization and an appropriation last year.

Mr. GROSS. What was the actual appropriation for the fiscal year?

Mr. DADDARIO. $1.9 million.

Mr. GROSS. What is the reason for the step-up to $2.4 million in fiscal 1970 and to $3.6 million in 1971?

Mr. DADDARIO. Because it is a program which we were just getting underway. It was understood that it would gradually increase to something on the order of $18 to $20 million over the course of many years. That overall figure also has now been reduced because since we have begun doing this other countries have begun to participate, and it looks as though the overall job will be done in a cheaper way. Nonetheless, the increase as we go along is to develop a capability to handle this very important matter and to develop the personnel and capability to do it. We will naturally start with the low sum, and we will work up from there. As I said, we expect next year an expenditure in the amount of $3.6 million.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL of California. Is it not also true that there has been a considerable demand for this type of work on the part of the National Bureau of Standards and data organizations of the industrial and academic communities?

Mr. DADDARIO. There is no question but that there has been a tremendous demand. The reason this program was developed was because of this need and the inability of the private sector in fact to be able to do it because of its complex nature.

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

Mr. DADDARIO. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman for the splendid contribution which he and his colleagues on the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development have made in several very important areas, including some very complicated scientific fields. There also exists an excellent working relationship between our Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Science and Astronautics in matters dealing particularly with problems in the field of pollution. I know the chairman understands that we are interested in this question of pollution.

Although I do believe we are in agreement, for clarification of the RECORD, may I ask for an explanation of the language which appears in the report at the bottom of page 2, the last paragraph, which reads as follows:

> To date the program in the field of chemical kinetics has emphasized the analysis of data on the chemical reactions of gases. In fiscal years 1970 and 1971, this emphasis will shift to the chemical reactions of solutions because of the need for this data to combat water pollution.

Then at the top of page 3—and this in my opinion needs clarification—there is the following:

> In order to develop procedures to control stream and river pollution, it is necessary to understand the rates and mechanisms of reactions of possible pollutants with water.

The question which I would like to ask the gentleman, my very good friend, is this: Is it correct that these provisions would not provide or authorize you to make grants to research what is occurring in various solutions and in various technical fields, but this merely authorizes the collection of data as developed from other sources?

Mr. DADDARIO. What this does is to develop and evaluate information on such matters, for example, as waste soap. Soap disolves in water and this is designed to determine at what rate it dissolves and this information can then be evaluated. This would involve not only soaps, but detergents and other soluble matters. Then this information would be put together and evaluated in a critical way which would be of benefit to the water pollution programs which come under the jurisdiction of the committee on which the gentleman from Minnesota serves. Similarly, the work being done in various other fields such as nuclear energy would be of benefit to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. BLATNIK. The reason I ask the question is because we have already authorized for research and demonstration grants, grants to attempt to solve many problems which remain unsolvable and to seek solutions to control some of these sophisticated chemicals. We have already authorized anywhere from $60 to $100 million in the Water Pollution Control Act.

Mr. DADDARIO. May I say to the gentleman that there is no conflict in this regard. The information which will come from this program is the kind of information which is forwarded to the National Bureau of Standards and then which is compiled into this list of critical data. It is not an exclusive area, but it is a compilation of such information wherever it might be found so that it can be made available, and it preserves the work being done through research in the area which the gentleman is discussing and in many other areas as well.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has answered and clarified my questions to my satisfaction.

We have authorized seven regional and two national water pollution control laboratories for the first time which delve in great depth into very complicated and precise problems, including chemical studies and reactions that lead to pollution, causes of pollution and steps or procedures necessary to abate that pollution or maintain it at a permissible level. This operation would authorize the Bureau of Standards to gather this data from all sources, whether it be a Federal laboratory, a university, or a chemical industry.

The proposal made here would be to allow the Bureau of Standards to gather all this information into a readily available booklet. It may even be computerized. Their purpose would not be that of going into creative research work, but merely the collecting and the filing of other research work.

Mr. DADDARIO. The gentleman from Minnesota is correct, Mr. Chairman, in this regard. Wherever this information is available, and after it is analyzed, it can be made available by the Bureau of Standards. So the Bureau of Standards might not be working just in this one particular area, but in other areas as well, and perhaps in conjunction with other groups. The results of the work of an agency such as the one the gentleman referred to, having special talents to do that particular research, would do it, and the results would then be available to the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend him. This is a very badly needed service, especially with the proliferation of scientific knowledge into so many complex and highly specialized fields. The average, busy scientist, regardless of the area in which he specializes or works, needs such assistance so that that information and data can be readily available to him from a central source.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his explanation and for his clarification, and I strongly urge the adoption of this measure.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the questions that have been asked by the gentleman from Minnesota, and I thank the gentleman for having done so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL).

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H.R. 4284, the Standard Reference Data Act.

I would also like to compliment my distinguished colleague from Connecticut on his remarks and on his diligent performance as chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development.

This legislation was unanimously reported by the committee.

Dr. Allen Astin, Director of the National Bureau of Standards, testified before our committee that the standard reference data program is one of the Bureau's most sophisticated activities and is one which contributes significantly to understanding and communication among scientists and engineers.

Both the sophistication and the need for the program are, I believe, self evident.

The acceleration of scientific technological achievements during the past decade has been breathtaking.

I would ask my colleagues to reflect for just a moment on the fact that the extent of accomplishments in science and technology since World War II will be duplicated in the next 5 years.

Indeed, the flood of information pouring from the world's laboratories has nearly overcome the capacity of normal scientific processes to digest it.

The standard reference data system exists to keep this output manageable.

I want to point out to my colleagues that this is not an open-ended authorization.

The Fulton amendment adopted by this body on August 14, 1967, provides for annual authorizations, and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his foresight.

Annual review will allow us continuing influence over the management of all this material, its availability and distribution.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that my colleagues recognize the essential function performed by the national standard reference data program and give their full support to the bill before us.

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

Mr. BELL of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I congratulate the gentleman on his excellent statement and commend the work of the subcommittee on this legislation as well as the full Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. Chairman, I favor this legislation. I believe it is necessary if we are going to be able to have available for our engineers and scientists the fruits of science and modern progress and be able to have this information readily available in many fields and disciplines.

So I strongly feel this bill should be passed.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, such time as he may desire.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, for centuries it has been the custom to sort and classify and store the results of scientific investigations. This store is a resource from which scientists and engineers draw information on the matter and materials of the world in order to fashion the goods upon which our standard of living is based.

But the exponential growth of the volume of scientific results being produced has left the old fashioned sort and store operations way behind. The new material is so vast that the sorting cannot be kept up to date; even the sorted data includes unreliable numbers, contradictory numbers. The scientist or engineer who needs this information is in for a time-consuming and often frustrating time. His time and his frustration add up to a colossal waste over the whole of our scientific and technological activity.

The new concept introduced by the standard reference data system is the comprehensive, systematic evaluation of data so that they are available when and where needed. Experts select only those numbers for the properties of matter and materials they believe to be the most reliable. The result is a much reduced searching time, and a much increased chance of finding useful and reliable data.

The data we are talking about here are the life blood of our modern technology. A nuclear power plant designer decides how much cooling fluid is required by knowing how rapidly heat is conducted through the coating of the uranium fuel element in the reactor core, how rapidly heat is conducted through the shielding material, and how rapidly heat is transferred though the material of the steam generator. To the extent that these data do not exist, are not readily available, or are unreliable, we delay the progress of our technology and waste our resources.

A good start has been made toward the establishment of an operating standard reference data system, but this program requires our continuing support. It can enhance our scientific and technological progress at a relatively miniscule investment, and I urge the House to support the bill.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Chairman, the standard reference data program administered by the National Bureau of Standards is an excellent program that is directed at solving the problem of recording, validating, and storing the world's scientific and technical output. The program allows for a sifting through of the tremendous amount of data on the properties of matter and materials produced by modern science and technology to find the most reliable and accurate values of these properties.

The result of this work is that the individual scientist and engineer need not do this sort of work himself. Because of this, the program not only saves valuable time and manpower in science and industry but also gives us reliable standards, universally accepted.

We are all aware of the need for scientific and technological information now and in the next decade that will give us the answers to solving our problems of hunger, pollution, overcrowded cities, and the greater use of our resources. Any program that will aid our scientists and technologists in gaining time in reaching decisions needs our support.

Significantly, the Soviet Union patterned their standard reference data system after ours and I feel the following article from a Soviet Union publication in August of 1966 is of interest to the Members:

> From the experience gained by the national service of the USA and the preliminary evaluation of the efficiency of such a service in our country, it is possible to conclude that the GSSSD (State Service of Standard Reference Data) is a highly economical system. The application of this service on a countrywide scale will help sharply to reduce the time spent by experts in science and technology on obtaining information, to decrease rejects due to unreliable data on the properties of substances and materials at all the stages of industrial planning, production, utilization, and repairs; to speed up adoption of new materials in production, and eliminate the duplication of work. The profits obtained as a result of the GSSSD activity on a national scale will greatly exceed the expenditure required for its establishment.

The standard reference data bill, H.R. 4284, is sensible and should be supported.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the standard reference data program is an important program and should be supported. I should also point out that the bill was unanimously reported by the committee.

I believe one point which deserves emphasis is that the Government itself is a major user of standard reference data. The programs of the Department of Defense, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Atomic Energy Commission, and many other agencies are critically dependent upon accurate data. The design of rocket engines, life support systems, long-range communication systems, and nuclear reactors all require data of extremely high accuracy. And from what I understand, our sophisticated methods of missile defense often depend upon standard reference data in the areas of chemical kinetics, atomic and molecular properties, and thermodynamic and transport properties. In planning its program, the needs of the Government are always considered and provided by the Bureau.

Another way to illustrate the Government involvement in standard data is to consider the production of the raw data which is evaluation. It is easy to trace the producers of data from the documentation which is present in the standard data publications, and the Bureau recently made a survey of the references quoted in three of their publications which appeared during fiscal year 1969—NSRDS–NBS–15, 20, and 25. Among references to work carried out in the United States, over 70 percent gave acknowledgments of work done by or for specific Government agencies, mainly AEC, DOD, and NSF. In addition, this figure tends to underestimate the actual Government involvement, since it covers only specific projects and grants and does not consider the more general forms of Government assistance to universities which may in fact be used to conduct research.

In this light, the standard data program may be considered as an integral

part of the total Government research and development program. The utility of the research supported by the various agencies of the Government is greatly enhanced by the consolidation, critical evaluation, and dissemination which is carried out by the Bureau. I should also point out that the cost of this program is a very small fraction—perhaps one-tenth of 1 percent—of the total Government support of basic research alone, and an even smaller fraction of the $16 billion Government research and development effort. If these funds for the standard data program can improve the efficiency of the Federal R. & D. program, then I believe the funds will have been well spent.

Finally, I would like to point out that this is one of the few programs in Government where we can take advantage of, and receive a benefit from, the research work being conducted in foreign countries—Russia, England, Germany, and France. Another interesting point which came out of this survey I mentioned is that 51 percent of the references cover work done in foreign laboratories. Much of this foreign work was reported in obscure journals, and was conducted in laboratories whose competence would be unknown to many American scientists and engineers. By making these foreign results available to U.S. scientists after critical evaluation by the Bureau, it is possible to realize a considerable savings. It would be difficult to make a meaningful quantitative estimate of these savings, but it is clear that if the evaluated data of foreign origin were not available, it would be necessary to repeat many of the measurements in U.S. laboratories.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971, but not to exceed a total of $6,000,000, to carry out the purposes of the Standard Reference Data Act (Public Law 90-396; 82 Stat. 339).

Mr. DADDARIO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike "and such sums as may be necessary for succeeding fiscal years,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. EDWARDS of California, 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. 4284) to authorize appropriations to carry out the Standard Reference Data Act, pursuant to House Resolution 446 he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. 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 pro tempore. 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 367, nays 2, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—367

Abernethy	Burlison, Mo.	Downing
Adair	Burton, Utah	Dulski
Adams	Bush	Duncan
Addabbo	Button	Dwyer
Albert	Byrne, Pa.	Eckhardt
Alexander	Byrnes, Wis.	Edmondson
Anderson, Calif.	Cabell	Edwards, Calif.
	Caffery	Edwards, La.
Anderson, Ill.	Camp	Eilberg
Anderson, Tenn.	Carter	Erlenborn
	Casey	Esch
Andrews, Ala.	Cederberg	Eshleman
Annunzio	Celler	Evans, Colo.
Ashley	Chamberlain	Evins, Tenn.
Ayres	Chappell	Fallon
Baring	Clark	Farbstein
Barrett	Clawson, Del	Fascell
Beall, Md.	Clay	Feighan
Belcher	Cleveland	Findley
Bell, Calif.	Cohelan	Fish
Bennett	Collins	Fisher
Betts	Colmer	Flood
Bevill	Conable	Flynt
Biaggi	Conte	Ford, Gerald R.
Biester	Conyers	Ford, William D.
Bingham	Corbett	
Blackburn	Corman	Foreman
Blanton	Coughlin	Fountain
Blatnik	Cowger	Friedel
Boland	Cramer	Fulton, Pa.
Brademas	Culver	Fuqua
Brasco	Daddario	Galifianakis
Bray	Daniel, Va.	Gallagher
Brinkley	Daniels, N.J.	Garmatz
Brooks	Davis, Ga.	Gaydos
Broomfield	Davis, Wis.	Gettys
Brotzman	de la Garza	Giaimo
Brown, Calif.	Delaney	Gibbons
Brown, Mich.	Dellenback	Gilbert
Brown, Ohio	Denney	Gonzalez
Broyhill N.C.	Dennis	Goodling
Broyhill, Va.	Devine	Gray
Buchanan	Dingell	Griffin
Burke, Fla.	Donohue	Griffiths
Burke, Mass.	Dorn	Grover
Burleson, Tex.	Dowdy	Gubser
Gude	Martin	Ruth
Haley	Mathias	Ryan
Hall	Matsunaga	St Germain
Halpern	May	St. Onge
Hamilton	Mayne	Sandman
Hammer-schmidt	Meeds	Satterfield
	Melcher	Saylor
Hanley	Meskill	Schadeberg
Hanna	Mikva	Scherle
Hansen, Idaho	Miller, Calif.	Scheuer
Harsha	Miller, Ohio	Schneebeli
Harvey	Mills	Schwengel
Hastings	Minish	Scott
Hathaway	Mink	Sebelius
Hawkins	Minshall	Shipley
Hébert	Mize	Shriver
Hechler, W. Va.	Mizell	Skubitz
Heckler, Mass.	Mollohan	Slack
Helstoski	Monagan	Smith, Calif.
Henderson	Montgomery	Smith, Iowa
Hicks	Moorhead	Smith, N.Y.
Hogan	Morgan	Snyder
Holifield	Morse	Springer
Horton	Morton	Stafford
Hosmer	Mosher	Staggers
Howard	Moss	Stanton
Hull	Murphy, Ill.	Steed
Hungate	Murphy, N.Y.	Steiger, Ariz.
Hunt	Myers	Steiger, Wis.
Hutchinson	Natcher	Stephens
Ichord	Nedzi	Stokes
Jacobs	Nelsen	Stratton
Jarman	Nichols	Stubblefield
Johnson, Calif.	Obey	Stuckey
Johnson, Pa.	O'Hara	Sullivan
Jones, Ala.	O'Konski	Symington
Jones, N.C.	O'Neill, Mass.	Taft
Jones, Tenn.	Patman	Talcott
Karth	Patten	Taylor
Kastenmeier	Pelly	Teague, Calif.
Kazen	Pepper	Teague, Tex.
Kee	Perkins	Thompson, Ga.
Keith	Pettis	Thompson, N.J.
King	Philbin	Thomson, Wis.
Kleppe	Pickle	Tiernan
Kluczynski	Pike	Udall
Koch	Pirnie	Ullman
Kuykendall	Poage	Utt
Kyl	Podell	Van Deerlin
Kyros	Poff	Vander Jagt
Landgrebe	Pollock	Vanik
Landrum	Preyer, N.C.	Vigorito
Langen	Price, Ill.	Waggonner
Latta	Pryor, Ark.	Waldie
Leggett	Pucinski	Wampler
Lennon	Purcell	Watkins
Lipscomb	Quie	Watson
Lloyd	Railsback	Watts
Long, La.	Randall	Weicker
Lowenstein	Rarick	Whalen
Lujan	Rees	Whalley
McCarthy	Reid, Ill.	White
McCloskey	Reid, N.Y.	Whitehurst
McClure	Reifel	Williams
McCulloch	Reuss	Wilson, Bob
McDade	Rhodes	Wilson, Charles H.
McDonald, Mich.	Riegle	
	Rivers	Winn
McEwen	Roberts	Wold
McFall	Rodino	Wright
McKneally	Rogers, Fla.	Wyatt
McMillan	Ronan	Wylie
Macdonald, Mass.	Rooney, N.Y.	Wyman
	Rooney, Pa.	Yates
MacGregor	Rosenthal	Young
Madden	Rostenkowski	Zablocki
Mahon	Roth	Zion
Mailliard	Roudebush	Zwach
Marsh	Ruppe	

NAYS—2

Gross	Michel

NOT VOTING—63

Abbitt	Derwinski	Mann
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dickinson	Nix
	Diggs	Olsen
Arends	Edwards, Ala.	O'Neal, Ga.
Ashbrook	Flowers	Ottinger
Aspinall	Foley	Passman
Berry	Fraser	Powell
Boggs	Frelinghuysen	Price, Tex.
Bolling	Frey	Quillen
Bow	Fulton, Tenn.	Robison
Brock	Goldwater	Rogers, Colo.
Burton, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Roybal
Cahill	Green, Pa.	Sikes
Carey	Hagan	Sisk
Chisholm	Hansen, Wash.	Tunney
Clancy	Hays	Whitten
Clausen, Don H.	Joelson	Widnall
	Jonas	Wiggins
Collier	Kirwan	Wolff
Cunningham	Long, Md.	Wydler
Dawson	Lukens	Yatron
Dent	McClory	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Don Clausen.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Olsen.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Joelson with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Abbott with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr McClory.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Long of Maryland with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Diggs.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Dawson.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Powell.

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. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RETURN TO THE SENATE OF S. 1583, APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT AND ACCOMPANYING PAPERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a request from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1583) entitled "An Act to provide that appointments and promotions in the Post Office Department, including the postal field service, be made on the basis of merit and fitness", together with all accompanying papers.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, is this the bill that was passed by the other body on Tuesday morning without any debate whatsoever, the only explanation being the bill as printed in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not aware of what action took place in the other body.

The Chair is aware of the action of the other body which is now before the House.

Without objection, the request of the Senate is agreed to, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is discharged from further consideration of the bill S. 1583, and the Clerk will return the bill to the Senate.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the schedule for next week.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have finished the legislative business for this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day. There are 16 District bills as follows:

H.R. 9551, Metropolitan Police Band;

H.R. 1783, to incorporate Paralyzed Veterans of America;

H.R. 257, to prohibit picketing near church;

H.R. 4183, pensions to retired police and firemen's widows;

H.R. 4184, to equalize retirement benefits for totally disabled police and firemen;

H.R. 9548, to exempt Maryland and Virginia wages from attachment in District of Columbia;

H.R. 6947, to amend grandfather clause regarding chancery locations;

H.R. 9549, to amend Podiatry Act;

H.R. 9553, to amend District of Columbia Minimum Wage Act for hospital employees;

H.R. 4181, to amend statute of limitations regarding actions on property improvements;

H.R. 255, to deduct interest in advance on installment loans;

H.R. 12677, to convey property to Jewish Historical Society;

H.R. 8868, the Interstate Compact on Juveniles;

H.R. 12720, to convey property to Washington International School, Inc.;

H.R. 5967, two auto tags per Member; and

H.R. 12671, to permit employment of minors, 14 to 16.

On Tuesday:

H.R. 4018, to provide for the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965—open rule, 2 hours of debate.

On Wednesday: No legislative business.

On Thursday:

H.R. 7491, to clarify the liability of national banks for certain taxes—open rule, 1 hour of debate; and

H.R. 8261, acquisition of control of air carriers—open rule, 1 hour of debate; making in order the committee substitute as an original bill for purpose of amendment.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

APOLLO 11 LAUNCHING

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, all Members are aware that the Apollo 11 launch, one of the historic events in the history of this country, is scheduled for Wednesday next. Many Members are expected to be present at the launching. As I understand, all Members have been invited. In view of that, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday next, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the dire necessity to meet the financial crisis that this country is in, I am unable to find any reason at all why a substantial amount of money should be spent to transport to Florida—I do not know how many Members of Congress and their wives or other members of their families—to this launching. I do not know how much this enterprise is going to cost, but I do know it will cost a tremendous amount of money. I have no other way of protesting this sort of thing. I think this is one of the most ill-advised operations that we could have at this time.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is a very responsible and important member of the party which operates the administration.

Mr. GROSS. Which administration?

Mr. ALBERT. As I understand, the invitation to attend the launching has come from the administration, not from the House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. The remarks that I just made still apply, I will say to the gentleman, regardless of whose administration it came from.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am just as concerned as the gentleman is.

About 60 years ago, here on the House floor, the same kind of debate was taking place on the airplane. The House was told that it would never contribute to the economy of our country. I wonder what the Members who stated such views would say if they were here today?

We are spending between $3 and $4 billion a year on our space program. I do not believe there is any way that a layman, such as our Members are, can have a feeling for the space program without just flat seeing part of it, and I think this is a very popular subject for our people today, the Members of Congress.

I am very sorry the gentleman feels

the way he does. I wish he would go down to Florida. If he would go down there and see something of our space program and how it is operating, he would get a feel of what our country is doing. If there is anything in the world today our country is on top of, it is the space program. Around the world there is nothing that gives our country a better image than our space program.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know of a single thing that a Member of Congress can contribute by way of a safe launching of this vehicle or the safe return to earth of this vehicle by having taken a trip down to Florida. I do know one thing. I believe every Member of this House has a television set. I intend to be watching on television, to the extent of the time I have to devote to it. I will be interested in reading newspaper accounts and hearing radio accounts of this launching and the flight of this vehicle. Yes, of course, I will, but I do not need to go to Florida to spend the taxpayers' money for that purpose in an enterprise to which I could make no good contribution.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There are many Members of this body who have been present for one launching, and I would tell the gentleman that there is not one of those who would say he could have learned from TV what he saw going on down there while witnessing the launch. It is just different. That is all there is to it.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight who, as everyone knows, is a very outstanding Member of the House, and is certainly always conscious of our responsibilities to the taxpayers. I observed the Apollo 8 launching and had an opportunity to inspect the facilities at Cape Kennedy. I believe the gentleman would have a better working basis on which to judge future requests for money on the part of NASA if he were to go down there and see the operation. I really think the gentleman would.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further comment?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if I can arrange a trip for the gentleman from Iowa which does not cost the taxpayers a cent, will the gentleman go down and look over the space program at Cape Kennedy and the launching?

Mr. GROSS. No; I thank the gentleman, because I do not think I can contribute anything to the launching by making such a trip. If I thought I could contribute, I would go. I do not think anyone else is going to contribute anything to it other than those who are closely associated and connected with the program and have a knowledge of what is taking place.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to prolong this.

Mr. Speaker, I object to the request.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from California and withhold my objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield because I wanted to make a statement correcting a statement made by the distinguished majority leader, and I know the gentleman will accept it.

The majority leader said this was the time of one of our greatest days in this country when these people will be launched. I would like to amend that and say it is one of the greatest days in the world. It is a day when for the first time in the history of mankind we will send men out who will put their feet on another celestial body. This is far greater than anything that has taken place. I hope the gentleman will accept the request.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am glad to yield to the gentleman's appraisal of the situation. It certainly is a momentous moment in the history of the world.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of what has transpired, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 14, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to make it plain that the invitation to attend the Apollo 11 launch at Cape Kennedy on Wednesday, July 16th, is a bipartisan invitation on the part of the NASA Administrator and the Democratic side of the House as well as the Republican side of the House. The invitation is for the U.S. day of history, man's first journey to the moon, the Apollo 11 launch of three U.S. astronauts for the moon on next Wednesday, July 16. Gee whillickers, what a day we have, all of us in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, unless we people back these three fine U.S. astronauts on the most dangerous mission that we have ever had anybody undertake in this country for a peacetime purpose, I think we will be letting our U.S. astronauts down. Our American people do care, we in Congress care, and we will show our confidence by showing up to see our U.S. astronauts successfully on their way.

It must be remembered that in 1961 when President Kennedy stated as a national goal that this Nation would try to make a manned flight to the moon and return within this decade, on my motion a rollcall was held on the floor of this House, and this House unanimously authorized this particular journey and this tremendous Apollo program. To me it seems a shame that everyone in this House does not feel the same way and that some very, very few have changed their minds in spite of the tremendous successes of the United States in space to date.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that certain people lift their sights above the cornstalks on either side of the row they are hoeing.

In peaceful competition, I am for our team of astronauts to land on the moon first, and for our good country to be preeminent in space, science, technology, and progress.

Sour grapes at this time in trying to prevent the 254 Members of the House from going to Cape Kennedy who have already accepted the invitation to cheer our team on, will not succeed in reducing our enthusiasm. Any Member can decide to stay home, but to attempt to block all the others against their will is simply poor sportsmanship.

Our hopes, our fears, and our cheers ride with our U.S. astronauts—brave, fearless, and dedicated, daring, competent, trained, and ready. What a time to be alive, what a privilege to participate in the Apollo program, I am deeply grateful.

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

There was no objection.

SECRETARY KENNEDY USES SCARE TACTICS OF PRICE CONTROLS

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Kennedy should stop threatening general wage and price controls as a scare tactic about inflation.

Wage and price controls would have to be imposed by legislation and Secretary Kennedy does not have a chance of getting such a measure through the 91st Congress.

The Secretary of the Treasury is deceiving the country through these outlandish suggestions of controls that he has no power to impose. It is time for the Secretary to learn his job and to face up to the hard facts involving our monetary and fiscal problems. The use of scare tactics is childish and ineffective.

The imposition of wage and price controls would create an administrative monstrosity.

We would be administering millions of price and wage controls, and, as we discovered during World War II, these types

of controls are almost impossible to administer fairly. We would create a huge black market operation and we would not accomplish the purposes for which the legislation might be intended.

As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over price controls, I would consider wage and price controls only as a last resort when other measures have failed.

The Secretary and the administration could use the great powers of moral suasion at their command to control prices in many areas. The Secretary could have used moral suasion to prevent the latest increase in the prime lending rate by the major banks. This has been effective before and it would be effective now if the Secretary would use it. Instead, he resorts to silly and meaningless scare tactics about general statutory price controls.

By allowing the banks to raise the prime rate, Secretary Kennedy has already cost the American people an additional $15 billion a year in excessive, exhorbitant, and usurious interest rates. After striking this blow at the American people, I would hope that the Secretary would not do further damage by popping off about general wage and price controls.

IMPROVING THE FEDERAL DONABLE PROPERTY PROGRAM

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that more than anyone else, you, yourself, have an understanding of and concern for the Federal donable property program. Your vision and effort during the years when you sat on the Government Operations Committee have resulted in a program which today can rightly claim to have given incalculable assistance to thousands of schools, hospitals, and other essential institutions throughout the United States. By this program, authorized under section 203(j) of the Federal Property Act, surplus personal property owned by the Federal Government may be donated to State and local governments and private tax-exempt organizations which serve educational, public health or civil defense purposes. The property to be donated is transferred by the General Services Administration to special State agencies in accordance with determinations and allocations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Department of Defense. The State agencies, which are required to be established by the act, make distribution of the property to eligible organizations within the State. During fiscal year 1968, personal property originally costing the Government $309,774,429 was allocated for donation under this program.

The last substantive amendment to the donable property provisions of the Federal Property Act occurred in the 87th Congress. Then, Public Law 87–786 authorized donations to several special types of educational institutions such as schools for the mentally retarded and physically handicapped, educational television and public libraries. Since that amendment in 1962, a number of individual amendments affecting the donable property program have been proposed. None has been enacted. I believe there is a need now for the Congress to consider revisions of the act which would strengthen and otherwise improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the program.

I am, therefore, introducing today a bill embodying such amendments. These are by no means all of the amendments which have been or are now being proposed with respect to the donable property program. However, I believe those in my bill are particularly worthy of our consideration. They have as their general objective the simplification, consolidation and strengthening of the responsibilities of the affected Federal agencies and the statutory guidelines under which they operate.

The principal things this bill would do are these: It would give the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the responsibility of allocation of personal property under the control of the Secretary of Defense to institutions which the Secretary of Defense has determined to be of special interest to the armed services, as well as the Red Cross, the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the Campfire Girls, Boy Clubs, and the USO. It would simplify the operations of Federal agencies disposing of property under the exchange/sale provisions of section 201(c) of the Federal Property Act. It would raise from $2,500 to $4,000 the acquisition cost of an item on which HEW may impose conditions and restrictions relating to the use of the property. It would give flexibility to HEW to determine whether a local government institution or tax-exempt organization may be regarded as serving an educational or public health purpose entitling it to be a donee. HEW already exercises this broader authority in connection with the transfer of real property for educational and public health services under subsection 203(k) of the act.

I believe that amendment of the act along the lines of my bill would greatly facilitate efficient and economic operation of the program and correspondingly redound to the public benefit by further strengthening the material base of those indispensable institutions providing education, health protection and security from disaster for all of our people.

CLEANING UP THE POLLUTION PROBLEM

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, last week Mr. Carl Klein, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Quality and Research told a water pollution conference that States and localities must clean up their own pollution because the Federal Government cannot afford to do so now.

Mr. Klein was quoted by several newspapers as saying:

> The local governments created the pollution problem and they're going to have to come up with the money to solve it.

If that statement by the Assistant Secretary truly reflects the administration's point of view, then it is just another sad example of the many indications we see daily that our Government's priorities are incredibly out of kilter.

It is unbelievable that the Nation's Government can sit in Washington, D.C., surrounded by sewers which the mapmakers tell us are really lakes and rivers and still say that we cannot find money in the Federal Treasury for pollution abatement.

If a Congress and an administration can levy the taxes we levy, and spend the dollars we spend and still not provide ample money to cleanse our rivers, streams, and air, then we simply do not know how to govern, we do not know how to make intelligent choices, and we have no sense of values worthy of mention.

In the past 6 years, Congress has passed the Clean Air Act of 1963; the 1965 and 1966 amendments to that act; the Air Quality Act of 1967; the Water Quality Act of 1965; the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966; and the Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965. That legislation encourages States to adopt environmental quality standards and promised local governments financial help to construct municipal sewage treatment plants. But how hypocritical the promise of that legislation appears when viewed in the light of Federal action.

It is a strange thing, Mr. Speaker, but the people of this Nation believed Congress when it said it would spend $1 billion to fight water pollution. But President Nixon has followed his predecessor's disastrous request for just $214 million to fund water pollution programs for fiscal year 1970—instead of the $1 billion promised and now, in spite of high-sounding legislation which encourages States to establish water quality standards by holding out the promise of Federal help, a top official in the administration tells us that as far as pollution is concerned, "we cannot do everything from Washington for the locality."

In my own State of Wisconsin, the State Department of Natural Resources has said that more than $211 million worth of municipal pollution control construction is required in the next 6 years. Federal aid has been requested this year for 93 projects, but will only be available for approximately 12.

Unless we can come to our senses, history will tell that ours was a generation which worked with computers of unimaginable complexity, sent men to the moon, and functioned with thousands of devices which are a gadgetmaker's dream, but did not show the wisdom, the good sense, or even the good taste to clean up its own habitat.

TO INCREASE BANKING COMPETITION IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague, Congressman

ANNUNZIO, in introducing a bill to allow expansion of banking institutions of the District of Columbia. I would like to address myself to the economic arguments for this legislation to increase banking competition in the National Capital region.

Let us try to get the economy of the National Capital region in perspective. First of all, you may be surprised to discover how vital and growing this area truly is. Table I will show you our growth rate—measured by population and personal income—and comparable growth rates in other metropolitan areas.

You can see from this table that the National Capital region has had a higher growth rate in income and population than any of the 20 largest metropolitan areas in the Nation—greater than the spectacular records of Dallas, Houston, Seattle, and Los Angeles.

Another interesting statistic is the vitality of the central city, the District.

Table II compares employment growth in the District with the other large central cities. Sometimes we are inclined to look at the District of Columbia as a city with declining employment opportunities. Nothing could be further from the truth. The District's record in employment growth is the highest in the Nation—6 percent ahead of second-place San Francisco.

Table III also supports our argument that the District is a vital economic force. The latest income data available—for 1966—show that the total income of the metropolitan area was $9.3 billion. Of this total, $5.7 billion, or 61 percent of the total was earned in the District.

Still another interesting economic statistic is the relationship of the Federal payroll to the total personal income by a factor of 2.75 you will come very close to predicting the total personal income of the area.

What all this proves to us is that the National Capital region is one of the most prosperous and fastest growing parts of the country. These figures also indicate that the real underlying base of this economic vitality is the Federal payroll in the District of Columbia—supplying a source of basic income to Federal employees who are in turn serviced by the retail and service establishments including banks in this area.

Now let us turn to some figures that are not so encouraging. The total area is doing fine. We cannot say the same of the District.

If you will turn to table V, you will find that in 1950 most of the economic benefits of the District went to District residents. But some time between 1950 and 1959, the tide turned, and the suburban areas moved ahead of District totals.

Table V shows that in 1950, 58 percent of the total income of the metropolitan area went to persons who lived in the District. By 1967 only 33 percent of area income went to District of Columbia residents.

What happened? Table VI gives you the answer.

Table VI shows that in 1960, 53 percent of the jobs in the District were held by District of Columbia residents. By 1968 this percentage had dropped to 40 percent. There was an absolute loss of nearly 17,000 jobs by District of Columbia residents in this 8-year period.

On the other hand commuters from the Virginia and Maryland suburbs increased their percentage of District jobs from 47 percent in 1960 to 55 percent in 1968—an absolute increase of about 125,000 jobs.

Some 341,000 suburban residents come to the District every day to work—200,000 from Maryland and 141,000 from Virginia.

All this shows that the District has been, is now, and will be a dynamic and vital source of employment and income because of the Federal payroll. But it also shows that the majority of the employees working in the District pocket their paychecks and go home to the suburbs. The figures on retail sales and bank deposits show that the tendency is to deposit their checks in suburban banks and to spend their money in suburban retail stores.

The reason is quite simple—the ladies control the bank accounts and spend the money. They cannot be blamed for using the most convenient stores and the most convenient banks.

The large retail establishments of the District have long ago recognized this fact and kept abreast of the trend by putting their stores near their customers. In doing so they did not desert the District. On the contrary it is quite apparent that sales in the suburbs have helped these retailers maintain their level of service in the District.

District banks on the other hand have not been able to compete for the payroll checks that go out of the District each pay day to the suburbs of Maryland and Virginia. We have tried, but no device—bank by mail—or others today is as effective as a conveniently located bank. We run into a wall—a legislative wall—at the District borders and cannot move out with people who have been our customers.

Table VII shows that District of Columbia banks held 83.8 percent of the area deposits in 1947. By 1968 this figure had dropped to 55 percent.

Another way to look at this picture is to compare the relative growth in deposits. From 1955 to 1957 the deposits of District banks increased by 88 percent. The deposits of suburban banks increased by 334 percent.

If the trend continues, and I see no reason to expect a sudden reversal, the District banks will unquestionably play a greatly diminished role in the banking competition in this area.

Indeed it is possible to foresee a day when District of Columbia banks would be hard pressed to meet the credit demands of the District. If the District economy is revitalized, as it must be and will be, large commercial credits will be needed. The question arises—Where will the District banks get the deposits to meet the demands.

Mr. Speaker, all these figures indicate to me that the restrictions limiting District banks to the 61 square miles of the District of Columbia pose a real threat to the orderly growth of the whole area. The bill will increase competition throughout the area and provide a sound banking base for future growth.

As a separate but I believe related presentation, Mr. Speaker, I draw my colleagues attention to the political economies of the Washington, D.C., area. It is predictable, even understandable, that a bill with the thrust and purpose of this one will be energetically opposed by interests in the immediate counties of Virginia and Maryland. Basically I believe such opposition is ill-directed in that the improvement of the competitive posture of the banks of the single economically interdependent metropolitan area will inure to the benefit of all within the perimeters regardless of State lines. However, if this be disputed, would it be unfair to note that history has provided an abundance of example of decisions which time proved to be substantially in favor of the contiguous State areas of Maryland and Virginia and if not a burden certainly of lesser or questionable value to the economic welfare of the District?

Is it too much to suggest that for once a primacy of consideration be bent towards the interest of economic entities within the District? Surely there are some of my colleagues who must feel that the District of Columbia was not set up as the personal thralldom of the two neighboring States. In this instance a determination can be made in this legislation to form an approach to a banking problem, singularly acute within the District, which can in the long run work beneficially for all those within the metropolitan district which has at its hub and at its heart the National Capital. A National Capital which requires and deserves some privacy and some of the short-term consideration so long extended the neighboring States at the Capital's expense—the careful and favorable consideration of this proposal is earnestly solicited and we would hope that the Banking and Advisory Committee could hold early hearings.

TABLE I.—INCOME AND POPULATION GROWTH IN 20 LARGEST AREAS

Rank	SMSA	Total personal 1967 [1] income (billions)	Average annual percent increase in total personal income 1959–67 [1]	Average annual percent increase in population, 1960–67 [2]
1	New York	$50.2	5.7	1.1
2	Los Angeles	28.8	6.4	1.8
3	Chicago	28.1	5.8	1.2
4	Philadelphia	16.4	5.5	1.4
5	Detroit	15.8	6.6	1.3
6	San Francisco	13.3	7.0	1.8
7	Boston	13.1	5.9	.6
8	Washington	10.1	8.0	4.0
9	St. Louis	8.2	5.8	1.3
10	Pittsburgh	8.1	4.4	.1
11	Cleveland	7.7	5.2	1.0
12	Newark	7.6	6.2	1.6
13	Baltimore	6.8	6.4	1.4
14	Minneapolis	6.5	6.8	1.4
15	Houston	5.7	7.3	3.8
16	Seattle	5.2	7.2	1.9
17	Milwaukee	5.1	5.4	.7
18	Patterson	4.8	6.7	1.8
19	Dallas	4.9	7.4	3.3
20	Cincinnati	4.6	4.8	1.0

[1] Survey of General Business (May 1969).
[2] Bureau of the Census, series P–25.

Note: Summary: Highest growth in the Washington standard metropolitan statistical area.

TABLE II.—EMPLOYMENT GROWTH IN THE CENTRAL CITY AND SMSA BY PLACE OF WORK, IN THE LARGEST SMSA'S[1]

	Annual average percent growth in employment, 1959–65	
	Central city	SMSA
New York	1.0	1.6
Chicago	.1	1.6
Philadelphia	.1	1.5
San Francisco	2.0	3.4
Boston	.3	1.4
Washington	2.6	4.6
St. Louis	.6	1.6
Newark	1.1	2.4
Baltimore	.1	1.9
Minneapolis	.9	2.6
Patterson	.4	3.5

[1] Employment data had to be used for this comparison rather than income data because the latter not available for cities, except Washington, D.C.
[2] Employment data for the central city available for 11 of the 20 SMSA's of table I.

Note: Conclusions: Washington employment growth is highest in both the central city and SMSA for the largest SMSA's.
Source: Lewis Wilfred, Jr. "Urban Growth and Suburbanization of Employment—Some New Data," the Brookings Institution (1969).

TABLE III.—INCOME BY PLACE OF WORK IN THE WASHINGTON AREA

Years	District of Columbia	Suburbs	SMSA[1]
1950	2.3	0.8	3.1
1960	3.8	2.0	5.8
1966	5.7	3.6	9.3
1975 (projected)	10.3	8.0	18.3
Percent annual growth 1966–75	[2]6.8	[2]9.37	[2]8.0

[1] SMSA=Standard metropolitan statistical area.
[2] Income growth by place of work is the highest of the largest urban areas of the United States.

Source: Component analysis using data from: U.S. Department of Commerce, Regional Economic Information System; U.S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business (August 1968); U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, County, Business Patterns; U.S. Civil Service Commission employment data.

TABLE IV.—ECONOMIC MODEL OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND SMSA GROWTH

For all practical purposes, the total personal income of District of Columbia, the suburbs or the SMSA (metropolitan area) equals:

TPI=2.75 Egr.
TPI=Total personal income in billions of current dollars.
Egr=Earnings of Government employees residing in area.

A comparison of the actual and estimated data shows:

		Estimated TPI	
	Egr	2.75 Egr	Actual TPI
SMSA (Washington standard metropolitan statistical area):			
1940	377.7	1,020	1,080
1950	1,114.3	3,080	3,060
1959	2,030.2	5,570	5,450
1966	3,333.5	9,180	9,290

TABLE V.—TOTAL PERSONAL INCOME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND SUBURBS (1950–75) BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE

The total person income of residents of the District of Columbia and its suburbs (remainder of the Washington standard metropolitan statistical area) is—

	Billions of current dollars				
	1950	1959	1966	1967	[1]1975
District of Columbia	1.79	2.23	3.11	3.34	4.76
Suburbs	1.27	3.22	6.18	6.79	13.54
Total	3.06	5.45	9.29	10.13	18.30
District of Columbia as percent of total	58	41	35	33	26

[1] Note: Estimated from historical trends (1959–67).
Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Regional Economics Information System (computer printouts) except projections. District of Columbia data published in Survey of Current Business (August 1968).

TABLE VI.—CHANGE IN CENTRAL CITY JOBS HELD BY IN-COMMUTERS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 1960–68

	At place jobs			
	1960		1968	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Held by residents of—				
District of Columbia	270,199	53.0	253,850	41.1
Maryland suburbs	123,020	24.1	200,740	32.5
Virginia surburbs	92,274	18.1	140,820	22.8
Subtotal	(485,493)	(95.2)	(595,410)	(96.4)
Other	24,498	4.8	22,240	3.6
Total	509,991	100.0	617,650	100.0

Source: 1960 from "Journey to Work," U.S. Bureau of the Census; 1968 Economic Survey, by Hammer, Greene, Siler Associates.

TABLE VII.—IPC DEMAND AND TIME DEPOSITS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMERCIAL BANKS AND BANKS IN DC SMSA

[Dollars in thousands]

Date	Total IPC deposits for District of Columbia banks	Total IPC deposits for SMSA No. 166[1]	District of Columbia percent of total SMSA deposits
Dec. 31, 1947	944,053	1,127,096	83.8
June 30, 1949	895,851	1,094,590	81.8
Dec. 30, 1950	1,162,111	1,454,346	79.9
June 30, 1952	1,221,378	1,569,989	77.8
June 30, 1954	1,260,908	1,664,751	75.7
June 23, 1958	1,453,473	2,043,693	71.1
June 15, 1960	1,478,875	2,201,452	67.2
June 30, 1962	1,693,977	[1]2,585,875	65.5
June 30, 1964	1,978,727	3,247,704	60.9
June 30, 1956	1,990,082	3,438,779	57.9
June 29, 1968	2,281,284	4,150,486	55.0

[1] Figures for suburban banks based on actual office location.
Source: 1947–64—Federal Reserve Board, 1966–68—FDIC.

TO INCREASE BANKING COMPETITION IN THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the current restrictions limiting commercial banks in the District of Columbia to the 61 square miles of the District pose a threat to the orderly economic development of the National Capital region. I am pleased to join with the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA) in introducing a bill to increase banking competition in the entire National Capital region. I believe that a detailed explanation of what this legislation would and would not do is in order at this time.

Under the existing provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, a registered bank holding company must obtain the approval of the Federal Reserve Board before acquiring control of any bank, and the Board is prohibited from granting its approval where the acquisition would cross a State line—that is, where a holding company has subsidiary banks in one State and seeks to acquire a bank in another State. This State-line limitation is contained in section 3(d) of the 1956 act.

Because this restriction has given rise to special difficulties in the metropolitan area of Washington, D.C., the attached bill would modify section 3(d) with respect to the Washington metropolitan area. The bill would add a proviso to section 3(d) permitting the Board to approve a bank acquisition across a State line only in the following two specific circumstances:

First. Where the holding company is based in the District of Columbia—that is, where its banking subsidiaries are principally located in the District of Columbia—the Board could approve the company's acquisition of a bank located in the immediate suburban areas of Maryland and Virginia. Specifically, the acquired bank would have to be located in "the National Capital region," which has been defined in several other Federal statutes as follows:

> National Capital region means the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in the State of Maryland, Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, and Prince William Counties and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and all other cities now or hereafter existing in Maryland or Virginia within the geographic area bounded by the outer boundaries of the combined area of said counties and cities. (United States Code, title 40, section 652(a)).

The definition quoted is from section 103 of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, although other statutes also define the National Capital Region as encompassing this same area.

Second. Where the holding company is based anywhere in the States of Maryland or Virginia, the Board could approve the company's acquisition of a bank located in the District of Columbia.

This amendment is intended to make it possible for individual banks in Washington to become affiliated, through registered holding companies, with banks in Maryland and Virginia in order to improve banking services and increase banking competition throughout the area. A District of Columbia-based bank holding company could acquire banks only in the immediate suburbs of Washington, although a holding company based anywhere in Maryland or Virginia could acquire a District of Columbia bank.

The bill would not alter Federal or State law in any other way. Thus, for example:

The bill would not reduce or alter the existing authority of Maryland and Virginia over the establishment of State-chartered banks and branches within their jurisdictions. It would not permit any District of Columbia or other out-of-State bank to come into Maryland or Virginia and establish branches there. Just as at present, new banks or branches could be established only with the approval of the State banking authorities, in the case of State-chartered banks, or

the Comptroller of the Currency, in the case of national banks.

The bill would not reduce or alter the existing authority of Maryland and Virginia banking agencies to examine and supervise State-chartered banks within their jurisdictions. Thus, a State-chartered bank acquired by a holding company under this proposed legislation would retain its separate identity and continue to be subject to supervision and examination by State authorities. Similarly, the bill would not authorize the merger of Maryland or Virginia banks with District banks.

The bill would not alter the legality of bank holding companies in Maryland or Virginia, since the formation of bank holding companies currently is permitted by the law of both States.

The bill would not alter the standards or requirements for Federal Reserve Board approval of an acquisition, except for the specific modification of the State-line restriction described above. Under the existing provisions of the Bank Holding Company Act, the Board would be requried to seek the views of the appropriate State banking agency on any proposed acquisition of a State-chartered bank. If the State agency disapproved of the acquisition, the Board would have to hold a full hearing on the matter, and its decision would be subject to review in the courts. Moreover, the Board is required to give heavy weight to the competitive considerations involved in any proposed acquisition, and to notify the Attorney General of every application the Board receives, so that the Justice Department's Antitrust Division may present its views and have an opportunity to challenge the acquisition under the antitrust laws.

The bill would not alter the supervisory powers of the Federal Reserve Board over registered bank holding companies. A holding company formed pursuant to this bill would be subject to the same strict regulation as now provided under the 1956 Act for all other registered bank holding companies.

The bill would not affect the current controversy concerning "one-bank holding companies." This bill relates exclusively to registered bank holding companies, and its desirability will not be affected by the outcome of the one-bank holdng company controversy, whatever that outcome may be.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I observe that the approach embodied in the bill makes good economic sense, but it also preserves the rights of the States of Maryland and Virginia to supervise and to regulate banks in their respective jurisdictions.

A SALUTE TO MARY CRUTCHER, RESPONSIBLE JOURNALIST

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to offer a salute to Miss Mary Crutcher, a distinguished Texas newspaperwoman, for what I consider an extraordinary public service to the people of the United States.

Miss Crutcher is assistant city editor of the Fort Worth Press. During the many years she has served in this difficult and demanding position, she has won the unstinting admiration of her colleagues in the newsroom.

Probably few people outside the profession of journalism fully realize what tremendous complexities, responsibilities and stresses are involved in the day-to-day news operations of a metropolitan newspaper. It is like writing history in a pressure cooker.

As assistant city editor, Mary Crutcher is right in the middle of the daily battle to make each day give an account of itself. Under the gun from the clock, the competition and the inherent vagaries of the business of gathering news, hers is not a job for the lazy, the easily discouraged, the fainthearted or the excitable.

Miss Crutcher not only survives the job but thrives on it. To her work she brings the intelligence, perceptiveness and seasoned judgment of a true craftsman, yet somehow maintains the same zest and enthusiasm that she brought to her first newspaper job.

It was all these qualities, plus an inherent dedication to justice and simple fairness, that led Mary Crutcher to undertake a sort of personal crusade against an ill-considered Government policy that amounted to racial discrimination in reverse.

The situation was brought to light as a result of complaints lodged by citizens seeking to secure FHA loan guarantees on homes whose titles contained restrictive racial covenants.

Such covenants are patently illegal and everybody knows it. The Supreme Court of the United States had made it abundantly clear that restrictive covenants based on race or color are invalid and legally unenforceable—as indeed they should be.

The FHA, too, recognized the illegality of these restrictions, and adopted administrative regulations which allowed them to be waived in cases where members of a minority race were seeking FHA loan guarantees. If the prospective home buyers happened not to be members of a minority race, however, the FHA was refusing to insure the mortgages. In other words, the FHA was pretending that such deed restrictions had some tinge of legality, which of course they do not.

The result was discrimination in reverse—ignoring the covenants when the would-be home buyers were minority group members, observing them when they were not.

Patiently, persistently, Mary Crutcher began assembling facts. She interviewed Government officials, real estate experts, prospective home buyers—anybody who could shed light on the situation.

Not surprisingly, she discovered that this unwise policy was causing needless problems and frustration, as well as economic loss to innocent individuals, not only in the Fort Worth area, but indeed across the entire Nation.

Confronted with the facts that Miss Crutcher had painstakingly assembled and presented to readers of the Press, the FHA changed its policy. Regulations prohibiting the insurance of mortgages on property encumbered by covenants were rescinded last month, and the existence of such legal nullities no longer disqualifies property as security for an insured mortgage, regardless of the race or color of the prospective purchaser.

So Mary Crutcher won her fight, and the entire Nation is better off because of it. It is a textbook example of responsible journalism, and my colleagues will share my sentiments when I say to this dedicated newspaperwoman, "Thanks, and well done."

TOWARD A REVIEW OF U.S. OVERSEAS INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining a group of my distinguished colleagues in introducing legislation calling for the appointment, by the President of the United States, of a "blue ribbon" committee to review the overseas information activities of the U.S. Government.

I cannot think of a single study which can make a more important impact on the course of our Nation's foreign policy than the one suggested in the bill, H.R. 12722.

Surely the events of the past year, the bitter attacks, verbal and physical, on representatives of the United States, should convince us that our national image has been slipping abroad.

This has not furthered the achievement of our foreign policy objectives. It has made our Government's undertakings more difficult, and created problems for our private sector's overseas operations.

In the long run, this decline in the U.S. image can seriously erode our position of leadership in the free world, creating mounting difficulties for our country and for the cause of peace and freedom in the world.

There is a way of getting at this problem—and it has to begin with a thorough reappraisal of our overseas information activities.

Such a review was recommended late last year by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. As chairman of that subcommittee, I participated in the lengthy studies which culminated in our report on "The Future of U.S. Public Diplomacy."

The review was also advocated, last year and again in May of 1969, by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information headed by Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

There has also been widespread editorial support for just such a review in newspapers throughout the Nation. One of the most recent and most comprehensive of these appeared Monday, July 7, in the Miami Herald, as follows:

EFFECTIVE VOICE NEEDED FOR AMERICA'S MESSAGE

The Pentagon wastes more money on one project than the U.S. Information Agency spends on world communications in one year.

The Soviet Union spends five or six times as much on its foreign informational program as the U.S.I.A.

The Rockefeller mission learned that throughout Central America and the Caribbean, Cuban radio propaganda outstrips the Voice of America in key hours.

Foreign affairs are conducted through four channels: diplomacy, trade, communications and force. The first three complement each other in trying to avoid the fourth.

But the United States spends 19 times as much on force as it spends on the other three.

The Defense Department's budget is $80 billion; the U.S.I.A. budget totals $173 million.

Those figures which seem so clearly out of balance reflect an imbalanced attitude in Washington, a reluctance to emphasize the preventive.

"International communication is rapidly moving beyond the domain of information, persuasion, and influence . . . It is on the verge of becoming an integral part of the international political process—providing the means for the resolution of conflicts in a peaceful way, and for the improvement of man's material condition," a congressional subcommittee chaired by Miami's Dante B. Fascell found last year.

That subcommittee recommended a thorough overhaul of the U.S. government's information policy, particularly including the U.S.I.A.

The U.S. Advisory Commission on Information recently issued its 24th report and arrived at a similar conclusion that the national commitment is incomplete in this field.

Both groups deal with the fact of public diplomacy's increasingly important role in world affairs and the importance of the U.S.I.A. within that role. They recommend it as a means of strengthening U.S. foreign policy.

The advisory commission suggests the U.S.I.A. better utilize its operations in 105 foreign countries to feed research and information back to this country on prevailing attitudes that might determine foreign policy effectiveness; commended the 90th Congress for establishing a career corps of Foreign Service information officers; suggested a larger participation in policymaking and urged the Voice of America to emphasize standard radio rather than short wave bands for its programs.

There is an urgency for candor and frankness that expand the communications exchange and increase its acceptance. An old-time correspondent in Moscow, for example, recently commented that Voice of America broadcasts to Russia never had any true impact until they stopped using exile announcers on them. The Russian audience equated the exile with a political point of view, not with candor or frankness.

We believe, too, that greater emphasis on communications exchange—or public diplomacy—is a proper part of the effort to de-escalate world concentration on the military.

An improved U.S.I.A., with an enlarged role in foreign affairs, is a sound way to begin.

I may add, Mr. Speaker, that a group of distinguished American citizens, organized as the Emergency Committee for a Reappraisal of U.S. Overseas Information Policies and Programs, and headed by Dr. Edward L. Bernays, of Cambridge, Mass., has been working diligently for the same objective.

Only the impetus of a Presidential Commission can give this study the scope, authority, and effectiveness needed to bring about substantial and meaningful changes in our overseas information policies.

If all of these recommendations continue to be ignored, I predict—and I do so with a heavy heart—a rising level of unpleasantness, misunderstanding, frustration, and disillusionment, in our relations with foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to compliment my colleague from Alabama, the Honorable JACK EDWARDS, for his initiative and diligence in presenting this matter to the House. In doing so, he has performed a valuable service to our country.

The text of my bill follows:

H.R. 12722

A bill to establish a committee to examine the oversea information activities of the United States Government; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is established the Committee for the Review of United States Oversea Information Activities (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Committee").

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Committee to review the objectives, the organization, and the operations of all informational, educational, cultural, and related activities of the United States Government in foreign countries; to assess the relevance and the effectiveness of such activities in terms of the support which they provide for the attainment of United States foreign policy objectives; to examine the extent to which foreign public opinion is considered in the formulation and execution of United States foreign policy, and the manner in which this is done; and to submit its findings and recommendations.

SEC. 3. The Committee shall be composed of nine members as follows:

(1) One Member of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate.

(2) One Member of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(3) One member of the National Security Council appointed by the President of the United States.

(4) One officer or employee of the Department of State appointed by the President of the United States.

(5) One officer or employee of the United States Information Agency appointed by the President of the United States.

(6) One member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information appointed by the President of the United States.

(7) Three individuals from private life appointed by the President of the United States from among individuals with knowledge and experience in the fields of information, education, and cultural affairs, one of whom the President shall designate to serve as chairman.

A vacancy in the Committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), members of the Committee shall each be entitled to receive $100 for each day (including travel time) during which they are engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Committee.

(b) Members of the Committee who are full-time officers or employees of the United States shall receive no additional compensation on account of their services on the Committee.

(c) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Committee, members of the Committee shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as the expenses authorized by section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

SEC. 5. Five members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 6. The Committee shall meet at the call of the Chairman or a majority of its members.

SEC. 7. The Committee may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable.

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out this Act, the Committee may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, direct and contract for such studies, as it deems advisable. The Committee may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

SEC. 9. The Committee may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chairman of the Committee such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Committee.

SEC. 10. The Committee shall submit a final report to the President and to the Congress not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act. Such report shall contain the results of the investigation and study conducted under this Act, together with such recommendations as the Committee may deem appropriate. The Committee shall cease to exist thirty days after submitting its final report under this section.

SEC. 11. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

BURNING FOOD IN INDIA

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an incredible event which is being planned in India.

A religious leader in the western part of that country says he is going to burn 9,000 tons of food—I repeat, 9,000 tons of food—in a sacrifice that is supposed to "foster universal peace and the welfare and prosperity of the human race."

This same religious leader burned over a half million dollars worth of food last year in a similar ceremony.

This year, the so-called sacrifice will, if carried out, destroy $16 million worth of food.

I am advised that he plans to put to the torch 1,860 tons of rice, 930 tons of barley, 930 tons of butter, 375 tons of sugar, 4,590 tons of sesame seed, and 375 tons of herbs.

The Government of India made no effort to prevent last year's much smaller bonfire because, I am told, it would have been "impolitic" to interfere with such a religious ceremony.

I assume it would be just as "impolitic" to stop this one.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire whatever to meddle in the internal affairs of India, but a few things should be set straight right now. We are told over and over and over again that these people are among the poorest in the world and are among the hungriest residents of this planet.

Since the end of World War II, this Nation has given India $7.2 billions in foreign aid—a staggering amount of it

in food—and the Nixon administration is on Capitol Hill right now with a request for another $400 million handout.

And here is this religious leader getting ready to set fire to $16 million worth of food.

As I said before, I have no desire to meddle in the foreign affairs of India, but I see no reason whatsoever why the American taxpayer should be gouged for one more red cent for aid to a nation whose government will permit this sort of thing.

If the Indians want to burn every bushel of rice or barley in the country; if they want to put the torch to every last pound of butter and sugar within their borders, that is their business and it is perfectly all right with me.

But why the American people should be called upon to subsidize this is utterly beyond me.

At the proper time, Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer legislation that will appropriately affect the U.S. aid program to India if plans for this bonfire are carried out.

WHEAT EXPORTS

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, today the United States begins a series of crucial meetings at the ministerial level on the future of wheat exports under the provisions of the International Grains Arrangement.

Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin, as leader of the U.S. delegation, will chair the Washington talks. Representatives of the "big five" wheat exporting regions within the scope of the IGA—Canada, Australia, Argentina, the European Community, and the United States—will discuss the deteriorating international wheat marketing situation.

Mr. Speaker, the United States enters these negotiations from a position of decided disadvantage. Competitors are taking some traditional American markets by underselling American exporters.

Simply put, the United States is unable to price wheat competitively and—at the same time—conform to the treaty obligations of the IGA.

Our competitors are selling below the established minimums in some cases. These minimums, set at a time when wheat was in greater demand, are now considered unrealistic.

Our competitors have been found to market quality wheat at fictitiously low grade levels. They sometimes openly disregard their IGA commitments in this fiercely competitive market.

To make matters worse, the Soviet Union has become an exporting Nation. The Russians, unfortunately, are not signatories to the treaty.

Mr. Speaker, the United States cannot tolerate further abuses of the IGA without an appropriate response. An understanding must be reached on future marketing practices in the shortest possible time.

I congratulate the Secretary of Agriculture for calling high level meetings at this time. His response to a most urgent situation is appropriate.

I also congratulate Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Clarence Palmby for his no-nonsense statement on the deficiencies of the IGA, which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 1, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, wheat is in great surplus. The U.S. carryover at the beginning of the 1969 marketing year is estimated at nearly 800 million bushels. Incredibly, the combined carryover of Canadian, Australian, and United States wheat producers will soon reach 2.3 billion bushels.

If the United States is willing to sustain the financial burdens of the carryover, and the further burdens of supply management programs, so also must our competitors bear these same burdens. Open price warfare could result if pressures—political as well as economic—continue to hobble the IGA.

Mr. Speaker, Kansas wheat farmers must depend upon foreign sales for disposal of half their crop. Prosperity in Kansas and other wheat-producing States depends upon the success of these talks on the IGA.

Those of us from the wheat States await the outcome with guarded optimism. Secretary Hardin and Assistant Secretary Palmby have demonstrated their understanding of the importance of foreign wheat sales, and the difficulties we are experiencing under the terms of the International Grains Arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, the time for decisive action on behalf of the wheat industry is now.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in recent years there has been a growing recognition of the need for a dramatic expansion of housing production, particularly housing for low- and moderate-income families.

The Congress recognized this need by stating as its goal—in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968—the production of 6 million dwellings for moderate- and low-income families over the next 10 years and for increasing other production to an average rate of 2 million dwellings.

We can make this shift from low to high production only if we have the commitment and the cooperation of the homebuilding industry, and the genius of American business to supply the needed skill, resources, and technology. We also need the commitment of American labor pledged to supply manpower without discrimination, the good working relationships of government at all levels, and the people themselves.

The urgency of this matter requires that steps be taken immediately to develop cost-saving building innovations. One of the biggest stumbling blocks to this effort has been the thousands of different, often conflicting building codes across the country. Combine this with the lack of an authoritative technical institution to review and approve innovative construction techniques, and the result is higher costs of homes and obstacles to the introduction of new materials.

The legislation which I am introducing today, with 27 cosponsors, proposes a solution to this problem. My bill would establish a nongovernmental institution, called the National Institute of Building Sciences, to be organized under the auspices of the National Academies of Science and Engineering which would supply technical advice to the building industry, and act as a clearinghouse for the many governmental agencies, institutions, and professional groups now engaged in developing cost standards and appraising new housing materials and construction methods.

To facilitate the initial program, I propose that the Federal Government provide annual grants of up to $5 million for the first 5 years, after which the Institute would be self-supporting through fees, subscriptions, grants, and contracts with industry and government.

The proposal has the endorsement of the National Commission on Urban Problems—the Douglas commission—the President's Committee on Housing, the American Institute of Architects, and the Housing Producers Council.

The growth and development of similar institutions throughout Europe has been extremely valuable in overcoming severe housing shortages since the end of World War II. They usually operate as governmental agencies in each country. In this country, however, I feel that such an institution, whose operations would be directed by representatives of industry, professional societies, labor unions, academic and technical institutions, and the general public would be most effective as a nongovernmental advisory body, serving as an umbrella for the many existing organizations and agencies which now operate on an uncoordinated basis.

In addition to providing an imaginative impetus for needed housing at reasonable costs, this legislation would have the additional effect of creating more jobs and lowering the rate of seasonable unemployment in the building trades industry.

If we are serious about our housing goals, it is imperative that action be taken now.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that this bill is being cosponsored by Members from every section of the country, and by representatives of both parties.

THE CLEAN WATER RESTORATION ACT

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under date of June 6, 1969, I wrote the Governors of each of the 50 States, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and the Governors of Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands as follows:

As you probably know, funding of the construction grant program under the Clean Water Restoration Act has been grossly short of the authorizations contained in that Act.

The House Committee on Appropriations is currently considering a recommendation that $214 million in funds be provided for fiscal year 1970, the same as was provided in fiscal year 1969. The authorization for fiscal 1969 was $700 million and the authorization for fiscal 1970 is $1 billion.

I would greatly appreciate your providing me with information on the impact this short-funding has had on the water pollution control and abatement programs in your State. Have water pollution control and abatement programs been held back, or have arrangements been made to take up the slack resulting from the short-fall in Federal funds? If the latter, how much has been the additional cost to your State?

I and several other Members of the House, both Democratic and Republican, have joined together in an effort to secure full funding of the Act for fiscal year 1970. I believe the information which I have requested of you would be helpful in this effort.

To date, I have received responses from approximately half of the State Governors and from the Governors of Guam and the Virgin Islands. I am pleased to be able to report that a substantial majority of those who have responded support the efforts of myself and others to secure full funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act construction grant program for fiscal year 1970.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the feeling of our Governors with regard to this matter, I include the responses I have received to date in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of my remarks. In due course, I shall place the additional responses I receive in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The material follows:

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Phoenix, Ariz., June 16, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: This is in reply to your letter of June 6, 1969 regarding funding of the construction grant program under the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Arizona's allocation of PL–660 money has been sufficient to meet the demand for the past several years. During the immediate past three years the requests for PL–660 money have almost exactly equaled our allotment. Based on our present projections we anticipate that our 1970 allotment of approximately two million dollars will be sufficient to again satisfy all applicants. It is possible, of course, that several projects will develop that we have not anticipated. This is particularly true of projects on our Indian Reservations that are being stimulated by grants from the Economic Development Administration.

I appreciate your interest and concern in this matter.

Sincerely,

JACK WILLIAMS.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
Little Rock, June 17, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: We have received your request of June 6th, and take pleasure in transmitting the following information.

The "short funding" mentioned in your letter has not caused a great impact on the overall grant program prior to the past two fiscal years. However, with the adoption of the Water Quality Standards, with its abatement schedule for existing sources of pollution, the amounts appropriated for fiscal years 1968 and 1969 have not been sufficient to fully fund all needed projects. Under the FY 1969 appropriation of $214,000,000, Arkansas received an allotment of $2,829,800; in addition to this amount we have received $231,620 in grant funds reallocated from other states, making a total of $3,061,420 in useable funds. As of this date the construction grant fund balance is $984,017, with grant requests and anticipated grant increases remaining to be made of $922,000, which will leave a balance of approximately $62,000. As this money is available until December of 1969, it can be added to the $2,829,800 which Arkansas will receive for FY 1970 under the present proposed national appropriation of $214 million, giving a useable allocation of $2,891,800.

Grant requests are on hand at this time from four of the municipalities on the abatement list (Hot Springs, Little Rock, Dardanelle, North Little Rock) totaling $3,400,410; in addition to this, requests are expected from other municipalities which will probably total approximately $1,000,000. Subtracting the proposed allocation shown above will result in a deficit of approximately $1.5 million for the coming fiscal year.

To combat this situation in prior years, the Arkansas Pollution Control Commission has initiated a policy of giving a municipality a partial grant and making up the remainder during the next fiscal year, however, this practice cannot be carried on indefinitely as the program is authrized only until June 30, 1971.

Under the present authorization, Arkansas will receive about 1.3% of the national allocation for FY 1970; carrying this percentage forward, the State would receive over $13 million should the full authorization of $1 billion be appropriated. Obviously this would be far more money than could possibly be used, however, it is felt that the amounts now received are short of those needed to complete the work at hand. A realistic estimate of the amounts needed for the two next fiscal years would be between 4.5 and 5 million dollars. At this time no State monies have been appropriated relative to the construction grant program and it is not expected that any will be forthcoming soon.

As another matter of extreme interest to the Commission, the monies appropriated under Section 7(b) of the Act have repeatedly fallen short of the percentages authorized for Federal assistance in the maintenance of State water pollution control programs. It is hoped that consideration will also be given to this facet of the overall program, as it is felt to be of equal or greater importance as the construction grants program.

I hope the foregoing information will enable you to properly evaluate the grants program with respect to Arkansas, however, should we be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Will all good wishes,

Sincerely,

WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER,
Governor.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Sacramento, July 2, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The lack of funds for the construction grant program under the Clean Water Restoration Act, referred to in your letter of June 6, has indeed held back the water pollution control and abatement program in California.

For fiscal year 1969, our State Water Resources Control Board received 174 applications for grants totaling $55 million. From the $214 million appropriation, California's allocation was approximately $15 million. This provided for 52 grants, less than one-third of the requests.

For fiscal year 1970, 183 applications have been received requesting grants totaling $59 million. Already, 38 projects have qualified or are pending certification for grants which would exceed the anticipated total of $15 million from the $214 million recommended in the federal budget. In other words, the presently anticipated allocation would be exhausted before the fiscal year even began.

A bill has been introduced in the California Legislature to provide state funds to match federal grants. However, under the formula of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, this would result in providing for larger grants but to fewer projects. There is no state program at present which would provide for grants to construct sewerage works.

The authorization in the Act of $700 million for fiscal year 1969 and $1 billion for fiscal year 1970 lead communities to believe that ample grant funds would be available. The actual appropriation of only $214 million tends to discourage the construction of all necessary sewage treatment facilities since communities are reluctant to provide for the entire cost when there is a prospect of grant assistance.

Your efforts to secure full funding of the Act for fiscal year 1970 are very much appreciated and have my support.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN,
Governor.

COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
Denver, Colo., July 1, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Your letter of June 6, 1969 to Governor Love was referred to me for reply. Please forgive the delay in answering your request. To properly respond, it was necessay to obtain information from the Water Pollution Control Division of the Department of Public Health.

Since 1957 Colorado has been requiring the construction of secondary sewage treatment facilities. As a result, over 98 percent of the sewered communities in Colorado are presently equipped with secondary facilities. Also, unlike states in other parts of our country, Colorado has very few large communities. Most of these large communities installed sewage treatment facilities in the early years of the Construction Grant Program. Requests from these communities now are generally restricted to Federal aid for enlargement of their treatment plants rather than completely new facilities. As a result Colorado has not found that the reduction in Federal funds for the Sewage Construction Grant Program has had much effect on our abatement program. However, it is our understanding that at least two communities are presently considering new metropolitan-type facilities which will dip quite heavily into our construction grant monies and could possibly affect our abatement program in the next year or so.

I hope this information will be helpful to you in your efforts to obtain full funding under the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Sincerely yours,

T. W. TEN EYCK.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, June 10, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: Thank you for your letter of June 6 and for your interest in water pollution abatement.

In 1967, the Connecticut General Assembly adopted a Clean Water Act for this State and approved a $150 million bond issue to finance it, that sum being considered at the time to be sufficient.

However, because Federal funds have not been forthcoming in the amount that we expected, it was necessary for me to call upon the General Assembly this year for an additional $100 million in bonds to keep our pollution control program on schedule.

The program is being administered by the State Water Resources Commission, a division of the Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources, and I am asking the Commissioner of that Department, Joseph N. Gill, to write to you in more detail about this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN DEMPSEY,
Governor.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES,
Hartford, June 20, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: Governor Dempsey's letter of June 10th advised that you would receive more detailed reaction to your letter of June 6th from this agency. Short-funding has curtailed abatement progress in Connecticut ever since the enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956. The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 by providing for federal reimbursement offered a possibility of proceeding with a reasonable program. Connecticut immediately passed legislation and provided funds for the federal share to abate all the pollution within the state within a period of five years. This program contemplated pre-financing more than $110 million of federal grants and receiving under the existing authorizations about $48 million through fiscal 1971, with the hope of recovering the remainder from subsequent federal programs. In the two years we have been operating under this program the State has pre-financed $37,393,098 which will increase rapidly in the next few months. During this period we have received from the Federal Government $5,859,300. This experience leads us to conclude that the accumulative inadequacies in federal appropriations are increasingly difficult to handle by even the most progressive state plan.

In addition to providing this requested information I believe it is also appropriate to comment on the efforts during the last year and a half to secure fuller funding by the Federal Government. It is our understanding that the budget problems of the Federal Government will allow full authorized funding only by some form of contracted delayed payments of bonded obligations. From a state's viewpoint it should matter little in what form the obligation of the Federal Government is provided.

However, the suggestions which were considered in Congress last year complicated or nullified the benefits which might accrue from such additional funding by contractual arrangements.

1. There was a condition that the arrangements for reimbursement would be terminated. Such a condition would completely stymie Connecticut's efforts to operate a cooperative program with the Federal Government.

2. There was a suggestion to eliminate the use of tax free municipal bonds for the financing of sewage disposal facilities. Such a provision would so increase interest rates that local financing would become difficult, illegal or impossible.

3. There is a suggestion that municipalities issue bonds to cover the federal share of the project as well as their own. To stay within fiscal or statutory requirements on bonded indebtedness the scope of the projects would have to be so reduced that they would be merely stop-gaps or inadequate efforts.

4. It was suggested that the additional funding be limited by criteria which would have prevented financial assistance to the correction of many important pollution problems.

5. There was the suggestion that federal contractual arrangements would only cover principal and not interest. This would produce an administrative problem for state agencies in deciding which municipality would receive full federal aid and which would have to bear part of the interest cost.

If methods of more fully funding the federal program are again considered such undesirable features may again be drafted, or new and more disagreeable conditions might be developed. In following these legislative attempts to provide additional funds, we have always deemed the incorporation of these difficulties as unnecessary. It would appear that a simple change in the Federal Act which would permit a contractual agreement by the Federal Government to pay the annual costs of those bonds which have been issued by a state to provide to the municipality the federal funds which were or are not available would accomplish what seems to be the legislative purpose without disruption of progressive state plans.

There seems to be no difficulty in state bonding at reasonable rates for funds sufficient to obtain the construction of the needed facilities. The paper work and administrative difficulties would be eliminated because the projects have already been processed and approved for federal grants. It would be easier for the Federal Government to work with a few state agencies than with thousands of municipalities. With such encouragement more states would be inclined to adopt a pre-financing arrangement so that their pollution abatement program can be put on firm schedules and those who already have such programs, which I believe includes your State, would be inclined to enlarge the pre-financing concept as may be required.

The difficulty with such a suggestion is that it appears so simple that one suspects there must be a hidden difficulty that has already prevented its adoption. However, we have exposed it many times to those in charge of pollution abatement programs in other states, to people working on interstate programs or in the regional offices of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and to Commissioner Dominick and have uncovered no unforeseen difficulty. Actually, this discussion of our proposal was developed in cooperation with the Director of the State Water Resources Commission, John J. Curry, who operates our state program.

It is hoped that you will find this rather lengthy additional response to the information you solicited worth your consideration in your efforts to secure full funding, a task to which you carry our fullest hope.

I have taken the liberty of providing copies of this answer to Connecticut's Congressional delegation because it should be opportune for their consideration of this problem.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH N. GILL,
Commissioner.

STATE OF DELAWARE,
Dover, June 11, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Thank you very much for your letter of June 6 regarding the Clean Water Restoration Act.

I am forwarding a copy of your correspondence to Mr. John C. Bryson, Executive Director of the Delaware Water and Air Resources Commission, for his review and direct reply to you. I am sure that Mr. Bryson will be able to give the information that you request regarding the impact that the fund shortages have on our water pollution control and abatement programs in the State of Delaware.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL W. PETERSON,
Governor.

STATE OF DELAWARE WATER AND AIR RESOURCES COMMISSION,
Dover, June 23, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Governor Peterson has asked me to reply to your letter to him of June 6, 1969. The appropriations of $214 million as opposed to the $1 billion authorized will drastically reduce the efforts of the State to meet the 1972 deadline imposed by the Water Quality Act of 1967.

The states, in good faith and with the understanding that such funds would be authorized, gave commitments to the Secretary of the Interior for a five-year clean up program. This accelerated push for pollution abatement used up all of Delaware's construction funds without any effort on the part of the agency to encourage projects via the aid route. In fact, we now have several projects pending that we will not be able to finance within the foreseeable future. Our needs during the next five years will be approximately $75 million. Of this amount (at the current rate) only approximately $5 million of federal aid will be available. Therefore, you can readily appreciate the great void between the 30% eligibility ($22.5 million) and the amount of funds allocated to the State for construction grants.

It is my opinion that it will be necessary for Delaware and many other states to resubmit time schedules for compliance with the 1967 Water Quality Act. Currently, the major responsibility for this slow down lies with the federal government. This is due to both hesitation in approving state standards and the drastic reduction in construction grant funds made available to the states. Unfortunately, we have been unable to provide state funds to keep up Water Pollution efforts, since we have found it necessary to undergo some rather major tax programs in the state to meet current fiscal obligations. It is anticipated that some state aid for sewerage construction can be made available next year.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. BRYSON,
Executive Director.

HAWAII EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Honolulu, June 19, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: This is in reply to your request of June 6, 1969 relative to the State of Hawaii's construction grant program for water pollution abatement.

Our water pollution control program in Hawaii has been temporarily retarded. During the fiscal year 1968–69, the total estimated cost for all projects was $7,100,000 of which $2,345,000 was anticipated to be the federal grant portion. However, the annual federal allotment for fiscal year 1968–69 to Hawaii was $951,750 which was only 40% of the total federal grant request. Attached is a copy of our fiscal year 1968–69 summary of our construction projects.

In an effort to compensate for the federal short funding, the Department of Health submitted an administrative request bill for an appropriation of $5,000,000 to the State Legislature. The Legislature, however, passed an amended bill of only $1,500,000 which

still left a balance of $3,500,000 million in the total estimated project costs for the State during this period.

In spite of the adverse change in federal funding, our State continues to move ahead with plans for the control of water pollution in anticipation of federal funds. Your efforts to secure full funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act is most encouraging. We hope that enough support can be generated in Congress so that the federal government can provide the authorized funding for the abatement phase of our water pollution control program.

With warm personal regards. May the Almighty be with you and yours always.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. BURNS.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS' 1968-69

	Estimated total project costs	Estimated amount of Federal grant to be requested
City and county of Honolulu:		
Nanakuli interceptor	$1,500,000	$495,000
Makaha sec. 3 interceptor	350,000	115,500
Hawaii County:		
Kailua interceptor	900,000	297,000
Kawaihae-Puako secondary treatment and interceptor	750,000	247,500
Kauai County: Lihue-Nawiliwili interceptor	850,000	280,500
Maui County:		
Honokowai secondary treatment and interceptor	1,500,000	497 000
Kaunakakai secondary treatment and interceptor	750,000	247,500
Lanai secondary treatment and interceptor	500,000	165,000
Total	7,100,000	2,343,000

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
Springfield, June 25, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: In your letter of June 6, 1969, you stated that the House Committee on Appropriations is currently considering funding of construction grants for sewage treatment works under the Clean Water Restoration Act (Public Law 84–660).

The authorization for fiscal 1970 is $1 billion, but the proposed appropriation is for $214 million. Therefore, the Illinois allotment will be approximately $9.8 million vs. the $53.3 million at maximum authorized. This short funding has a serious impact on progress in Illinois toward construction of necessary abatement works. This is particularly true of the cities along the Illinois River, Lake Michigan and other interstate waters. The proposed funding will be sufficient for about 20 to 25 projects only.

There are now on hand, Federal grant applications for 273 projects having a total cost of $187 million, and eligible for $55 million in grants at 30 percent. Fifty-six projects requesting $18 million in grants are in the metropolitan Cook County; 217 projects are outside Cook County with grant requests of $37 million. All of these projects are required to be completed by July, 1972 in compliance with the Federal-State Water Quality Standards established in accord with the Federal Water Quality Act of 1965.

* * * * *

Many construction projects have been held back and others have been progressing slowly because of difficulties with financing. Practically all interstate projects were planned and scheduled in expectation that funds authorized by the Clean Water Restoration Act would be available. In spite of this, twenty downstate projects and two Metropolitan Sanitary District projects did proceed in FY 69 under potential reimbursement features of the Federal Act.

A one billion dollar Water Resources General Obligation Bond Referendum for Illinois in November, 1968 received a majority of "Yes" votes. However, because a majority of votes cast in the election was required, the issue did not receive legal approval. This bond issue was intended, in part, to assist municipalities in construction of sewage treatment works.

Sincerely,

RICHARD B. OGILVIE,
Governor.

STATE OF MAINE,
Augusta, June 19, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I have noted the concern expressed by your letter of June 6, 1969 for the effect of the lag of appropriations by the Congress behind the authorizations of the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Here in Maine we are equally concerned, have tried to keep the program momentum with pre-financing provisions of a limited nature, and now have before the Legislature a bond issue bill which carries a pre-financing provision as well.

Our water quality restoration implementation plan was based upon the authorization and is now in danger of falling out of gear badly. The first two years of the Act's four year authorization period would, if fully funded, have provided Maine with a total of $7.5 million in aid generating approximately $15 million in construction. Instead the direct aid figure amounted to about $3.5 million generating $6.8 million in construction. Fortunately some projects were saved by a pre-financing provision authorized by the 1967 Legislature leaving only $0.7 million of authorization uncovered.

To the best of our knowledge the Fiscal Year 1970 aid figure will approximate $1.8 million for Maine which will drop us behind from an authorized $6.1 million figure and provide a lag of $4.3 million in aid and $8.6 million in construction. In Fiscal Year 1971 $7.3 million was authorized and if there is a continuation of present policy we will slip back another $5.5 million. So as matters now stand we will be out of line by $21 million dollars worth of construction by July 1, 1971.

There is a bill before the current Legislative session to provide fifty million dollars in state money for the program including pre-financing but in addition to Legislative approval, it must pass Statewide referendum as well. A problem somewhat unrelated but nevertheless a problem is that Maine must recover the $5.3 million now invested in pre-financing from 1970 and 1971 funding of the federal grants in aid unless it is to sacrifice this money.

Maine communities under present construction costs must participate in something over $150 million in abatement projects and it is easy to see the impact of short fall on the program. At the present time the cost increase in construction is a prime factor in estimating the cost of delay.

I wish to express my gratitude for your concern in this matter and assure you that we will be pleased to supply any additional information at any time.

Sincerely,

KENNETH M. CURTIS,
Governor.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Annapolis, Md., June 25, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: At the request of Governor Mandel, I am replying to your letter of June 6th concerning the funding of the construction grant program under the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Governor Mandel recently appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee, at which time this subject was under discussion.

We are pleased to enclose herewith a copy of Governor Mandel's testimony of June 9th as we feel that his remarks will give you, substantially, the information you requested.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH G. ANASTASI,
Administrative Officer.

TESTIMONY OF GOV. MARVIN MANDEL

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to be here to express my support for increased appropriations for sewage purification plants.

Specifically, I appear before you today to urge you to appropriate the full sum of money authorized in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for grants to communities for the construction of sewage purification works. The Act authorizes one billion dollars for that purpose in fiscal year 1970. I am informed that the President's budget requests only 214 million dollars—the same as last year.

Mr. Chairman, 214 million dollars is woefully inadequate. One billion dollars is not enough. And I believe the Governors of all the states would agree with me. If support for sewage purification works is limited to that amount, the effectiveness of the national water pollution control effort will be severely lessened.

Let me assure you that I am aware of the extraordinary pressures on the nation's budget. I fully appreciate the desire of the President and some members of Congress to cut back and defer expenditures wherever possible.

State and local budgets are under similar pressures. In Maryland, and in many other states, it is unwise to defer construction of water pollution control facilities—unless we can defer pollution too.

So many of the problems I face today as Governor of Maryland—and you face too in the area of your own responsibilities—are embedded in social and economic disparities that no amount of public expenditures alone can remedy. The point is, the aggravating problems caused by municipal sewage pollution can be solved now. They can be solved by the simple expenditure of a relatively small sum of money. Furthermore, construction of sewage purification plants now is the cheaper method. Deferring the ultimate construction of these needed plants means adding the social and actual costs of inadequate pollution control to the construction costs of the plants.

In addition, municipal sewage is one source of pollution that we know how to control. It can be corrected now. It will never be less expensive to correct than today.

I stated earlier in my testimony that one billion dollars is inadequate for the construction of sewage purification works in fiscal 1970. Let me tell you about our experience in Maryland to illustrate the point.

In 1967 Maryland entered the local, State and Federal program of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. Water quality standards were adopted for all waters of the State. Standards and plans for implementation for interstate waters were approved by the Secretary of the Department of Interior. These standards thus became Federal as well as State.

The Maryland plan requires that by 1971 all municipalities in Maryland have arranged financing and have completed or have under construction the most advanced sewage purification works available under current technology.

In 1966, when Maryland began this program, approximately 720 thousand persons were contributing to water pollution for lack of modern sewage purification works. In addition, Maryland is growing at an average

rate of approximately 80 thousand persons per year. Thus, in a five year period, it was imperative that Maryland finance sewage works for a total of 1.12 million people—or an average of 224 thousand per year for five years.

Maryland's experience in 1966 was that the grant eligible portion of sewage facilities cost about 150 dollars per person. That figure increases at the rate of about 15 per cent per year. That means that by 1971 Maryland can expect to pay 300 dollars per person.

The average annual cost of the plan eligible for Federal and State grants (at an average construction rate providing service for an additional 224 thousand persons per year at an average cost of 225 dollars per person) is 50.4 million dollars. Maryland's communities are fully eligible for the maximum Federal grant. Thus the allotment to Maryland to finance a 55 per cent grant is slightly more than 27.7 million dollars.

If Congress appropriates one billion dollars, Maryland's allotment will be close to 17 million dollars. This is about 11 million dollars short of the amount needed. In order for Maryland to receive the allotment needed to finance the plan approved by the State and Federal governments, Congress would need to appropriate 1.64 billion dollars.

At the level of President Nixon's budget request, Maryland can expect to receive 3.5 million dollars in fiscal year 1970. This is about one-eighth of the amount needed to comply with the approved plan. New sewage purification facilities to complement the population growth that qualify for Federal grants total almost 10 million dollars—or about three times that which Maryland would be entitled to receive under the President's budget request.

Clearly, one billion dollars is not enough to finance the Federal share of construction of municipal sewage purification facilities. 214 million dollars is grossly inadequate.

Maryland's plan did not anticipate that Federal grant funds would be sufficient to fully finance the Federal share in the first five years. Instead, the Maryland General Assembly authorized the sale of 150 million dollars in bonds to pay the outright State grant and to pre-finance any deficiency in the Federal grant offer. This was done on the basis of the authorization for reimbursement through fiscal year 1971 and the hope that the reimbursement provision would be extended beyond 1971 in later amendments.

A Sanitary Facilities Fund was established for those purposes. The law authorizing the sale of bonds provides that reimbursements received from the Federal government be deposited in the fund to be used to finance other works. Thus, the fund was designed to provide capital to make up the deficiency in the early years of the program. If reimbursements came in as expected, Maryland could continue to build for growth and modern sewage purification works. The State share would be taken out of the fund until it was depleted early in 1980.

Maryland did not anticipate the default in the appropriation schedule authorized by the Federal Act. As a result, because our carefully conceived plan is working well, Maryland is in financial trouble. During the first two years the backlog of purification needs was reduced from 720 thousand to approximately 300 thousand. If the Federal government appropriates the amounts authorized in the Act, Maryland's backlog needs will be financed and under construction by mid-1970, months ahead of our target date.

At the present rate of Federal appropriations, Maryland will receive about 14 million dollars for fiscal years 1968 through 1971. 57.5 million dollars was anticipated under the Federal Act for the same fiscal years. Thus, the Sanitary Facilities Fund will go broke early in fiscal year 1970 unless Federal appropriations are increased.

You might be interested in the fact that actual Federal grants for construction of sewage purification works in Maryland average less than 10 per cent compared to the 55 per cent grant authorization of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

In closing, I want to express my concern in support of increased appropriations for sewage purification plants. Our people are fed up with billion dollar talk and million dollar action.

The example set by Congress can greatly enhance or hinder the national water pollution control effort.

An effective program has been developed in Maryland. This program includes local, State and Federal partnership. But unless Maryland continues to receive Federal support the program will fail for lack of financial support.

This means other states will be less apt to try and work out programs involving all three levels of government. And this means that industry will be less apt to place a high priority on nonproductive water pollution control investments. These are two very serious consequences of decreasing the amount of Federal involvement in the sewage purification effort.

In summary, pollution caused by municipal sewage is unnecessary. This type of pollution can be lessened by constructing modern sewage purification works. The cost of building these plants five years from now will be double today's cost. This is one problem that can be solved—with a modest expenditure of Federal funds now.

Therefore, I urge this subcommittee to look favorably on appropriating the full one billion dollars for construction grants in fiscal year 1970 as authorized in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, June 27, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: Governor Milliken has asked me to reply to your request for information on the effect of the short-funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act on Michigan's water pollution control program. The people of Michigan have expressed their concern over this growing threat to our environment by passing the $446 million Clean Water Bond issue last November. The Michigan Legislature responded to this mandate of the people and on June 12, 1969, Governor Milliken signed into law Public Act 21 which is the enabling legislation for the disbursement of $285 million of the Clean Water Bond issue to be used in the construction of sewage treatment facilities eligible under provisions of P.L. 84–660. I am enclosing a copy of this Act for your information. Sec. 3(2) of Act 21 provides that a treatment works qualifying for a grant under this Act and under P.L. 84–660 shall receive a 25% state grant, an additional payment from the state water pollution control fund as an advance against the prospective federal share and a portion of the annual allotment to Michigan under provisions of P.L. 84–660. The Act provides that the total grant shall not be less than 55% of the eligible cost until June 30, 1971 which is the expiration of the funding authorization of P.L. 84–660.

The needs study which provided the factual information on which the Clean Water Bond issue was based indicated a total need of $570 million for treatment works which would be eligible for $285 million in grants under P.L. 84–660 at the 50% Federal participation commitment. In addition, this study projected a need for an additional $641 million expenditure for the control of storm water overflows and for lateral sewers. The bulk of this $641 million will have to be furnished by local units of government without the assistance of grants from the Federal government. Fifty million dollars of the Clean Water Bond issue will be utilized to assist small communities in Michigan in the construction of lateral sewers based on financial and water pollution control needs. This enabling legislation is currently in its final stages in the Legislature.

The foregoing information illustrates the concern of the people of Michigan over the water pollution problem. The Clean Water Bond issue and the passage of the implementation legislation resulted in a slowdown in the construction of sewage treatment facilities in Michigan from early 1968 to the present time. On June 25, 1969, the Michigan Water Resources Commission presented to the Michigan Legislature, in accordance with Act 21, P.A. of 1969, two lists of projects eligible for grant funds under the State Act and under P.L. 84–660, copies of which are enclosed. The first list, titled "Applicants eligible for additional grant funds under Sec. 3(1) of Act 329, P.A. of 1966, as amended" is a listing of 39 projects on which construction commenced after June 30, 1967. These 39 projects have a total of $48,496,912 and are eligible for $24,248,456 under provisions of P.L. 84–660. These projects have already had committed a total of $13,020,822 in Federal grants under P.L. 84–660, primarily at a 30% rate and are now eligible for an additional $11,227,634 from the Federal government to bring them up to the 50% Federal participation commitment. The second list consists of applicants who intend to award construction contracts before December 31, 1969. This list contains 54 projects with a total estimated project cost of $133,179,225 and are eligible for $66,589,612 under the 50% Federal participation commitment.

The additional cost to the State and the local units of government is the interest cost of bonding for the unpaid Federal commitment. Based on past appropriations for P.L. 84–660 grants, the Federal government will only be providing an estimated 5% of the total needs, instead of 50%.

I am also enclosing a copy of Governor Milliken's press release of June 12, 1969, when he signed Act 21. I would like to call to your attention the following portion of this release "Moreover, new Federal legislative proposals have been put forward which would alter the basic legislation and change the ground rules under which the programs of Michigan and other states have been formulated. Clearly, this would represent a serious breach of faith with the states and more important would delay effective pollution control immeasurably."

I trust this will provide you with the information you require. If we may be of further assistance, we shall be glad to do so.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. KELLOGG,
Executive Assistant.

GOVERNOR MILLIKEN SIGNS LEGISLATION

Gov. William G. Milliken Thursday signed the enabling legislation for the allocation of $285 million for local grants for sewage treatment control under the Clean Water Bond Issue approved by voters last November.

In signing the bill (S–107 I.E.) at a ceremony in his office, the Governor was critical of "inaction by the federal government" on pollution control. He also urged local governments in Michigan to "expedite" their plans for pollution control.

The Governor said:

"This legislation is a major step in combatting the ominous threat of pollution in Michigan, and in achieving clean water by 1980.

"By a number of actions, Michigan has demonstrated its commitment to this goal. Those legislators and citizens present at this

ceremony deserve the appreciation of all of Michigan for their efforts on behalf of the bond issue, and the enabling legislation.

"Last November, the citizens of Michigan approved a $335 million bond issue to help finance local wastewater treatment facilities. At the same time, approval was given for a $100 million bond issue for the development of State and local outdoor recreation facilities. Our pollution control goal is to remove, by 1980, the threat to our inland lakes, our rivers, and the Great Lakes by the construction of approximately 210 new treatment plants, the improvement of 126 existing sewage treatment plants, and the construction of sewers for an additional 3½ million people. $285 million will be distributed as grants for treatment plant construction and $50 million will be used to aid small, unsewered communities in the construction of sewer systems necessary to correct existing pollution.

"Our financing formula for the treatment plant and interceptor phase of the program was based on Federal legislation which provided for Federal assumption of 50 percent of the costs of eligible projects if the State would pay 25 percent.

The federal legislation also authorized the appropriation of funds by 1971 which would, as divided among the states by specified formula, have by then covered half the Federal government's obligation to Michigan's estimated project needs. Michigan's bonding program is geared to 25 percent Federal financing by 1971 with the State to prefinance the other Federal 25 percent as well as paying its own 25 percent.

"Unfortunately, Federal performance has not been forthcoming at a rate that will equal even one-half of the Federal promise. For example, in the upcoming fiscal year, Michigan's share of the total amount authorized for this program would be roughly $42 million, but it appears that less than $8 million will be forthcoming.

"I find it exceedingly difficult to understand the low Federal priority assigned to the sewage treatment works grant program when, in referendum after referendum across the country, the citizens of America have clearly demonstrated their very firm support for cleaning-up our lakes and streams.

"Moreover, new Federal legislative proposals have been put forward which would alter the basic legislation and change the ground rules under which the programs of Michigan and other states have been formulated. Clearly, this would represent a serious breach of faith with the states and more important would delay effective pollution control immeasurably.

"Michigan, with or without the Federal support promised, will move ahead as rapidly as possible. It must be understood, however, that the tremendous potential of effective Federal-State-local partnership has not only been circumscribed in this program, but will be increasingly difficult to invoke in any future programs.

"Through inaction, the Federal government is faulting on its commitment to environmental control. By authorizing one billion dollars and appropriating only $200 million, Congress is providing about one-fifth of what is needed to carry out federal responsibility.

"With this legislation signed today, the State government can provide grants to local government. I urge local governments to expedite their pollution control programs in order to qualify for these grants.

"I also urge favorable action by the Legislature on the companion bill to the legislation signed today. The pending legislation would provide $50 million which would allow economically depressed communities to move ahead on their programs of collecting sewers and sewage treatment facilities.

"Water pollution was the subject of my first message to the Legislature on February 6.

"I am highly pleased now, four months later, to be able to sign the enabling legislation for clean water bond program."

[From Public Acts of 1969, State of Michigan, 75th Legislature]

ENROLLED SENATE BILL 107

An act to amend the title and sections 1, 2, 3, 6, 8 and 11 of Act No. 329 of the Public Acts of 1966, entitled "An act to provide state grants for sewage treatment facilities," as amended and added by Act No. 75 of the Public Acts of 1968, being sections 323.111, 323.112, 323.113, 323.116, 323.118 and 323.121 of the Compiled Laws of 1948; and to add sections 3a and 12 to 18

The People of the State of Michigan enact:

SECTION 1. The title and section 1, 2, 3, 6, 8 and 11 of Act No. 329 of Public Acts of 1966, as amended and added by Act No. 75 of the Public Acts of 1968, being sections 323.111, 323.112, 323.113, 323.116, 323.118 and 323.121 of the Compiled Laws of 1948, are amended and sections 3a and 12 to 18 are added to read as follows:

"TITLE

"An act to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other liquid wastes into any waters of the state; to provide financial assistance to local agencies for the construction of treatment works to prevent such discharge; and to abate and prevent pollution of the waters in and adjoining the state; and to implement Act No. 76 of the Public Acts of 1968.

"SEC. 1. (1) A fund to be known as the state water pollution control fund is established to be used for assisting counties, cities, villages, townships or other public bodies created by or pursuant to state law and having jurisdiction over disposal of sewage or other liquid wastes, hereinafter referred to as local agencies, in financing their construction of treatment works.

"(2) As used in this act:

"(a) 'Treatment works' means the various devices used in treatment of sewage or industrial wastes of a liquid nature, and extensions, improvements, remodeling, additions and alterations thereof, including necessary intercepting sewers, outfall sewers, pumping, power and other equipment and their appurtenances.

"(b) 'Intercepting sewer' means a sewer, including necessary pumping stations, designed or constructed for 1 or more of the following purposes:

"(i) To receive the existing flow of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other liquid waste from 1 or more sewers or outlets, other than from a building or dwelling, that discharge or formerly discharged the flow into any waters of the state; and convey the flow to a treatment works.

"(ii) To serve in lieu of an existing or proposed treatment works.

"(iii) To convey sewage from a sewage collection system directly to a treatment works.

"(c) 'Outfall sewer' means a sewer designed or constructed to convey the effluent from a treatment works to the point of final disposal.

"(d) 'Construction' means the engineering architectural, legal, fiscal and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures and other similar action necessary to the construction of treatment works; the erection, building, acquisition, extension, improvement, remodeling and additions to or alterations of treatment works; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of treatment works. 'Construction' does not include acquisition of lands and rights of way.

"SEC. 2. The proceeds of sale of $285,000,000.00 of the bonds authorized by Act No. 76 of the Public Acts of 1968, being sections 323.371 to 323.382 of the Compiled Laws of 1948, or any series thereof, and any premiums and accrued interest received on the delivery thereof, shall be deposited with the state treasurer in the water pollution control fund. Disbursements from the fund shall be made only for specific eligible treatment works projects approved by the appropriation committees and by the legislature by concurrent resolution adopted by a roll call vote of a majority of the members elected to and serving in each house. A concurrent resolution shall include all or part of the projects on the list of eligible projects reported by the water resources commission as provided in section 16, but in case of a part only it shall be an entire part representing all projects on the list having priorities higher than those of projects not included in the resolution and projects out of the priority order shall not be included. The income from temporary investments of the proceeds shall be deposited in the general fund.

"SEC. 3. (1) Grants shall be made under this act only for treatment works eligible for federal grants under United States Public Law 84–660, as amended, and on which construction commenced after June 30, 1967, and shall be made in an amount equal to 25% of that portion of the treatment works cost that is eligible for such federal grant. However, (a) treatment works which receive federal grants only under federal laws other than United States Public Law 84–660, as amended, and on which construction commenced after June 30, 1967, are eligible for state grants not to exceed 25% of the cost of treatment works, and; (b) the sum of state and federal grants on projects which receive federal grants only under federal law other than United States Public Law 87–660, as amended, shall not exceed 75% of the cost of the portions of such treatment works which would have been eligible for grants under United States Public Law 84–660, as amended.

"(2) Commencing July 1, 1967 and ending June 30, 1971, a treatment works qualifying for a 25% state grant under this act and a federal grant under United States Public Law 84–660, as amended, is eligible to receive an additional payment from the state water pollution control fund as an advance against the prospective federal share of the eligible treatment works cost authorized by United States Public Law 84–660, as amended, so that the combined state grant, state advance of the federal share, and federal grant apportioned to the treatment works shall not be less than 55% of the eligible cost. After June 30, 1971, the combined state grant and state advance of the federal share shall not be less than 50% of the eligible treatment works cost.

"(3) Financial assistance shall be given under this act to a local agency only if it has agreed, when filing its application for assistance under this act, to adjust the amount of its request for federal grants to the amount that is determined by the water resources commission to be available for apportionment. This agreement shall not affect the eligibility of the local agency for future reimbursement of costs of the treatment works, which were prefinanced by the local agency but which would have been eligible for federal grants if funds therefor had been available.

"(4) Financial assistance shall be given under this act to a local agency only for treatment works on which eligibility for a federal grant has been established and construction contracts awarded or construction commenced after June 30, 1967.

"(5) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (1) and (2) of this section, when a treatment works owned by a local agency is to be replaced in whole or in part by a system of another local agency under an official plan approved by the water resources commission after June 30, 1967, the project costs eligible for a state grant to the regional local agency may include 50% of the present value of the treatment works or part thereof that is to be replaced, less the land value and any state or federal grants used in the construction thereof. The present value shall be based on a straight line depreciated cost including any capital improvements thereto based on a maximum life of 40 years for structures and 20 years for equipment from the date the treatment works was placed in operation. The grant shall be made only if the regional local agency has entered into an agreement for acquisition of the treatment works or part thereof to be replaced and applies the grant toward such acquisition.

"SEC. 3a. (1) Disbursements from the fund shall be made by the director of the department of administration and the state treasurer in accordance with the accounting laws of the state only for the following purposes for which the bonds have been authorized:

"(a) Expense of issuing the bonds.

"(b) Grants and advances to local agencies as provided in subsections (2) and (3) and subsection (5) of section 3.

"(2) Before any disbursement from the fund, as provided in subsection (3), is made to a local agency to assist it in constructing treatment works, the water resources commission shall certify to the director of the department of administration and the state treasurer that such agency is eligible for financial assistance under this act. The certificate shall include or have attached thereto a certificate by the water resources commission, or by the state department of public health when so requested by the commission of the necessity and sufficiency of the treatment works and all portions thereof.

"(3) Disbursements from the fund to a local agency, as authorized by section 3, shall be made on certification to the director of the department of administration and the state treasurer by the water resources commission that such disbursements are due. A local agency is eligible for this certification at the same time and in the same proportions that federal grant payments are authorized. However, a disbursement shall be made from the fund to a local agency for 50% of the reasonable cost of preparing completed final construction plans and specifications for that part of the treatment works that is eligible for a federal grant, on (a) issuance of a construction permit by the department of public health for the treatment works for which the construction plans and specifications have been prepared (b) receipt of evidence satisfactory to the commission of the local agency's ability to finance the local share of the project cost and (c) certification to the director of the department of administration and the state treasurer by the water resources commission of the necessity and sufficiency of the plans and specifications.

"SEC. 6. Federal funds allocated to the state before July 1, 1971, in excess of 5% of the eligible costs of treatment works that have been certified for financial assistance under this act, shall be used under the reimbursement provisions of United States Public Law 84–660, as last amended by United States Public Law 89–753, to reimburse local agencies in full, for that portion of the federal share which they advanced, before such federal funds are used for reimbursement to the state of any portion of the federal share which the state has advanced. Federal funds received by the state, for reimbursement of the portion of the federal share which the state advanced, shall be deposited in the state water pollution control fund for state assistance in financing treatment works under this act.

"SEC. 8. An official plan shall:

"(a) Provide for timely construction of treatment works which will prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other wastes as defined by Act No. 245 of the Public Acts of 1929, as amended, being sections 323.1 to 322.12a of the Compiled Laws of 1948, into the waters of the state.

"(b) Provide for adequate planning, zoning, population projections and engineering and economic studies to delineate with all practicable precision those portions of the area which public sewerage systems may reasonably be expected to serve within 10 years, and within 20 years, and any areas in which the provision of such services is not reasonably foreseeable.

"(c) Be in compliance with the state pollution control plan required by United States Public Law 84–660, as amended.

"(d) Set forth a time schedule and proposed method of financing, construction and operation of the pollution control system.

"(e) Be reviewed by the official planning agencies having jurisdiction within the local agency, including the regional planning agency, if any, for consistency with programs of planning for the area, which reviews shall be transmitted to the water resources commission with the plan.

"SEC. 11. (1) The water resources commission, with the consent of the head of any other agency of this state, shall utilize such officers and employees of such agency as may be found necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

"(2) A recipient of assistance under this act shall keep such records as the commission shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by the recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with such assistance given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit. The commission, the auditor general and the state treasurer or any of their duly authorized representatives shall have access, for the purpose of audit and examination, to any books, documents, papers and records of the recipient that are pertinent to grants received under this act.

"SEC. 12. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act or of any rule of the water resources commission, compliance with sections 12 to 16 is a prerequisite to the making of a grant or advance under this act. Sections 12 to 16 provide procedures for establishing the priority of eligible projects and for certifying projects for an allocation of grants and advances for treatment works construction. The point system is designed to give ½ weight to financial needs and ½ weight to water pollution control needs.

"SEC. 13. (1) Points assigned to a treatment works project as a complete measure of financial needs shall not exceed 15.

"(2) One-fifth of a point shall be assigned for each $5.00 or major fraction thereof, based on estimated reasonable cost of the treatment works as entered on the application issued therefor by the administering federal agency, per capita of equivalent population established by the applicant's engineer as the basis of design of the treatment works.

"(3) One-fifth of a point shall be assigned for each $5.00 or major fraction thereof, based on applicant's oustanding financial obligations, exclusive of school debt, on the date the application is filed, per capita of population established by the latest federal census. In case of a project to be constructed by 1 local agency to serve any other local agency or portions thereof, or project to be constructed by a new local agency formed by existing local agencies to be served, debt obligations per capita shall be based on the combined financial obligations and population of the areas served.

Sec. 14. (1) Points assigned to a treatment works project as a complete measure of pollution control needs shall not exceed 15.

"(2) Two points shall be assigned for each of the following interests subject to pollution-caused injuries, which injuries will be corrected or substantially lessened by the proposed project:

"(a) Public health, safety or welfare but not including bathing.

"(b) Public water supply for domestic use.

"(c) Water supply for commercial or industrial use.

"(d) Irrigation or livestock water supply for agricultural use.

"(e) Organized public recreational use including bathing.

"(f) Aesthetic value or utility of riparian lands.

"(g) Water supply for wild animals, birds and fish, and adverse effects on aquatic life or plants.

"(h) Usefulness of fish or game for human consumption.

"(3) A treatment works required to be constructed in compliance with a judgment rendered by a court of competent jurisdiction, or with a stipulation or an order of the water resources commission, or an agreement with the department of public health, shall be assigned from 1 to 4 points in accordance with the following schedule, if the stipulation, order or agreement specifically recites the existence of unlawful pollution and was in effect not less than 30 days before the deadline for filing applications, and if the pollution abatement date is such that compliance therewith would make it necessary to start construction during the year ending:

"(a) June 30 of the fiscal year for which the application is filed, 4 points.

"(b) June 30 of the first succeeding fiscal year, 3 points.

"(c) June 30 of the second succeeding fiscal year, 2 points.

"(d) June 30 of the third succeeding fiscal year, 1 point.

"(4) An applicant in default of a performance date specified by an order, stipulation or agreement may be assigned points under the preceding schedule only at the discretion of the water resources commission.

"(5) A treatment works project, which qualifies for less than 4 points under subsection (3) and for which construction contracts are awarded before the deadline date for filing applications, shall be assigned from 1 to 4 points, so that the combined points assigned pursuant to subsections (3) to (5) shall equal 4.

"SEC. 15. (1) Total priority points for a treatment works project shall be the sum of the points assigned for financial needs and for water pollution control needs.

"(2) If 2 or more projects receive the same priority point totals the water resources commission shall assign priorities to the tied projects in the relative order of their points for water pollution control needs. If the projects have the same point totals for water pollution control needs the commission shall assign priorities after considering factors such as waters affected, extent of public interests involved, relative magnitude of pollution injury and other factors as the commission deems appropriate.

"SEC. 16. (1) For the purposes of sections 12 to 16 the fiscal year is July 1 to June 30.

"(2) An application for a treatment works construction grant for a specific fiscal year shall be filed with the water resources commission not later than September 15 preceding the fiscal year for which the application is filed. An application postmarked not later

than midnight of September 15 will meet this requirement.

"(3) A point total shall be assigned by the commission to each application that has been timely filed and conforms to the requirements of the administering federal agency no later than the following January 1.

"(4) Projects entitled to construction grants shall be certified to the administering federal agency from the eligibility list as established by the water resources commission as approved by the legislature. Certification shall be made within 7 days after approval by the legislature and after receipt of federal authorization to certify projects.

"(5) Priority certification of a project to the administering federal agency is subject to the condition that construction contracts for the project be awarded by the next October 1. Failure to comply with this condition of certification will be considered cause for the commission to request the administering federal agency to take action necessary to withdraw any grant offer that may have been obligated to the project. However, on a showing satisfactory to the water resources commission that the project will proceed within an extended period, the commission may allow 30 day extensions totaling not more than 90 days.

"(6) An application for a treatment works construction grant filed with the commission is valid only for the year for which the application is filed.

"(7) The commission shall report to the legislature by January 15 of each year the projects eligible for grants and the points and priorities assigned to them pursuant to this act and the projects which failed to comply with the condition of certification set forth in subsection (5). Within 10 days after the effective date of this act, the commission shall submit to the legislature its June 27, 1968 list of projects and points and priorities assigned to them for projects which it appears can now be certified in accordance with the terms of this act and for which the applicants have provided assurance that they intend toward construction contracts before December 31, 1969. If legislative approval or rejection of eligible projects is not given each year within 45 days after receipt of the commission's list of eligible projects, the commission list will be considered approved.

"SEC. 17. It is the intent of this act that the water resources commission encourage local agencies to use grants provided herein to assist in abatement of any unlawful pollution of waters of this state. When the commission is petitioned relative to such pollu- and determines that untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other liquid wastes are being discharged into the waters of the state from any system of sewers, drains or existing treatment works, including but not limited to combined sewer overflows from regulating structures owned, operated or maintained by a local agency or a combination of local agencies, the commission shall take prompt and timely action under procedures prescribed by law to obtain the abatement of unlawful pollution caused by such discharges.

"SEC. 18. Notwithstanding any other provision of law in the contrary a petition under chapters 20 or 21 of the drain code of 1956 may be filed by 1 public corporation when the purpose thereof is to alleviate pollution of the waters of the state."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect June 15, 1969.

This act is ordered to take immediate effect.

PROJECTS FROM JUNE 27, 1968, PRIORITY LIST FOR WHICH APPLICANTS HAVE PROVIDED ASSURANCE OF THEIR INTENTIONS TO AWARD CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS BEFORE DEC. 31, 1969

[Key to points for financial and pollution control needs: Col. A—Construction cost per capita; B—Debt per capita; C—Financing dependent upon Federal grant; D—Pollution injury created; E—Order status; F—Voluntarily advanced project]

Project No.	Applicant	Priority points: Financial need A	B	C	Subtotal	Pollution need D	E	F	Subtotal	Total points	Project cost	55 percent grant [1]
1304	Warren	2.8	17.4	0	15.0	8	4.0	0	12	27.0	$5,300,000	$2,915,000
1387	Detroit (63 communities)	.8	12.0	0	12.8	10	4.0	0	14	26.8	80,000,000	44,000,000
1358	Ravenna	10.0	15.8	0	15.0	6	4.0	0	10	25.0	300,000	165,000
1384	Monroe County (Petersburg)	19.0	.0	0	15.0	4	3.0	0	7	22.0	950,000	522,500
1349	Ashley	5.2	10.4	0	15.0	2	4.0	0	6	21.0	105,300	57,900
1394	Waldron	16.8	7.4	0	15.0	2	4.0	0	6	21.0	217,500	119,600
1391	Camden	10.2	4.0	0	14.2	2	4.0	0	6	20.2	141,000	77,500
1397	Kalamazoo	.2	7.4	0	7.6	8	4.0	0	12	19.6	2,512,000	1,381,600
1337	Bellevue	11.4	0	0	11.4	4	4.0	0	8	19.4	515,500	283,500
1207	Saginaw	.4	13.8	0	14.2	4	0	0	4	18.2	1,552,500	853,800
1339	Trenton	1.6	4.2	0	5.8	8	4.0	0	12	17.8	1,436,250	789,900
1347	Oakland County (Walled Lake-Novi)	1.8	8.0	0	9.8	4	4.0	0	8	17.8	2,335,500	1,284,500
1353	Monroe County (Monroe Township)	5.4	1.8	0	7.2	6	4.0	0	10	17.2	3,245,000	1,784,700
1373	Ypsilanti Township, Washtenaw County	.2	8.8	0	9.0	4	4.0	0	8	17.0	540,000	297,000
1414	Genesee County (Swartz Creek interceptor)	1.6	14.8	0	15.0	2	0	0	2	17.0	4,755,000	2,615,200
1357	Dimondale	6.6	0	2	8.6	4	4.0	0	8	16.6	348,000	191,400
1343	Hopkins	6.8	0	0	6.8	6	3.0	0	11	15.8	120,000	66,000
1374	Monroe County (Frenchtown Township)	5.2	2.6	0	7.8	4	4.4	0	8	15.8	3,630,000	1,996,500
1377	Vermontville	4.4	3.4	0	7.8	4	4.0	0	8	15.8	109,000	59,900
1352	Flushing	2.4	11.2	0	13.6	2	0	0	2	15.6	143,300	78,800
1302	Breckenridge	5.2	4.2	0	9.4	2	4.0	0	6	15.4	155,000	85,200
1381	Onekama	11.4	0	0	11.4	4	0	0	4	15.4	284,275	156,300
1328	Birch Run	3.8	8.4	0	11.2	2	0	0	2	14.2	113,000	62,100
1306	Rose City	9.6	0	0	9.6	4	0	0	4	13.6	111,000	61,000
1335	Lake Odessa	3.6	1.4	0	5.0	4	4.0	0	8	13.0	359,000	197,400
1319	Reading	7.0	0	0	7.0	2	4.0	0	6	13.0	259,300	142,600
1396	Monroe County (Bedford Township)	7.0	0	0	7.0	2	4.0	0	6	13.0	2,100,000	1,155,000
1354	Benton Harbor	1.4	5.4	0	6.8	6	0	0	6	12.8	431,500	237,300
1351	Ottawa County (Hudsonville-Georgetown)	1.6	8.6	0	10.2	2	0	0	2	12.1	1,132,000	622,600
1405	Genesee County	3.2	6.8	0	10.0	2	0	0	2	12.0	3,420,000	1,881,000
1312	Perry	4.4	3.4	2	9.8	2	0	0	2	11.8	166,000	91,300
1406	Genesee County (Davison)	.4	9.4	0	9.8	2	0	0	2	11.8	96,000	52,800
1360	Marcellus	8.8	1.2	0	9.6	2	0	0	2	11.6	250,300	137,700
1365	Litchfield	5.2	.2	0	5.4	2	4.0	0	6	11.4	148,200	87,000
1342	Brooklyn	5.0	4.4	0	9.4	2	0	0	2	11.4	150,300	82,600
1307	Essexville	1.8	2.4	0	4.2	4	3.0	0	7	11.2	325,000	168,700
1375	Monroe County (South Rockwood)	.4	4.8	0	5.2	2	4.0	0	6	11.2	116,300	63,900
1326	North Branch	9.0	0	0	9.0	2	0	0	2	11.0	338,400	186,100
1330	Bay City	1.4	5.0	0	6.4	4	0	0	4	10.4	2,565,200	1,410,800
1355	Beulah	4.4	1.8	0	6.2	4	0	0	4	10.2	154,000	84,700
1412	Genesee County (Fenton Township)	3.2	2.8	0	6.0	4	0	0	4	10.0	836,000	459,800
1311	Three Oaks	3.6	0	0	3.6	2	4.0	0	6	9.6	351,600	193,300
1372	Lansing	0	7.6	0	7.6	2	0	0	2	9.6	240,000	132,000
1363	Decatur	5.2	0	2	7.2	2	0	0	2	9.2	323,000	177,600
1410	Genesee County (Fenton)	1.0	5.8	0	6.8	2	0	0	2	8.8	242,000	133,100
1392	Middleville	4.8	1.0	0	5.8	2	0	0	2	7.8	356,300	195,900
1303	St. Charles	3.0	2.0	0	5.0	2	0	0	2	7.0	180,000	99,000
1345	Pigeon	4.6	0	0	4.6	2	0	0	2	6.6	149,000	81,900
1334	Pinckney	4.2	0	0	4.2	2	0	0	2	6.2	106,500	58,500
1402	Genesee County (Mount Morris Township)	.8	1.2	0	2.0	4	0	0	4	6.0	1,613,000	887,100
1322	Richland Township, Saginaw County	3.6	.0	0	3.6	2	0	0	2	5.6	90,000	49,500
1411	Genesee County (Vienna Township)	1.0	.0	0	1.0	4	0	0	4	5.0	1,096,000	602,800
1367	Grand Rapids (Cascade-Grand Rapids Townships)	1.4	1.4	0	2.8	2	0	0	2	4.8	654,000	359,700
1338	Portage	.8	1.6	0	2.4	2	0	0	2	4.0	3,590,000	1,974,500
	Total										133,179,225	(2)

[1] Rounded down to nearest hundred.
[2] See the following table:

Amount required for 55 percent grant, $133,179,225×.55	$73,259,573
Amount of Federal funds available as of June 23, 1969	3,114,356
Amount of State funds required	70,145,217

APPLICANTS ELIGIBLE FOR ADDITIONAL GRANT FUNDS UNDER SEC. 3(1) OF ACT 329, PUBLIC ACTS OF 1966, AS AMENDED

[Key to points for financial and pollution control needs: Col. A—Construction cost per capita; B—Debt per capita; C—Financing dependent upon Federal grant; D—Pollution injury created; E—Orde status; F—Voluntarily advanced project]

Project No.	Applicant	Priority points: Financial need A	B	C	Subtotal	Pollution need D	E	F	Subtotal	Total points	Project cost	55 percent grant [1]
1166	Wayne County (Huron Township, Flat Rock)	3.4	11.0	0	14.4	6.0	4	0	10	24.4	$2,033,230	$1,118,200
1146	Detroit	1.0	9.2	0	10.2	10.0	3	0	13	23.2	4,465,000	2,455,700
1125	Port Huron	7.0	8.6	0	15.0	4.0	0	4	8	23.0	143,731	79,000
1191	Grand Rapids	.6	8.4	0	9.0	10.0	4	0	14	23.0	890,000	489,500
1193	Kent County (Plainfield Township, Rockford)	1.6	4.0	2	7.6	10.0	4	0	14	21.6	2,377,000	1,307,300
1118	Stevensville	11.4	13.8	0	15.0	2.0	4	0	6	21.0	597,000	328,300
1032	Eau Claire	2.6	11.0	0	13.6	2.0	4	0	6	19.6	134,000	73,700
1157	Kalamazoo	0	6.6	0	6.6	8.0	4	0	12	18.6	792,000	435,600
1121	Montcalm Community College	9.0	1.2	0	10.2	4.0	0	4	8	18.2	144,119	79,200
1167	Wayne County (Flat Rock plant)	.8	6.4	0	7.2	6.0	4	0	10	17.2	384,500	211,400
1175	Genesee County (Grand Blanc Township)	2.6	10.6	0	13.2	4.0	0	0	4	17.2	1,376,000	756,800
1012	Webberville	4.8	10.2	2	15.0	2.0	0	0	2	17.0	209,000	114,900
1143	Crystal Falls	4.8	1.4	2	8.2	4.0	4	0	8	16.2	565,800	311,100
1134	Monroe County (Luna Pier)	8.0	0	0	8.0	4.0	4	0	8	16.0	834,400	458,900
1154	Flushing	.4	13.6	0	14.0	2.0	0	0	2	16.0	131,636	72,300
1109	Oakland County (Oakland interceptor)	2.8	4.8	2	9.6	6.0	0	0	6	15.6	25,804,400	14,192,400
1009	St. Clair County (Algonac)	1.6	3.6	2	7.2	4.0	4	0	8	15.2	824,000	453,200
1369	Wright Township, Ottawa County	6.4	0	0	6.4	2.0	0	4	6	14.4	112,500	61,800
1169	Wayne County (Brownstown Township)	2.6	5.6	0	8.2	2.0	0	4	6	14.2	132,500	72,800
1177	Genesee County (Grand Blanc City, Township)	.6	9.4	0	10.0	4.0	0	0	4	14.0	621,000	341,500
1003	Howard City	4.2	1.8	0	6.0	4.0	4	0	8	14.0	112,808	62,000
1103	Forsyth Township, Marquette County	4.6	1.2	0	5.8	4.0	4	0	8	13.8	361,000	198,500
1122	Jonesville	11.2	.4	0	11.6	2.0	0	0	2	13.6	870,000	478,500
1107	Ovid	2.6	2.8	2	7.4	2.0	4	0	6	13.4	156,000	85,800
933	Vernon	6.8	0	2	8.8	1.0	3	0	4	12.8	100,895	55,400
1172	Genesee County (Fenton)	.8	7.6	0	8.4	4.0	0	0	4	12.4	126,150	69,300
1041	Norway	3.0	.8	0	3.8	4.0	4	0	8	11.8	382,500	210,300
1120	Sparta	3.2	3.8	0	7.0	4.0	0	0	4	11.0	429,306	236,100
1010	Kent City	5.0	0	0	5.0	2.0	4	0	6	11.0	94,600	52,000
1161	Sterling Heights	.2	4.6	0	4.8	6.0	0	0	6	10.8	102,004	56,100
1136	Carson City	4.6	1.0	0	5.6	4.0	0	0	4	9.6	183,486	100,900
1038	Potterville	2.8	4.6	0	7.4	2.0	0	0	2	9.4	211,000	116,000
1013	Big Rapids	.8	6.0	0	6.8	2.0	0	0	2	8.8	582,494	320,300
1180	Genesee County (Flint Township)	1.6	4.4	0	6.0	2.0	0	0	2	8.0	111,040	61,000
1016	Adrian	.2	1.0	0	1.2	2.0	4	0	6	7.2	219,200	120,500
1011	Saranac	1.2	0	0	1.2	2.0	4	0	6	7.2	185,856	102,200
1001	Kalkaska	3.8	0	0	3.8	2.0	0	0	2	5.8	145,757	80,100
1047	DeWitt Township, Clinton County	3.0	0	0	3.0	2.0	0	0	2	5.0	1,144,700	629,585
1015	Lakeview	.8	0	0	.8	2.0	0	0	2	2.8	39,300	21,600
	Tekonsha [2]										119,000	65,400
	Macomb County [2]										248,000	136,400
	Total										48,496,912	([3])

[1] Rounded down to nearest hundred.
[2] Subject to receipt of revised application.
[3] See the following table:

Amount required for 55 percent grants, $48,496,912×0.55	$26,673,301
30 percent State and Federal grants presently committed	14,300,029
Additional State funds required	12,373,272

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lincoln, June 11, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: This will acknowledge your letter concerning the funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act.

I am referring your letter to Mr. Ted Filipi in our Environmental Health Office to reply to your letter in detail.

Very truly yours,
NORBERT T. TIEMANN,
Governor.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Jackson, June 25, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Your request regarding the funding of the construction grant program under the Clean Water Restoration Act is appreciated.

The short-funding of the construction grant program has had essentially no effect on the water pollution control and abatement programs in Mississippi up to this time. No programs have been held back, so it has not been necessary for us to take up slack. We have no State program which could be used for such a purpose, since we have felt that a greater number of local governments would benefit without one.

We expect to use substantially all the funds allocated to us for fiscal year 1969 for the first time since the program was initiated in 1956. We also expect to encumber approximately the same amount during fiscal 1970. It is possible that we could use a slight increase, but this is not definite.

I recognize your problems in this area, but our situation is different in this respect.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN B. WILLIAMS,
Governor.

STATE OF NEBRASKA, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COUNCIL,
Lincoln, Nebr., June 16, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Your letter of 6 June 1969 addressed to Governor Tiemann was received and forwarded to me for reply of details. The municipal officials of Nebraska are in need of financial assistance for construction of wastewater treatment plants. Already 50 municipalities have been ordered by the Nebraska Water Pollution Control Council to provide secondary treatment. The City of Omaha has now under way a project that will cost approximately 25 million dollars and Mayor Sorenson informed me that they will be glad to carry on our directive if we can show them how financial arrangements can be made. A similar program faces Lincoln, where-in the wastewater treating plant already giving secondary treatment is inadequate and the plant must be enlarged, both for capacity, and production of a higher quality effluent.

There is now under consideration by the Nebraska Legislature, the proposal of state aid for municipalities. If this bill passes, and if funded it will automatically demand an additional 20% Federal Funds for fulfilling the 55% allotment.

I regret, that at this time I cannot give you specific figures, for all of the projects that are now under consideration. These, if you so desire, can be made available to you in approximately 15 days.

Please be assured that Nebraska needs this financial assistance, and if there is any means that we can use to further the cause, please let us know how we can help.

Yours very truly,
TERRENCE A. O'BRIEN,
(for T. A. Filipi, Executive Secretary).

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Carson City, Nev., July 2, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: Your recent letter requested information on the impact of short funding for construction grants provided under the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Federal funding for water pollution control projects in the past has been adequate to enable participation in all projects, but with the increased awareness of the actual and potential problems by the public and the rapid growth in Nevada's population, funding has not been adequate for the past two years for direct participation in all projects and we have been certifying projects on a reimbursable basis.

Proposed construction for fiscal year 1969 total in excess of $12 million and of which approximately $10.9 million is eligible for 660 funding or for a total of $3.6 million. Nevada's allocation this year is $919,000. If the communities can afford to wait for payment, it would take approximately four years to re-imburse for fiscal year 1970 construc-

tion and five years to repay current re-imbursable and 1970 projects.

Such obligations, of course, will have a serious effect upon applications for projects to be constructed after fiscal year 1970. What the ramifications will be, we are unable to assess at this time, but we anticipate serious delays in necessary projects.

The proposal to repay the federal share over a thirty year period would be valueless to Nevada communities because most of our communities today are at the maximum legal tax rate and have incurred bonded indebtedness which would not permit them to bond for the federal share. The only possible means by which proper water pollution control measures can be implemented is through adequate federal funding to provide for participation in all eligible projects.

The State of Nevada has no statutory or financial provisions to assist political subdivisions in the construction of water pollution control works and since the legislature only meets biannually and recently adjourned, such assistance cannot be provided for at least two years.

If the total authorization of $1 billion dollars was funded for fiscal year 1970 and a similar amount for fiscal year 1971, assuming Nevada would receive a proportionate share of the difference, funding would be available to meet the re-imbursable projects approved to date and to meet the projected needs for fiscal year 1970 and projects being planned for fiscal year 1971.

At that time, if the federal government wished to reassess its program and reduce funding, given sufficient notice, it would be possible to attempt to provide for assistance from the state level.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

PAUL LAXALT,
Governor of Nevada.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
Concord, June 12, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Thank you for your letter of June 6th concerning the funding of the construction grant program under the Clean Water Restoration Act. I offer the following information concerning the effects of the failure to fully provide Federal funding.

At the present time, the State of New Hampshire is receiving approximately 32% of funds authorized under the Clean Water Act for the Fiscal Year 1969–70. We have been informed that our State allocation will be about $1,300,000, while the Act itself authorized $4,100,000 for the same period.

At present, there are no funds left from our 1969 allocation and one project which has been approved for funding (Newport), has received a partial grant for $400,000, leaving about $550,000 which must come from 1970 funds.

Several New Hampshire communities have gone ahead with prefinancing of their projects, hoping to receive Federal grants in the future. These communities are: Merrimack, Durham, Dover, and Laconia. The eligible work is approximately $8 million, which would mean $4 million in Federal grants when the money is available.

In addition, the towns and cities of Concord, Farmington, Franklin, Jaffrey, Lebanon, Newport, Pembroke-Allenstown and Peterborough, are ready to proceed with their work with total eligible costs of about $14 million and no Federal funds available for some time to come.

New Hampshire has always fulfilled its obligation for 40% State Aid on each project and our present Legislature, I am confident, will approve the Commission's request for the next biennium.

There is but one good solid course of action which should be taken and that is for the Federal government to at least appropriate the full amount of money voted under the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

In addition, serious consideration should be given to further implementation of the grants program especially in light of construction costs which are going up at the rate of nearly 10% each year.

Sincerely,

WALTER PETERSON.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Trenton, June 20, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Your letter of 6 June 1969 to Governor Richard J. Hughes has been referred here for response. It relates to new Jersey's capital needs for grants toward construction of sewerage facilities found to be eligible under the Clean Water Restoration Act.

The cost of sewage treatment plants needed in New Jersey in the next five years closely approaches $1 billion. If they are not realized it will be only because of inability of New Jersey municipalities to finance them.

The yellow-backed booklet enclosed is a presentation of Anticipated Capital Needs for Sewerage Facilities in New Jersey as seen in February 1969. In response to these stated needs the New Jersey Legislature has seen fit to put to referendum in November 1969 a bond issue in amount of $271 million, $242 million of which is to provide 25% State Grants to projects which are eligible for Federal grants under U.S. Public Law 660, as amended.

Governor Hughes has indicated that he will sign the referendum bill 2 July 1969.

Enclosed, also, is a copy of statement which I made before the U.S. Senate Sub-Committee on Air and Water Pollution on 11 April 1968 related to S-3206, Water Quality Improvement Act of 1968.

Also enclosed is a copy of my testimony presented last week to the Interstate Abatement Conference on Pollution of the Hudson River called by the Department of the Interior. This statement further expresses our current views concerning State and Federal funding of sewerage construction.

If all of the funds authorized by Federal law for Federal grants in this area were appropriated, New Jersey's share would be about 11% of the estimated capital needs described in the enclosed report. This being the case the promise in the Federal statute of 55% Federal funding is one that cannot be fulfilled in the best of circumstances. If the present rate of actual appropriations continues New Jersey will receive from the Federal government less than 3% of its current capital needs.

In my opinion the effect so far of the Federal grant-in-aid program for sewerage construction has been to slow down progress rather than to hasten it. I am confident that our State's Clean Water Bond Issue will be approved by the voters in the fall. Unless, at the very least, the full authorization of Federal funds is appropriated the badly needed facilities will not be constructed on an acceptable timetable even with the proceeds of our State bond issue.

Almost as important as full appropriation is the retention in the statute of the reimbursability feature, contrary to the suggestion being made by some now that it should be removed. Without reimbursability and with limited federal funds we will find ourselves in the position of ordering municipalities to proceed to construct with the knowledge that if they do they will be foreclosed from ever receiving federal assistance. This is an impossible situation.

We hope that you and your associates will be successful in persuading the Congress to give full support to the water pollution control effort in the form of maximum grant appropriations.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD J. SULLIVAN,
Director, Division of Clean Air and Water.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD J. SULLIVAN

My name is Richard J. Sullivan. I am Director of the Division of Clean Air and Water which, in New Jersey, is the agency responsible for air pollution control, solid waste disposal and water pollution control.

I am glad to have the opportunity to speak to this distinguished forum for a few minutes about S-3206 and its effect on New Jersey's water pollution control efforts.

More than 90% of our state's citizens live in communities served by a sewerage system. This is probably the highest percentage of any state in the nation. Every one of our sewered communities provides treatment of its waste before discharge into the receiving waters. We may be the only state in the nation in which this is true.

In the last twenty years we have spent more than $600 million on the construction of collection and treatment facilities. Less than 3% of this amount was federal aid. None of it was state aid. The 97% was paid by local communities or regional groupings of them.

Despite this effort many of our streams are seriously polluted. The degree of treatment of waste is inadequate. In ours, the most densely populated state in the nation, growth has outdistanced pollution control.

New Jersey is on the threshold of a vast corrective effort to eliminate the pollution of our streams, estuaries, bays, lakes, and coastal waters—pollution which now limits their use and which corrupts our physical environment. In what we believe to be a systematic, orderly, and scientific program, the stage has been set for the construction of large regional waste water treatment facilities.

Water quality standards have been defined and all the waters of the state have been classified after public hearing establishing as a matter of policy our water quality objectives for all waterways. Engineering feasibility studies have been done for most of the area of the state and others in process will shortly be completed. These studies have been arranged for the most part on the initiative of our Department and have been paid for by state funds approaching $2 million. Additionally, the Department has contracted for sophisticated oceanographic studies along the length of our coastline. To achieve our water quality standards waste water treatment regulations have been promulgated for all of the drainage basins of the State. Pursuant to statute we have lent to those responsible for treatment plant construction about $4½ million to defray engineering costs for the work that must precede actual construction.

Our Department has issued more than 200 enforceable, administrative orders directing the construction of the needed collection, distribution and treatment facilities.

We are plainly ready to go.

The key word now for us in New Jersey is not *legislation*. We have all the State law we need to accomplish the required construction. Neither is the key word *enforcement*. Although we will continue to enforce rigorously and conspicuously. Nor is it *planning*. Most of the planning is done and we are ready to build. The key word is not *research*. While the solution to certain pollution problems obviously requires more knowledge we know how to build the treatment plants we need. The key word is *money*. Lots of it.

Our estimate of the cost of facilities now needed to serve the public, to avoid pollution of our waters, to meet water quality standards, and to conform with the treatment

regulations and administrative orders described above is $762 million. This is the cost of trunk lines and treatment facilities eligible for aid. The cost of local collection systems which will be built to accompany these facilities is about 200 million.

These facilities can be constructed over the next five years. For the five years following it is our estimate that $100 million per year will be needed for additional collection, distribution, and treatment works. This means that the price tag on effective water pollution control in New Jersey for the next decade is $1.5 billion, not counting private investment.

(I have attached to this brief statement a report prepared by us on 1 March 1968 describing the anticipated capital needs for pollution control in New Jersey and setting forth in some detail, among other things, the basis upon which we have drawn the estimates I have just given.)

In 1967, New Jersey adopted legislation permitting State government to award construction grants. In the current fiscal year we have appropriated modest funds to match the modest federal funds allocated to us. Presumably, we will do likewise for the fiscal year starting 1 July 1968. At present these funds are so small as to have no measurable impact on our program.

It has in fact always been a curiosity to me that when the statute proposed here to be amended was adopted it permitted a maximum of 55% federal aid for an eligible project. But the full 4-year authorization, if appropriated, would give the State of New Jersey only 14% of the total eligible cost. The separation between the 14% and the 55% is so unrealistic as to have the negative effect of creating expectations which it is not possible to meet. The circumstances have been made even more difficult because of the fact that grant appropriations made last year, and proposed for this, amount to less than 5% instead of 14.

If the $1.5 billion is spent in New Jersey it surely will not solve our water pollution problem. Other things must be done and obviously the effort must continue beyond the next 10 years as we continue to grow. But the construction of the regional treatment facilities that this money will buy will permit most of our streams to achieve the water quality standards we have set for them—standards which were recently approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

In any case it is absolutely certain that if these regional treatment facilities are not soon constructed our bad pollution problem will get worse. Some of our waterways will be dead but not buried.

For these reasons we strongly support and urge the adoption of Senate Bill 3206. In our judgment the bill is an ingenious, practical device to get things moving as originally planned without the necessity at this difficult moment of appropriating the full amount of the required capital aid funds.

While we strongly endorse this legislation we are not fully in accord with every provision of it. I would now like to comment on several specific provisions.

1. We strongly favor the requirement that aid be limited to facilities which will serve populations in excess of 125,000, except where this is impracticable. The entire corrective program in New Jersey contemplates the construction of large regional facilities serving drainage basins rather than continuing the proliferation of treatment plants serving individual municipalities. We already have the authority to disapprove any proposed construction which is not adequately regional; this authority was recently upheld in a court challenge.

2. We likewise favor the requirement that a system of charges imposed upon users pay for the amortization of the original investment and the cost of operation and maintenance. Such a system in our judgment is most equitable.

3. We also favor the operator certification program imposed as a conditional requirement to the receipt of grants. For fifty years, New Jersey law has required that treatment plants be operated only by persons licensed by our Department, after examination.

4. We find that the bill contains no formula for the allocation of contract funds to the respective states. Such a formula, of course, does apply to grant funds. We think this is a deficiency. An allocation formula should be included for all funds. First, in the interest of planning it would be most helpful to have at least an estimate of the amount of construction that can be funded with federal aid either by grants or under the contract provision. Second, we do not welcome the prospect of projects in different states competing with one another for the approval of the Secretary. The formula allocation would be more equitable. Third, presumably it will be necessary for the state to fund 25% of the cost of a project in order to entitle it to the maximum federal aid. Without a formula allocation we cannot know our share in sufficient time to arrange for state appropriation of the funds needed for matching purposes.

5. We find *very* disagreeable the termination of the existing reimbursability provision on projects initiated after 1 July 1968.

Elected local officials responsible for the construction of public works are under great pressure to exhaust all possibilities of state and federal aid before imposing burdensome taxes upon their constituents. Such an official who moves too early or too late or without diligence may find himself unemployed next time around. The federal aid program recently has been filled with uncertainty. I cannot emphasize too strongly that the amount of the aid is less important than the certainty of its availability. We do not need 80% federal and state funding to make this program move. It would probably move just as fast with 50% non-local funding, if the money were on hand. And in any case, 25% for sure is better than 50% maybe. The technique of reimbursability takes the local official off the hook. If he qualifies his project *now* for whatever aid may be appropriated later he is sure—and the voters are sure—that he has done all possible to ease the burden upon them. If this bill is adopted and New Jersey gets its full share of federal assistance next year this share will be but a fragment of the money we must spend next year if the construction is to proceed on schedule. Without reimbursability all those who would not get any of the limited funds next year will be asked to proceed with construction with the knowledge that if they do they will never get any aid. Our ambitious program may be standing around with its hands in its pockets waiting for better days ahead.

Furthermore, several weeks ago the State Commissioner of Health and I testified before Governor Richard J. Hughes Special Commission to Evaluate the Capital Needs of New Jersey. In our testimony we recommended that the State establish a $400 million capital fund to defray half the cost of trunk lines and treatment plants now needed. We advised that half of this amount would be the states 25% share of the cost and the other half was likely to be reimbursed in time by the Federal government under the pre-financing provisions of existing law. If S-3206 is adopted that testimony will prove to have been very bad advice.

In summary, New Jersey has a carefully constructed program for the elimination of the pollution of its waterways. We are ready to build the needed treatment plants and associated facilities. The key word is money. For our program to be complete we must spend in the next five years more capital funds than we have spent in the last fifty years. Federal and state assistance to local government is necessary to make this happen. The bill before you would in effect increase the amount of available federal aid and should be adopted. We recommend that it be altered to provide for an allocation formula for the states and to keep in place the reimbursability provisions of existing law.

ANTICIPATED CAPITAL NEEDS FOR SEWERAGE FACILITIES IN NEW JERSEY

New Jersey State Department of Health, Division of Clean Air and Water: Roscoe P. Kandle, M.D., State Commissioner of Health; Richard J. Sullivan, director, Division of Clean Air and Water.

A. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Water pollution

To say that New Jersey has a serious water pollution problem is to state the obvious. We state it nevertheless.

It is not a problem caused by a small number of indifferent polluters. It is the result of the growth of our communities having greatly outdistanced our pollution control efforts. Seven hundred fifty treatment plants put more than one billion gallons per day of inadequately treated sanitary and industrial wastes into our waterways. *This* is the essence of the problem. It is augmented by agricultural run-off, animal wastes, the use of insecticides, storm water run-off and transitory dumping, or pollution episodes.

As a consequence many of our bayshore beaches and the bays themselves have been lost to recreational uses, including inland waters bordering communities along the southern shore whose whole economy is water-oriented.

A number of our rivers, including the Passaic and the Raritan, are the receiving waters for inadequately treated wastes but must serve as well as the sources of public drinking water supplies.

Several of our largest lakes, whose entire development has been based upon the use of the water for recreational purposes, are now threatened with pollution.

Seventy-nine thousand nine hundred fifteen acres of bay waters in the Raritan basin and along our southern coast have been closed to the harvesting of shellfish because the water has become so highly contaminated.

The use of private septic systems in some areas of our state where sewers are not available not only causes pollution of the ground and of nearby streams but contaminates wells which would otherwise be usable for drinking water supplies.

The continued disposition of partially treated wastes just off shore on our north Atlantic coast, if permitted to go uncorrected, may threaten the use of the surf waters themselves.

Industry which considers locating in New Jersey is surely influenced by the quality of our environment. For a so-called "wet" industry the quality of water available for use is often a crucial factor in deciding upon a new location.

In several places in our state in cases referred to below the courts have ordered that growth stop until adequate waste disposal facilities can be made available.

All of our major and most of our minor waterways now fail to meet the water quality standards established for them.

Remedies

In any discussion of water pollution control in New Jersey the three key words are *enforcement, regionalization* and *costs*—in reverse order of importance.

Enforcement

The Division of Clean Air and Water of the State Department of Health is the agency in the state which has primary enforcement responsibility for water pollution control. We are committed to an unremitting enforcement program. The years of 1967 and 1968 have seen more enforcement activity than in any period in memory.

Water quality standards were defined with the aid and advice of the Division of Fish and Game and promulgated as our defini-

tions of water quality objectives. After public hearing, all of the streams, rivers, bays, estuaries, and coastal waters of the state have been classified as to the water quality to be achieved. This means that the degree of water purity has been established for each waterway as an enforceable objective.

To cause these objectives to be met the state further promulgated regulations establishing the required degree of treatment of all waste entering any of these waterways. To achieve compliance with these regulations the Division has issued 236 administrative orders. These orders incorporate timetables for compliance. The recipients, which for the most part include municipalities, authorities and industries, are subject to the sanctions provided by statute if they fail to perform the necessary work in accordance with the schedule set forth.

In a series of recent court cases the state has demonstrated its willingness to litigate where its requirements are violated. In addition to Superior Court injunctions directing compliance with our orders the Division last year sought and obtained an unprecedented remedy. The state requested the court to order nine communities in Morris County to cease the issuance of building permits until adequate provisions can be made for the disposal of liquid waste. The same remedy was applied in the High Ridge Sewer Company case, in Washington Township in Gloucester County, and in the City of Bridgeton.

The Water Policy and Supply Council has augmented our enforcement policy by refusing to issue permits for water diversion unless the applicant can show that the ultimate disposition of the wastes generated will be in accordance with Health Department requirements.

Because the compliance schedules contained in extent administrative orders are not being met in many cases, in 1969 we expect to initiate a greater number of court actions.

While rigorous enforcement is surely necessary to the effective administration of the statutes, to press those who are reluctant to move, and to deal with individual pollution problems it is not an adequate response to the problem. However unrelenting the enforcement it cannot by itself cause the state's needs to be met.

Regionalization

For many years in New Jersey the tradition was upheld that no community is complete without its own sewage treatment plant. Because sewage disposal was provided as needed as any other municipal service, treatment plants in New Jersey proliferated. There are now about 750 sewage treatment plants in this state. The proliferation is graphically shown by the map of our state presented as Plate No. 1.

By statute treatment plants cannot be constructed unless permits for them are approved by the State Department of Health. Until 1966 however the Department had no statutory authority to disapprove a treatment plant because it was non-regional. In 1966 the Legislature established as public policy the need to require the construction of sewage disposal facilities on the basis of drainage basins rather than municipal boundaries. Even in the absence of that statute several large regional facilities had already been constructed, such as the facility of the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners, the Bergen County Sewer Authority, and the Middlesex County Sewerage Authority. In those cases logic prevailed over custom, in the absence of statutory requirements for regionalization. For most of the State, however, this has not been the case.

All of the administrative orders issued to local government require that the construction of new facilities be in accordance with developed plans for regionalization. The Department's power to prohibit non-regional facilities was upheld in 1968 in a court challenge by a municipality.

In order to develop the engineering plans for regional treatment facilities the Legislature in 1966 authorized the State Health Department to make grants to cover the cost of engineering feasibility studies. At a cost of $1.766 million the Department has funded such feasibility studies for almost all of the state's drainage basins. These studies are referred to in Table 4. There is still considerable reluctance in some parts of the state to accept regionalization. The advantages, however, are quite apparent: (a) as a rule, the larger the treatment facility the less the cost of construction and operation per capita, (b) more efficient and capable plant operation is attainable in large facilities. Such plants are able to hire qualified supervisory and operating personnel as well as to provide adequate laboratory controls. Many small plants are now operating without these necessities, (c) in order to meet the needs of growing New Jersey greater water re-use will be employed. This will require highly sophisticated treatment which cannot be accomplished with anything less than the most capable maintenance and operation; (d) many of the existing treatment plants are focal points of local blight. Many of these were conditionally approved when they were built as interim facilities which must be abandoned when a regional system is within reach, (e) there is much more flexibility and stability in the operation of a large plant. This makes the plant able to absorb sudden changes in the characteristics of the wastes being treated. This capability is most necessary in the handling of wastes derived from a wide variety of industrial processes.

The map on Plate 2 shows the location of proposed regional treatment facilities in accordance with the plans developed by feasibility studies. A glance also at Plate 1 will show the extent to which the proposed regionalization will reduce the number of small plants now operating.

Costs

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act (P.L. 84–660) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make grants to any authorized agency to assist in the construction of interceptor sewers, wastewater treatment plants and outfall sewers. The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 (P.L. 89–753) amended the basic act by increasing the amount of Federal Grants if the states participate in the grant program.

The New Jersey State Legislature enacted the "State Public Sanitary Sewerage Facilities Assistance Act of 1965" which authorized State participation under the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 and appropriated State funds to assist in the construction of wastewater treatment disposal facilities. This legislation authorized the State Department of Health to award grants not to exceed 30% of the construction cost of water pollution control projects which qualify for Federal aid assistance under the "Federal Water Pollution Control Act."

The State legislature appropriated a total of $5,798,200 for Fiscal Years 1968 and 1969 for State Construction Grants. These funds were apportioned in accordance with priorities established by the Department of Health to projects eligible for Federal aid. Ten projects were funded at a rate of 9.2% of the eligible construction cost from Fiscal Year 1968 funds and it is anticipated that ten projects will be funded at a rate of approximately 11% from Fiscal Year 1969 funds. (See Tables 1 and 2.)

Under the terms of the federal statute local government is eligible for 30% of the cost of construction of sewage treatment plants and trunk lines. This eligibility can be increased to 55% if the state provides the legal authority and the money to fund 25% of the cost of all such projects.

The state does have such legal authority in the 1965 Act listed above. In fact, however, neither the state nor the federal government has appropriated funds in amounts representing more than a tiny fragment of the needs.

The four-year authorization contained in the federal funding statute would, in accordance with statutory formula, provide New Jersey a total of about $109 million in aid or 12% of the costs described below. However, if the funds *appropriated* continue for the next two years at the level of the last two years federal aid will amount to less than 3% of the total needs described below.

To date federal and state aid funds that have actually been appropriated have been in such small amount as to have no measurable impact on the pollution control program.

In last year's statement of capital needs and again in this discussion the Department has made as careful an assessment as the facts would allow of the capital costs of constructing regional sewage treatment plants and trunk lines needed to serve the public, to correct pollution of our waterways, and to conform with the treatment regulations and administrative orders described above. Last year's estimates were presented in testimony before the Governor's Commission to Evaluate the Capital Needs of New Jersey. These estimates have now been updated.

The total estimated costs of all facilities now needed is $906,000,000. The cutoff date in this estimate is 1 July 1697. Any project for which construction was begun prior to that date is not included. This total therefore includes approximately $53 million of eligible facilities which were partially funded by state grants in fiscal 1968 and 1969, almost all of which are now under construction. These projects are presented on Tables 1 and 2. It also includes an additional $50 million of projects for which engineering plans are completed and approved by the Department and which have already been certified as eligible for federal and state aid.

The main list of needed facilities with a total cost of $803 million is presented as Table 4. These projects have not advanced to construction plans; most have not even begun the engineering work which must precede construction.

The $906 million total is the estimated cost of treatment plants, trunk lines and outfalls now needed in New Jersey and which are eligible under law for federal and state construction grants. The total does *not* include the cost of upgrading the treatment plant and conveyance systems of the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners. No information of any kind is available to us as to the cost of that project. The Commissioners contend that separate legislation must be enacted to give them authority to raise construction funds. It should be noted, however, that the treatment plant in question is the largest in the state; it is under administrative order to meet existing requirements, and has been taken to court by the Department for its failure to do so. That case is still pending. It is our *guess* that the cost of bringing these facilities into conformity with state law and Department requirements is in excess of $100 million.

The total estimate in our 1968 statement of anticipated needs was $762 million. Several comments should be made as to the reason for the increase of this number to the present estimate of $906 million: (1) it is a year later and the list of needs is commensurately longer. The starting point in time is the same for last year's estimate, i.e. 1 July 1967. This date was selected because any project for which construction commences after that date which receives 25% state aid is eligible for the maximum 55% federal aid. Projects starting construction before that date are eligible for a maximum of 33% federal aid no matter whether the state participates or

not; (2) projects have been added, such as sludge digesters for Middlesex County, and the bayshore outfall for Monmouth County which were not contemplated a year ago (3) the estimates in this report are a refinement of those presented last year. The refinement has been made possible by the completion of feasibility studies in the interim. The basis upon which all estimates are made in this report is set forth in Section C(4) construction costs have risen at a remarkable rate so as to make some of last year's estimates obsolete. If the rise continues this year's estimate will prove conservative in the light of next year's construction costs. All estimates presented are in 1968 dollars.

As noted above the $906 million is the assessment of the cost of eligible facilities. It will be necessary to accompany the construction of these eligible facilities with the construction of an estimated $225 million of sewage collection systems which are not eligible for federal and state aid (there is some eligibility for limited federal aid for such collection systems from the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development and other federal agencies. There is no eligibility for aid from the principal funding agency: The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, Department of the Interior.)

In our judgment it is wholly unrealistic to expect local government with the little federal aid now available to bear the enormous cost of constructing sewage facilities now needed.

To do so would place an unconscionable additional burden upon the property owner in the form of additional property taxes or use charges. Furthermore, in the concept of regionalization discussed above an area-wide problem is solved on an area basis. In many cases this means the construction of expensive trunk lines with sufficient capacity to serve upstream users when the need arises. It is unreasonable to expect those who now will use the system to pay all by themselves for a waste disposal facility that will accommodate growth and development that has not yet arrived. The question, it seems to us, revolves around the proper distribution of the costs among local, state and federal government.

While the federal aid appropriations have been very small to date interest in water pollution control is high in the Congress and we have good reason to believe that the federal aid program will be extended beyond the current law's expiration date, 30 June 1971.

If the state funds all projects at a level not less than 25% it will assure its local government of maximum eligibility for federal funding now and in the future.

Furthermore, soon to be introduced in the Congress is a revised version of last year's S. 3206 which passed both Houses with some differences that could not be resolved in the short time remaining at the end of the session. This bill would augment federal grants with mortgage contracts between the federal government and local entities which construct eligible sewerage facilities. The form of the contract would be a guarantee that the federal government would pay a share of the amortization cost over a period not to exceed thirty years. This contract arrangement is designed to make up the difference between cash appropriations and the federal law's authorizations in the alternative form of long-term payments of principal and interest.

It is our understanding through discussion with federal officials that this year's bill will call for the disposition of all such mortgage funds to the states in accordance with the following formula: 50% of all the money to states on the basis of population; the other 50% would be distributed *only* to those states that have the legal authority *and the money* to fund at least 25% of the costs of all eligible sewerage construction. New Jersey has the law but it does not have the money. If such a bill is enacted considerable sums of money will be lost to New Jersey if it does not provide funds of its own to underwrite at least 25% of eligible construction costs.

Under present New Jersey law the Department is authorized to lend to those responsible for the construction of sewerage facilities money to pay the costs of the engineering work which must precede construction. As a rule of thumb the cost of this engineering work is about 5–6% of the total cost of the project. The money is lent for three years without interest. If the loan extends beyond three years interest is charged at the rate of 2% per annum for the entire period of the loan. To date we have lent approximately $5.3 million.

If the state moves ahead with a construction program of the proportion needed, additional engineering loan appropriations must be made. Considering the likely timetable of construction, the amount of money involved and the likely rate of pay-back into the revolving fund it is our estimate that a $20 million fund should suffice. The estimate is very difficult to make because of uncertainty as to the schedule of pay-back and because of uncertainty as to how many of those responsible for the projects will actually make application for such loans. The $20 million figure is therefore an imprecise estimate.

It is not known what the source of these funds can be, whether through direct appropriation from the general treasury or by some other means. If the State were to provide capital funds for construction grants the *possibility* could be considered of using the established capital fund as a source of either loans or advance grants for engineering costs. An impediment to the advanced grant concept is that it would require the initiation of a grant before the project has moved well enough along to qualify for a grant under present requirements.

Varying capital funding alternatives are available for consideration involving varying degrees of participation by the three levels of government. The alternatives as we see them are presented in Table 5, discussed in Table 6, and the costs to the state of each are summarized in Table 8.

Our recommendation concerning state funding is on the following page.

B. RECOMMENDATION

Almost as important as the amount of non-local aid for sewerage construction is the certainty of its availability. Elected and appointed local officials responsible for the construction of sewers and treatment plants are under great pressure to exhaust all possibilities of state and federal aid before imposing burdensome taxes or charges upon their constituents. Such an official who moves too early or too late, or without diligence, may find himself unemployed next time around. The current federal aid program since its inception has been filled with uncertainty. Unless we can somehow assure local government of a fixed amount of aid, and eligibility for additional aid should it become available later from the federal government, our ambitious program may continue to stand around with its hands in its pockets waiting for better days ahead.

Last year in our appearance before the Government's Commission to Evaluate the Capital Needs of New Jersey, State Health Commissioner Roscoe P. Kandle and I recommended that the state finance 50% of the cost of eligible and necessary sewage disposal facilities. Under our recommendation half of this 50% would be the state's share of the construction cost, the other half would be money with which the state would prefinance hoped-for federal assistance. To the extent to which the federal government thereafter provided aid that money would reimburse the state's general treasury. In this manner local government would proceed to construct with the assurance that at least 50% aid would be available from the state, or the state and federal government in combination.

This remains our recommendation. It is presented as alternative funding plan number 5 in Table 5. The cost to the state would be about $435 million less whatever federal grants may be appropriated.

If the judgment is made that however logical and equitable the 50% aid program may be, the amount of state funds required is simply too large to be supportable we would offer an alternative recommendation. The best alternative in our judgment is presented as number 4 in Table 5. This plan calls for 25% state aid. This was the recommendation made to the Governor by his Capital Needs Commission last year and in turn made by the Governor to the Legislature. This is the least percentage of state aid which can be afforded local government and still assure it of maximum eligibility for federal grants.

Under this proposal all eligible projects would get 25% state aid; eligible projects would receive 30% federal aid as far as appropriations would permit. Local government would provide 45% of the cost and receive from the Federal government an unsigned I.O.U. for 25% additional aid when and if federal appropriations will allow.

Under this funding plan the cost to the state would be about $222 million. If even this amount is considered to be too high we would ask: Which of the projects on the attached list of needs should be scratched or deferred indefinitely? Which of these projects will we expect to proceed to construction without *any* state aid, and with reduced eligibility for federal aid?

What would happen if, for example, the Legislature decided to provide $100 million for state sewerage aid? In our opinion within eighteen months this total amount would fully be committed to projects with the greatest readiness to move ahead. It would not be spent in that period but it would be committed. There would be no aid funds for almost two-thirds of the facilities now needed. As a result those projects would not even move to do the *engineering planning* for construction with no prospect of aid. Eighteen months after a referendum the Legislature would be back again faced with the same question that it faces today.

In our judgment all of these needed facilities will be built sooner or later. If it is later they will cost appreciably more and we will suffer the effects of their absence in the meantime.

If we are willing to make this substantial commitment of our financial resources, New Jersey's waterways can be made clean. If we are not willing they will continue to become more polluted; and all the legislation, enforcement, planning, research, and handwringing lamentations on the desecration of our environment, won't make any difference.

C. VALIDITY OF COST ESTIMATES

The estimates provided in this statement were derived from one of the following sources. (1) comprehensive regional sewerage feasibility studies conducted by consulting engineering firms and financed by the State Department of Health; (2) engineering studies conducted by private or municipal engineers; and (3) engineering estimates by private or municipal engineers based upon final and detailed engineering plans. These estimates are based on 1968 dollars and no attempt was made to adjust the cost for normal inflation, or inflation of construction cost because of competition for services. When developing these estimates the Department did not consider such factors as the ability to pay or the time required to design and construct these facilities. The list represents the best estimates available of the current costs of all facilities now needed.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration's waste-water treatment plant

construction cost index (Plate 3) for the New York area is made a part of this statement. It should be noted that the average construction cost index has risen sharply during the past year and particularly during the last six months. There is no way of predicting the exact effect this continuing rise will have on the estimates presented in this statement. We can say that the costs will in fact be much higher than these estimates based on our best engineering judgment at this point in time and that the longer construction is postponed the higher the cost will be.

D. BASIS OF COST ESTIMATES

Atlantic County: The cost estimates for Atlantic County were established by a regional sewerage feasibility study financed by the State Department of Health. The study report was completed in April 1968 and was accepted by the Department for payment on October 9, 1968. The cost figures presented in the March 1, 1968 statement on "Anticipated Capital Needs" were based on preliminary estimates before the sewerage feasibility study was completed. Much of the construction of sewerage facilities is necessary to comply with orders issued by the Department.

Bergen County: The cost estimates for Bergen County were established by engineering studies completed by consulting engineers for the Bergen County Sewer Authority, Northwest Bergen County Sewer Authority and the Borough of Edgewater.

A portion of the construction estimate presented in the 1968 "Anticipated Capital Needs" statement for the Bergen County Sewer Authority appears in Tables 1 and 2. The remainder of the estimate has been revised in accordance with completed engineering studies.

Additional costs for the Northwest Bergen County Sewer Authority appears on Table 1.

The Borough of Edgewater has been ordered by the Department to upgrade the wastewater treatment process to meet the State water quality standards. The estimate for the Borough of Edgewater is identified as an individual project because at this time a more accurate determination can be made of the cost of needed facilities. In the 1968 statement this project was included in the estimate for unlisted projects.

Burlington County: The Burlington County estimate of the cost of providing needed sewerage facilities was developed as part of a regional sewerage feasibility study financed by the Department which is presently in the final stage of completion.

No estimate was identified for Burlington County in the 1968 statement because it was impossible at that time to evaluate the needs and arrive at even a preliminary estimate because of the lack of necessary information. The anticipated needs for Burlington County were included in the broad estimate for unlisted projects.

Camden County: The cost estimates for Camden County were established by a regional feasibility study financed by the Department and reflects the cost of the sewerage facilities to serve the immediate needs of the county as outlined in the study report. A large proportion of the required construction is necessary to comply with orders issued by the Department. Date of Report: December 1967.

Cape May County: A regional sewerage feasibility study financed by the Department for Cape May County is presently nearing completion. Enough information is available at this time to establish a firm estimate of the cost of needed sewerage facilities. This information was not available when the 1968 statement was prepared. The comprehensive study revealed a much greater need for sewerage facilities in Cape May County than was previously estimated due to the need to protect public health, the extensive recreational and shellfish harvesting areas and the need to comply with Departmental Orders.

Essex County: Almost all of the construction of sewerage facilities needed in Essex County will fall under the jurisdiction of the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners which will be covered separately in this statement. However some construction is required in the Township of Cedar Grove and the Borough of Fairfield. These estimates are identified separately whereas they were lumped in the estimate for unlisted projects in last year's statement.

Gloucester County: The cost estimates presented for Gloucester County are based upon a regional sewerage feasibility study financed by the Department and reflect the cost of those facilities which the Department believes are necessary at this time. Date of report: July 1967.

Hudson County: The Hudson County estimates are broken down into several specific projects, some of which appeared in the 1968 statement. Since that time more definitive engineering estimates and studies have been made. The estimate for the City of Hoboken in last year's statement anticipated some construction which was later determined to be ineligible for federal and state grant participation. Therefore this estimate has been revised downward to reflect this change.

Projects for North Bergen Township, West New York and the City of Bayonne have been more clearly defined and these projects are listed as individual items in this statement. These projects were included in the estimate of unlisted projects in the 1968 statement.

Hunterdon County: Engineering studies have been completed by engineers for the Raritan Township Municipal Utilities Authority which established the cost of regional facilities to serve Raritan Township and the Borough of Flemington. A regional feasibility study is presently being financed by the Department for the remainder of Hunterdon County. No costs are included here for the region under study.

Mercer County: The estimate for Mercer County comprises an updating of the East Windsor Municipal Utilities Authority estimate and the inclusion of the Ewing-Lawrence Sewerage Authority and Hamilton Township. These projects were included in last year's estimate for unlisted projects. However, studies have been completed to develop cost estimates since the preparation of the 1968 statement. Also included in the estimate for Mercer County is an expanded Stony Brook-Millstone River region which more than doubled the previous estimate for this region.

Middlesex County: The cost estimate for the Middlesex County Sewerage Authority has been updated based on engineering estimates and includes sludge digestion facilities which will be required because of a recent decision of the federal government. The remainder of the estimate for Middlesex County is based upon recently completed engineering studies and estimates and are now listed as individual projects. The latter were included in the estimate for unlisted projects in the 1968 estimate.

Monmouth County: The cost estimates for the Northeast Monmouth County Regional Sewerage Authority and the Middletown Township Sewerage Authority are listed on Tables 2 and 3 and do not appear on the comprehensive list. The Ocean Township Sewerage Authority project is not listed this year since the project was started before July 1, 1967 and is not eligible for further federal grant participation. The remainder of the Monmouth County estimate is based upon feasibility studies and engineering estimates that have been completed for the specific projects. The Bayshore Sewerage Authority project is now included in the listing.

Morris County: The Morris County comprehensive regional sewerage feasibility study financed by the Department was just completed in January 1969. This study provided the basis for establishing reliable cost estimates for needed sewerage facilities in Morris County.

The present estimate is significantly higher than that presented in the 1968 statement. The major portion of this increase has been caused by developments in the Rockaway valley involving the regional facilities operated by the City of Jersey City.

Ocean County: The cost estimates for Ocean County are based upon a regional sewerage feasibility study financed by the Department and completed in December 1967. The report reflects the cost of those facilities which the Department feels are necessary at this time and to comply with Departmental Orders.

Passaic County: The southern portion of Passaic County is served by the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners facilities. Cost estimates for needed construction for this area are not available. The "Comprehensive Report on Sewerage Facilities" for the Wanaque Valley Regional Sewerage Study Committee was completed in April 1968 and was not available when the cost estimate was developed for the 1968 statement. The estimate presented in this statement more realistically covers the needs of this area.

A regional sewerage feasibility study has recently been initiated to study the needs for the remaining portion (Mid-Passaic Basin) of Passaic County. This study is being financed by the Department and has progressed to the point where only a preliminary estimate has been developed.

Salem County: The estimates for Salem County have been developed by engineering studies performed for Penns Grove, Pennsville, and Upper Penns Neck.

Somerset County: The estimates for Somerset County were derived from engineering estimates developed by consulting engineering firms retained by the municipalities shown on the list.

Sussex County: The estimate for Sussex County includes an updating of the estimate for the Wallkill Valley Region. Just after the submission of the 1968 statement, the Sussex County regional sewerage feasibility study was completed and was used as the basis for the estimates for the remainder of Sussex County. This study was sponsored and paid for by the Department of Health.

Union County: The estimates for Union County were derived from engineering studies and engineering estimates by consulting engineering firms employed by the sewerage authorities. The estimate for the Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority appears on Table 3.

Warren County: The cost estimates for Warren County were developed by a regional sewerage feasibility study financed by the Department and completed in March 1968.

Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners: At the time the 1968 statement was prepared it was impossible to develop an estimate with any validity for the cost of constructing needed facilities in the commissioners district.

In March 1967 the State Department of Health issued an order to the Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners which contained work performance schedules and included a requirement to complete studies and preliminary engineering by a specified date. The Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners failed to meet these schedules and were taken to court by the Department. In this action the Department's jurisdiction was contested. The court decision was favorable to the Department and the Commissioners filed an appeal in the Appellate Division of Superior Court. The cast is pending.

It is still impossible to present a reliable estimate for these construction needs. Our *guess* is that the cost will be in excess of $100 million.

E. EXPLANATION OF TABLES

Table 1

Table 1 is a listing of eligible projects that were certified for federal grants and were not under construction by June 30, 1967. These projects became eligible to participate in the State Construction Grant program which was initiated for fiscal year 1968.

There was sufficient funds in the State Construction Grant account to award grants of only 9.2% of the eligible construction cost instead of grants "not exceeding 30%" allowable under the "State Public Sanitary Sewerage Facilities Assistance Act of 1965" as amended February 1967. It will require additional funds of $4,334,576 to raise these grants up to 25% as was originally intended.

Table 2

Table 2 is a listing of eligible projects which have been certified for federal grants and which can be funded during the present fiscal year. The eligible cost figures for these projects are not firm at this time since the federal authorities have not completed the review of all the listed projects. It was very likely that some of these figures will change. However, based on the stated figures there are sufficient state funds available to award state construction grants amounting to approximately 11% of the eligible cost. Additional funds amounting to $3,557,637 will be required to raise these grants to 25% of the eligible construction costs.

Table 3

Table 3 is a listing of all projects which have been certified for federal grants under the reimbursable provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended by the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. Funds have not been obligated to any of these projects and the eligible cost figures are engineering estimates based upon final detailed engineering plans. It will require funds amounting to approximately $12,700,000 to provide state grants of 25% of the eligible construction costs. It is very likely the eligible costs of these projects will increase when construction bids are received.

In summary the amount of money needed to provide 25% grants to all the projects listed on Table 3 and to raise the grants of those projects listed on Tables 1 and 2 to 25% will require approximately $20,555,000.

Table 4

This Table sets forth estimates of costs of eligible needed facilities not including those listed in Tables 1–3.

Financing Alternatives

Table 5

There are several alternatives for providing the funds needed for construction of needed waste treatment and disposal facilities: (1) financing 33% by the federal government and 67% by the local agency with non-participation by the state; (2) if the state provides 30% of the project funds, the federal government can provide 44% leaving the local agency to raise 26% of the project funds; (3) if the state provides 25% of the eligible construction cost, the federal government can contribute 55% leaving the local agencies to raise 20%; (4) if the state provides 25% grants and prefinances an additional 25% for federal government's share leaving 30% to be financed by federal grants and 20% from the local agency; and (5) if the state contributes 25% construction grants and if all applicants agree to accept 30% federal grants (instead of the 55% for which they would be eligible) then this will leave 45% of the construction cost to be raised by the local agencies.

The allocation to each state of federal construction grant funds is based on a fixed statutory formula and not based on the total needs of the state. (See Table 6.) However, even if the federal government provides New Jersey with its full allocation of funds and with state participation it will be impossible to generate enough construction activity to meet New Jersey's needs for sewerage facilities. It is therefore necessary for the State to fund sewerage projects independently of federal grants or prefinance a portion of the federal government's share of construction grants with the possibility of being reimbursed by the federal government in future years.

Financial Summary

It is obvious from Table 5 that without state participation it will be totally impossible for local agencies to raise the money necessary to provide the needed sewerage facilities even with federal participation. Either of alternates 2 and 3 would be feasible providing the federal government appropriates sufficient funds. However this is doubtful when a review is made of Table 7. There is no way of predicting at this time just how much federal grant money will be available in future years. If the present trend continues the federal government will appropriate only a small percentage of the authorized funds.

Alternates 3, 4 and 5 appear to be the only logical alternatives at this time. It may be possible to modify alternative 4 to fit the actual financial situations by prefinancing smaller federal grants thus allowing greater coverage with the federal money and requiring a larger contribution from the local agency. Under the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended an applicant receiving a 25% state construction grant is automatically eligible to receive a 55% federal construction grant providing the state has water quality standards approved by the federal government and the proposed facilities are of a regional nature. These two requirements are met in New Jersey.

Under alternative 5 it will be necessary for the local agency to express its acceptance of a 30% federal construction grant and accept eligibility for the additional 25% which it may receive in the future if Federal appropriations are sufficient. This arrangement would permit spreading the limited Federal funds over a larger number of projects.

Table 6

This Table summarizes state funds needed for construction of sewerage facilities eligible for financial aid for alternative funding plans.

Table 7

This Table sets forth the New Jersey share of authorized and appropriated Federal funds.

Table 8

This Table summarizes all cost estimates.

TABLE 1.—SEWERAGE PROJECTS RECEIVING STATE CONSTRUCTION GRANTS FROM 1968 FISCAL YEAR FUNDS

	Eligible construction cost	Amount of State grant [1]
Borough of Allentown	$339,100	$31,200
City of Plainfield	586,400	53,948
Township of Warren	482,200	44,362
Borough of Hillsdale	620,300	57,067
Town of Clinton	881,500	81,098
Middlesex County Sewerage Authority	5,458,400	502,172
Township of Hamilton	4,132,000	380,144
Borough of Fair Lawn	1,583,200	145,654
Borough of Caldwell	471,400	43,368
Northwest Bergen County Sewer Authority	12,660,000	1,130,036
Total	27,214,500	[2] 2,469,049
Total eligible cost	27,214,500	
25 percent of eligible cost	6,803,625	
Amount of State grants [2]	2,469,049	
Additional State money needed to raise grants to 25 percent	4,334,576	

[1] Grants amount to 9.2 percent of the eligible construction cost.

[2] This figure does not include a grant of $427,758 to the Netcong-Musconetcong Sewerage Authority.

TABLE 2.—SEWERAGE PROJECTS DUE TO RECEI VE STATE CONSTRUCTION GRANTS FROM FISCAL 1969 FUNDS

	Eligible construction cost	Amount o State grant [1]
Bergen County Sewer Authority	$3,039,000	$341,188
Montville Township Municipal Utilities Authority	1,327,000	148,982
Bridgewater Township Sewerage Authority	1,934,000	217,130
Township of Roxbury	1,391,000	156,167
Town of Phillipburg	47,500	5,333
Ewing-Lawrence Sewerage Authority	426,000	47,827
Madison-Chatham joint meeting	2,450,000	2 75,061
East Windsor Township Municiapl Utilities Authority	249,000	27,955
Pompton Lakes Municipal Utilities Authority	475,000	53,328
Northeast Monmouth County Regional Sewerage Authority	14,492,000	1,627,017
Total	25,830,500	2,899,988
Total eligible cost	25,830,500	
25 percent of eligible cost	6,457,625	
State funds to be obligated	2,899,988	
Additional State funds needed to raise State grants to 25 percent	3,557,637	

[1] State grants amount to approximately 11 percent of the eligible construction cost estimates.

TABLE 3.—*Projects certified for Federal grants (reimbursable) for which no grant funds have been obligated*

	Estimated eligible cost
Bergen County Sewer Authority	$1,950,000
Dover Township Sewerage Authority	14,433,000
Lower Township Municipal Utilities Authority	2,098,000
Bergen County Sewer Authority	1,300,000
City of Millville	2,750,000
Carlstadt Sewerage Authority	736,200
Middletown Township Sewerage Authority	11,113,000
Bergen County Sewer Authority	1,355,000
City of Summit	216,700
Borough of Fair Lawn	100,500
Rahway Valley Sewerage Authority	10,800,000
Hackettstown Municipal Utilities Authority	2,500,000
Borough of Fairfield	212,400
Borough of Allendale	283,100
Total	49,847,900

NOTE.—25% of Eligible Cost=$12,662,000.

TABLE 4.—*Itemized costs of needed eligible facilities*

Atlantic county:	
Atlantic coastal region	$29,350,000
Great Egg Harbor River region	2,283,000
Mullica River region	947,000
Subtotal	32,580,000
Bergen County:	
Bergen County Sewer Authority area	39,200,000
Northwest Bergen Co. Sewer Authority:	
Mahwah-Ramsey area	2,500,000
Oakland Borough	4,000,000
Edgewater Borough	3,200,000
Subtotal	47,900,000
Burlington County	30,000,000
Camden County Sewerage Authority:	
Cooper River region	7,400,000
Big Timber Creek region	15,800,000
Pennsauken Creek region	1,600,000
Delaware River region	28,300,000
Subtotal	53,100,000

TABLE 4.—*Itemized costs of needed eligible facilities*—Continued

Cape May County:	
Lower region	$20,800,000
Middle region	11,460,000
Dennis Creek region	1,350,000
Tuckahoe River region	650,000
Upper region	9,140,000
Subtotal	43,400,000
Essex County:	
Cedar Grove	500,000
Fairfield	380,000
Subtotal	880,000
Gloucester County Sewerage Authority:	
Consolidated region	20,000,000
Maurice River region	2,100,000
Racoon Creek region	200,000
Subtotal	22,300,000
Hudson County:	
City of Hoboken	10,500,000
Jersey City Sewerage Authority	33,000,000
Bayonne City	7,000,000
North Bergen Township	7,500,000
Town of Secaucus	5,700,000
Town of West New York	5,500,000
Subtotal	69,200,000
Hunterdon County: Raritan Township Municipal Utilities Authority	1,000,000
Mercer County:	
Ewing-Lawrence Sewerage Authority	10,000,000
Hamilton Township	10,400,000
Stony Brook-Millstone River region	27,000,000
East Windsor Township Municipal Utilities Authority	3,000,000
Subtotal	50,400,000
Middlesex County:	
Middlesex County Sewerage Authority	125,000,000
City of Perth Amboy	3,500,000
City of South Amboy	2,000,000
Woodbridge Township	6,500,000
Madison Township Sewerage Authority	1,000,000
Borough of Carteret	3,000,000
Borough of Sayreville	2,500,000
Edison Township	6,000,000
Subtotal	149,500,000
Monmouth County:	
Atlantic Highlands-Highlands area	2,100,000
Bayshore Ocean outfall	12,000,000
Borough of Union Beach	3,500,000
Hazlet Township sewerage Authority	5,000,000
Neptune Township region	3,500,000
Long Branch Sewerage Authority	3,000,000
Wall Township:	
Northern region	4,100,000
Southern region	3,300,000
Manasquan region	7,500,000
Subtotal	44,000,000
Morris County:	
Whippany watershed	3,000,000
Rockaway watershed	30,000,000
Pompton-Pequannock watershed	9,000,000
Subtotal	42,000,000

TABLE 4.—*Itemized costs of needed eligible facilities*—Continued

Ocean County:	
Metedeconk region (Inc. part of Monmouth County)	$25,200,000
Toms River region	26,140,000
Forked River-Cedar Creek region	13,970,000
Mill Creek region	15,340,000
Southern Ocean County region	11,850,000
Subtotal	92,500,000
Passaic County:	
Mid-Passaic Basin	15,600,000
Wanaque Valley region	23,500,000
Subtotal	39,100,000
Salem County:	
Pennsgrove, Upper Penns Neck Township	1,000,000
Pennsville Township	700,000
Subtotal	1,700,000
Somerset County:	
Bridgewater Township Sewerage Authority	5,000,000
Somerset-Raritan Valley Sewerage Authority	3,000,000
Montgomery Township	300,000
Manville Borough	300,000
Warren Township	2,000,000
Subtotal	10,600,000
Sussex County:	
Wallkill Valley region	12,500,000
Musconetcong-Lake Hopatcong region (including part of Morris County)	30,000,000
Subtotal	42,500,000
Union County:	
Linden-Roselle Sewerage Authority	6,500,000
Elizabeth Joint Meeting (including part of Essex County)	20,000,000
Subtotal	26,500,000
Warren County:	
Belvidere region	1,800,000
Phillipsburg complex	1,200,000
Blairstown area	1,120,000
Subtotal	4,120,000
Grand total	803,280,000

TABLE 5.—*Alternative funding plans (total cost, $853,128,000)*

ALTERNATIVE NO. 1 (STATE NOT PARTICIPATING)	
33 percent Federal	$281,532,000
67 percent local	571,596,000
ALTERNATIVE NO. 2	
44 percent Federal	375,376,000
30 percent state	255,938,000
26 percent local	221,814,000
ALTERNATIVE NO. 3	
55 percent Federal	469,220,000
25 percent state	213,282,000
20 percent local	170,626,000
ALTERNATIVE NO. 4	
45 percent local	383,908,000
30 percent Federal	255,938,000
25 percent state	213,282,000
ALTERNATIVE NO. 5	
Present:	
45 percent local	383,908,000
25 percent state plus 25 percent state prefinanced Federal	426,564,000
5 percent Federal	42,656,000

TABLE 5.—*Alternative funding plans (total cost $853,128,000)*—Continued

ALTERNATIVE NO. 5—continued	
After Federal reimbursement:	
55 percent Federal	$469,220,000
25 percent state	213,282,000
20 percent local	170,626,000

TABLE 6.—*Summary of State funds needed for construction of sewerage facilities eligible for financial aid for alternative funding plans*

Alternative 1	$0.0
Alternative 2	255,938,000
Table 1	4,335,000
Table 2	3,558,000
Total	263,831,000
Alternative 3	213,282,000
Table 1	4,335,000
Table 2	3,558,000
Total	221,175,000
Alternative 4	213,282,000
Table 1	4,335,000
Table 2	3,558,000
Total	221,175,000
Alternative 5	426,564,000
Table 1	4,335,000
Table 2	3,558,000
Total	434,457,000

TABLE 7.—FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION GRANT FUNDS AUTHORIZED AND APPROPRIATED FOR NEW JERSEY

Fiscal year	Federal funds authorized for New Jersey	Federal funds appropriated for New Jersey
1967–68	$14,040,400	$5,790,000
1968–69	22,384,400	6,171,100
1969–70	32,397,200	(1)
1970–71	40,397,200	(1)

[1] Not available.

TABLE 8.—*Summary of cost estimates sewerage construction in New Jersey* [1]

The cost of trunklines and treatment plants eligible to receive Federal and State aid and now required to conform with the statutes, regulations, and orders enforced by the State department of health:	
Facilities already partially funded (tables 1 and 2)	$53,045,000
Certified facilities, not funded (table 3)	49,848,000
All other needed facilities (table 4)	803,280,000
Total [2]	906,173,000
Local collection system which will be built to accompany facilities described in No. 1 above and which are ineligible for State aid and for Federal aid from Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. These systems may be eligible for limited aid from Department of Housing and Urban Development and other Federal agencies	225,000,000

[1] All estimates are based on 1968 construction dollars.

[2] Passaic Valley Sewerage Commissioners needs not included.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Raleigh, June 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I have your letter and comments on construction grants under the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Col. George Pickett, Director of the Department of Water and Air Resources, will be in touch with you with more details.

Cordially,

ROBERT W. SCOTT.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND AIR RESOURCES,
Raleigh, N.C., July 7, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Reference is made to your letter of June 6, 1969, addressed to Governor Robert W. Scott, concerning the proposed funding of the construction grant program under the Clean Water Restoration Act. In this connection, you requested information on the impact this low level funding has had on the water pollution control and abatement program in North Carolina.

The funding of this program at the low level of $214 million during F.Y. 1969 and the recommended appropriation in the same amount for F.Y. 1970 has and will continue to delay the construction of needed wastewater treatment facilities in North Carolina. With an appropriation of $214 million, North Carolina's allotment is approximately $5,300,000. Applications were filed by municipalities for F.Y. 1969 funds requesting $7,717,150 covering projects estimated to cost more than $31 million, whereas on July 1, 1969, applications requesting grant funds in the amount of $8,323,000 were pending. These projects have an estimated construction cost of more than $28 million. This means that many of the projects for which applications were filed during both F.Y. 1969 and F.Y. 1970 could not be funded due to the lack of Federal grant funds; thus, the construction of these projects has or will be delayed until grant funds become available. This not only results in delaying needed waste treatment facilities, but due to the increasing cost of construction, much of the benefits derived from the grants are usurped by increasing costs.

In addition to the above, many small incorporated communities which do not now have public sewage collection and treatment facilities are delaying initiation of such projects due to the lack of grant funds at a level which will permit them to finance the local share through bond issues which can be amortized with available sources of revenue. We believe, therefore, that the level of the grants should be increased considerably above 30% of the cost of construction and that the increase should not be contingent upon the availability of State grants as is now the case. In the final analysis, it matters little whether the non-Federal share is financed solely by the municipalities or jointly through State and municipal funds. It is suggested, therefore, that this particular aspect of the grant program be given further study.

We appreciate the opportunity of commenting on this important matter and hope that you and your associates in the House will be successful in your efforts to obtain appropriations more in keeping with the authorizations contained in the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. HUBBARD,
Assistant Director.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Thank you very much for your recent letter requesting information from North Dakota on the impact of short funding on the water pollution control and abatement programs in our state.

Water pollution control construction grants have had tremendous impact on the State of North Dakota. Our State has been fortunate in the fact that our allocations have amounted to approximately one million dollars per year which has been sufficient to provide grants to all communities requesting aid. Over the twelve year period that this program has been in operation, these funds have assisted 230 projects in North Dakota.

We fully realize that the situation in the more populous states is much different than that in North Dakota and in like low population states. We know that many states have had to develop priority ratings and that many communities have been deterred from building waste treatment facilities because of lack of sufficient grant funds.

We strongly support your efforts to secure full funding of the construction grant program under the Clean Water Restoration Act so that pollution control programs nation-wide can proceed in an orderly manner.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. GUY,
Governor.

OHIO WATER DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
Columbus, Ohio, June 16, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Your letter of June 6, 1969 was forwarded to this office by Governor Rhodes. Your efforts on obtaining funding for the Clean Water Restoration Act are deeply appreciated by the State of Ohio. Last year, $9.4 million was received by the State of Ohio for the 30% grant-in-aid program. A survey made in March of this year indicated 224 counties and municipalities were on orders from the Ohio Water Pollution Control Board for primary, secondary, and tertiary waste treatment facilities in the amount of $459 million. It is obvious that less than $10 million a year funding for this program is not the answer. The State of Ohio is proposing to utilize $100 million of funds from a State Bond Issue to extend the 30% grant-in-aid program to all political subdivisions on notice from the OWPCB for sewage treatment facilities.

The total cost to the State due to the short funding of the federal program is considerable. Obviously the $100 million will be the State's expense to compensate for the lack of funding on the federal level over the next five years. The unfortunate thing that has occurred due to the lack of federal funds is that municipalities are reluctant to construct sewage facilities on the basis of 100% local cost if there is hope of receiving a 30% federal grant. Since only a small percentage of applicants are able to receive the federal grant, the remainder wait in hopes of receiving it at a later date. Since construction costs have increased approximately 10% on this type of construction per year during the last few years, a municipality which waits three years, in effect, receives no benefit from the 30% federal grant, and if they wait longer, they are actually penalized on the construction costs.

We hope the above is of value to you in your endeavors to receive better Clean Water Restoration funding and if we can be of further assistance to you in the future, please contact us.

Sincerely,

NED E. WILLIAMS,
Executive Director.

STATE OF OREGON,
Salem, June 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C..

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I am sending for your information Senate Joint Memorial 11, House Joint Resolution 14, and House Bill 1074, all of which speak to the water pollution problem, and reflect the principal action taken by the Oregon Legislature in the Session just concluded. I am also sending copies of correspondence between my office and our Congressional delegation, and my Administrative Assistant in Washington, D.C., Mr. Dale Mallicoat. This issue also has been discussed in detail recently with the Governors of California, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and New York.

I agree with you wholeheartedly in the need for adequate and reliable funding of the program by the Federal government. Our programs have been held back, and we sit with more than $30 million dollars worth of projects ordered by our Sanitary Authority, and designed, engineered, and approved, with state and local funds in hand, but not being constructed because of failure by the Federal government to fund their promised portion. Inadequate funding also brings extremely unfair situations into play, and calls for unnecessarily difficult decisions. Some cities are funded 50–25–25, others 70–30, and still with others where the need is paramount, the local user may be required to pay 100% of the cost.

You will note in our House Joint Resolution 14 that Oregon is pledging the money needed to do the job from our standpoint. The states need not promises, but performance. There is no question in my mind but that the people of this nation will support strongly federal funding to the authorized level. The recent Gallup poll for the National Wildlife Federation clearly indicates this attitude. And as our SJM 11 says, it is a matter of keeping faith with the American people, and I hope the Congress can be so persuaded.

Sincerely,

TOM MCCALL,
Governor.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, June 26, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. DINGELL: Your letter of June 6, 1969, requested information concerning the impact on the sewage treatment plant construction program in Pennsylvania as a result of appropriations under the Clean Waters Restoration Act being considerably less than the authorizations. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this subject.

In Fiscal Year 1968 our Department of Health received 51 applications requesting basic 30% grants amounting to $28.6 million for Fiscal Year 1969 toward projects estimated to cost about $125.8 million. Pennsylvania's allocation of federal funds for Fiscal Year 1969 was $11,032,600, or about 39% of the amount needed for 30% grants.

Similarly, in Fiscal Year 1969, the Department of Health received and is processing 57 applications requesting $23.0 million as

basic 30% grants against Fiscal Year 1970 funds.

Pennsylvanians have approved a Land and Water Conservation and Reclamation Fund which makes $100 million, of a $500 million program, available for construction of sewage treatment facilities over a ten-year period. Under this program $20 million was appropriated for the period July 1, 1967, to June 30, 1969, for the sewage facilities.

In planning this program, it was hoped that these funds could be used to complement the federal funds under Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by the Clean Waters Restoration Act, to make our communities eligible for increased grants. Since the federal allocations have been less than authorized by law, we have had to use our state funds to make combination state-federal grants of 30% of eligible costs. The 70% of costs raised by the local citizens has resulted in annual sewerage service charges in many cases exceeding $150 per family per year, a hardship in many of our small communities.

From the foregoing you will note that the fortunate availability of state funds has made it possible to move many projects into construction which would have been retarded otherwise by the lack of federal funds. However, the current needs exceed even the combination of state and federal funds.

The construction program in Pennsylvania will become more critical in the next several years due to over 150 orders issued in the past two years to municipalities to construct or upgrade treatment facilities in consequence of new water quality criteria on both interstate and intrastate streams. We, therefore urge the increased appropriation of federal funds for Fiscal 1970 and subsequent years.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND P. SHAFER.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
Columbia, June 20, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Thank you for your recent letter concerning the funding of the construction grant program under the Clean Water Restoration Act. I am referring a copy of your letter to the Director of the State Pollution Control Authority for his comments.

I appreciate your bringing this to my attention.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. MCNAIR.

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF HEALTH,
Columbia, S.C., June 30, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: The Honorable Robert E. McNair, Governor of South Carolina, has referred your letter of June 6, 1969, to this office for reply.

The State of South Carolina, being a rather small state populationwise, has experienced little difficulty in the utilization of funds as provided under Public Law 660.

It has been our experience in the past that the smaller projects have been initiated, thus allowing for the satisfactory distribution of funds. Now, however, upon the initiation of construction to serve the more densely populated areas, we are finding it difficult to arrange financing under present limitations of Public Law 660.

We do greatly appreciate the efforts that you and other members of Congress are making to insure the full funding of the Clean Waters Restoration Act for the Fiscal Year 1970. It is evident that if adequate funds are not provided the likelihood of our initiating and completing projects presently proposed in this state will be seriously hampered.

Very truly yours,

W. T. LINTON,
Executive Director, Pollution Control Authority and Director, Bureau of Sanitary Engineering.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Pierre, June 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 6, 1969, regarding funding of the Construction Grant Program for water pollution control facilities.

To familiarize you with the past utilization of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Interior water pollution control construction grant funds in South Dakota, we submit to you the following tabulation:

Year	Fiscal year Federal grant allotment	Calendar year Federal funds approved and used
1957 and 1958	$1,324,825	$887,202
1959	676,700	355,190
1960	680,700	117,848
1961	646,400	432,844
1962	999,760	1,047,358
1963	1,095,570	423,949
1964	1,205,150	47,470
1965	1,150,650	[1] 406,278
1966	1,302,070	449,834
1967	1,393,350	[1] 755,800
1968	1,460,400	328,153

[1] Includes EDA.

As you will note from the above tabulation, the State of South Dakota has not been able to utilize entire federal grant allotments in all cases. However, this should not justify reducing the Federal appropriations for facility construction. In the near future, it is hopeful that several large projects can be undertaken which will need approximately $2 million of Federal grant monies in one year.

The construction of water pollution control facilities in many small communities (100 to 500 population) in this State has been held back, not by lack of Federal Water Pollution Control Administration funds, but by financial and bonding limitations of the community itself and the necessity of obtaining Farmers Home Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture, loan and grant monies to finance the projects. If Farmers Home Administration money were available, many of our lagging communities would have facilities constructed without delay.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK L. FARRAR,
Governor.

TENNESSEE EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Nashville, June 13, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: Your letter of June 6, 1969, arrived at the time the Tennessee Stream Pollution Control Board is considering the priorities for grants under the Clean Water Restoration Act for fiscal year 1970.

The Board has received 26 applications for work totaling $81,044,000 and the 33 per cent grants would be $24,287,000. I understand that the Tennessee allocation will be about $4,300,000 if the appropriation is the recommended $214 million.

We believe that almost all of the projects could be under construction by June 30, 1970, if the funds were available. A few of the small projects may be delayed if supplemental grants applied for from other Federal agencies are delayed.

Our Board believes that the water pollution control and abatement program in Tennessee is being delayed because it has received from two to three times as many applications each year as it has had grant funds for the past five years. Arrangements have not been made to finance the projects with local funds and in most of the cases the projects have waited.

The present backlog for construction is more than the $81,044,000 shown above since the Board has not encouraged all of the towns which need to build facilities to file an application.

If we can furnish additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

BUFORD ELLINGTON.

TEXAS WATER QUALITY BOARD,
Austin, Tex., June 17, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Governor Preston Smith has given me your letter of June 6, 1969 and asked that I reply to you directly on behalf of his office and that of the Texas Water Quality Board.

At the outset, I know that Governor Smith appreciates, as I do, your long and continued interest and support of clean water programs and other conservation programs throughout the Nation. This state has benefited from your work on fisheries and wildlife conservation over a long period of time.

The State of Texas has been quite fortunate in the field of water pollution control and water quality management in that, up until recent times, the state had few large urban centers and limited industrial capacity. The low population density, therefore, minimized the intensity and number of water pollution control problems in the state. At the same time, the State of Texas began a well-planned and aggressive water pollution control program many years ago, with the result that the state's situation with regard to the construction of municipal sewage treatment plants substantially kept pace with the growth and expanding need within the state. We acknowledge fully, in this connection, that the Federal assistance beginning in 1956, or thereabouts, through the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and its successor acts has constituted, and will continue to constitute, an essential facet of the Texas municipal waste control program.

In reviewing the municipal waste treatment needs throughout the state, and comparing them with the financial capabilities of the state's municipalities, and considering the municipalities' needs in other directions, it is our conviction that the present level of funding for the Construction Grants Program under the Clean Water Restoration Act will insure in this state a continuation of the state's program at a satisfactory level. Generally speaking, we are finding that we are funding construction grant requests as fast as those requests are being received, and essentially as fast as is reflected by the state's need.

To supplement the foregoing, we do see, a few years from now, a need for the construction of several regional sewerage systems in the larger metropolitan areas of the state. To adequately fund such projects may well require a change in the present thirty percent (30%) limitation for the construction grants, and possibly some increase in the overall funds available to this state. This situation, however, is not expected to obtain within the next two or three years, perhaps for a considerably longer period than that.

Speaking specifically to the questions in the third paragraph of your letter, the Texas water pollution control and abatement program has not been held back by the present level of funding and it has been unnecessary to make special arrangements resulting from any lack of Federal funds. Insofar as suggesting that there has been or could be an additional cost to the state, the municipalities of Texas have historically provided their share of construction funds without calling upon the resources of the state and, accordingly, this state does not presently have a funded state construction grants program, although one is authorized in the legislation organizing the Texas Water Quality Board. Still, in this connection, it is my view that it is difficult to define that a reduction in a Federal program constitutes an additional cost to a state, certainly not to the taxpayers of the state. Fundamentally, the funds available to local government, to state government, and to the Federal government result from the economic activities of the same set of taxpayers.

In closing, may I restate, on behalf of Governor Smith and myself, our appreciation of your interest and effective work.

Sincerely,

HUGH C. YANTIS, Jr.,
Executive Director.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Richmond, June 9, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: I am forwarding your letter of June sixth to the Virginia Water Control Board for further comment on your inquiry concerning the proposed appropriation under the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Sincerely yours,

MILLS E. GODWIN, JR.

STATE OF VERMONT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Montpelier, Vt., June 30, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I am pleased to learn of the effort that you and others are making in Congress to increase the Federeal appropriation for the Clean Water Restoration Act.

I am sending a copy of your letter to Mr. Reinhold Thieme, Commissioner of Water Resources for the State, and asking him to provide the information that you need. We would like to help you in this cause as the reduction in Federal appropriations has greatly hindered our anti-pollution efforts here in Vermont.

Unfortunately, we have not been able to supplement the loss of Federal funds with State money because of the fiscal problems we have ourselves. I am sure that Commissioner Thieme can give you more specific information in this regard.

Thank you again for your letter.

Sincerely,

DEANE C. DAVIS.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD,
Richmond, Va., June 20, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In response to your letter to Governor Godwin, please find attached a tabulation of the grant requests and recommendations based on available money of the past 8 years. We must point out that Virginia has a policy of not holding a grant application from one year to the next so that the same request may show up in each of several years before it is funded.

You will note from the tabulation that only ¼–⅓ of the projects are funded in any given year. The State does not have a grant program of its own, and to our knowledge no plans are afoot to initiate State grants to supplement grant funds available under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The 1968 General Assembly authorized the Board to administer such State funds if the General Assembly saw fit to appropriate funds for this purpose.

I believe that these few remarks speak for themselves, although I will be happy to answer any questions which arise.

Sincerely,

A. H. PAESSLER,
Executive Secretary.

STATE OF UTAH—DEPARTMENT
OF SOCIAL SERVICES,
Salt Lake City, Utah, June 26, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: This is in answer to your request of June 6, 1969, for information regarding Federal funding of the construction grant program under the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Utah's water pollution control and abatement program has not been held back as a result of short funding under the Act. In fact, during the past two years Utah has not used its entire allotment of construction grant money because the major part of our municipal waste treatment program has been completed.

We do have some small municipalities still in need of construction grants, and we are presently undertaking a campaign to accelerate completion of the needed projects. However, available funds are beyond what we anticipate as necessary in the next two or three years.

Some money will need to be committed to revamping of overloaded plants and possible to the addition of tertiary treatment in some areas. However, we still do not foresee any slowdown in our water pollution control plan under the present funding setup.

Sincerely yours,

E. ARNOLD ISAACSON, M.D., MPA
(For G. D. Carlyle Thompson, M.D., Director of Health.)

GRANT APPLICATIONS PROCESSED OVER THE PAST 8 YEARS IN VIRGINIA

Year	Number of grant requests	Total cost of proposed projects	Grants requested on eligible portions	Number of projects approved	Amount grant money available
1962–63	45	$33,000,000	$5,224,390	18	$1,852,920
1963–64	52	33,000,000	7,584,260	14	1,846,755
1964–65	49	30,000,000	6,302,704	16	2,050,150
1965–66	46	30,000,000	5,937,694	21	3,100,000
1966–67	66	54,000,000	11,965,835	13	4,150,600
1967–68	56	54,000,000	12,315,756	16	4,278,100
1968–69	75	74,000,000	18,946,889	33	4,448,400
1969–70	87	68,000,000	20,195,417	26	[1] 4,500,000

[1] Approximate.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, OFFICE OF
THE GOVERNOR,
Olympia, June 23, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: The following information is presented in response to your inquiry of June 6 with the hope that it will assist you during Congressional consideration of proposed appropriations for the implementation of the Public Law 84–660 Construction Grants Program.

During fiscal 1969 the Washington State Water Pollution Control Commission considered applications for financial assistance under the provisions of the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966 which represented a total value of facilities eligible for grant participation of $22,390,000. Other applications representing a value of several million dollars were held pending under the reimbursement provisions of the Act. Appropriations limited grant participation to only 49% of the total eligible value of the requests considered in the State of Washington.

During the first rating period for fiscal 1970 the Commission considered applications representing a value of $18,772,000. Additional applications representing a value of $23,162,000 in eligible projects were held pending under the reimbursement provisions of the Act. In this first rating period for fiscal 1970 appropriations limited grant participation to only 56% of the total eligible value of the requests. A second rating period for fiscal 1970 will be held in December to disburse funds reallocated to the state. At that time additional applications will be considered. Anticipating that appropriations for fiscal 1970 will be similar to those for fiscal 1969, the grant participation will be provided for some percentage less than 56%.

In the general election of November 5, 1968, Washington voters, by more than a 75% majority, approved Referendum 17 which authorized up to $25,000,000 in state obligation bonds to be used to assist local governments in the development of water pollution control facilities. The $25,000,000 was determined to be the amount needed at the state level to match federal grants on the basis of the existing formula for financing facilities, which is the federal funds providing 30% of eligible costs, state funds for 15% of eligible costs and the local jurisdiction providing 55% of the eligible costs. The present determining factor limiting the effective utilization of Washington State's bonds at the rate of expenditure originally anticipated is the reduced amount of the federal appropriation below the amount authorized in the enabiing legislation.

We therefore urgently endorse a level of appropriation sufficient to implement Public Law 84–660 to make Washington State's matching grant program fully effective.

Up to the present time no arrangements have been made "to take up the slack resulting from the short-fall in federal funds." Enabling legislation has recently been passed by the Washington State Legislature to allow for making independent state grants and loans to municipalities for the construction of water pollution control facilities. No appropriations, however, were made to implement this enabling legislation.

We understand that Congress is currently considering proposals which would modify the present Construction Grant Program. Revised programs would call for contract grants to municipalities of up to 30% of the eligible costs of construction of water pollution control facilities over a 40-year period. This type of program would provide a substantial benefit to the water pollution control effort in the State of Washington, particularly in view of the insufficient funding of the existing grant program. However, it should be pointed out that the effectiveness of a contract grant program would be greatly reduced unless the federal government included in its obligation to the municipalities the payment of prin-

cipal and interest on its assumed portion of the eligible construction costs.

Your interest and efforts in this area are appreciated. We sincerely hope that you will exercise your influence in the House of Representatives to support adequate funding of the Construction Grants Program and the inclusion of the payment of interest as well as principal in the Contract Grant Program.

Sincerely,

DANIEL J. EVANS,
Governor.

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, June 19, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Your support for realistic funding of the construction grant program under the Clean Water Restoration Act is greatly appreciated.

On the assumption that the authorizations in that Act would be honored, Wisconsin began a program of partial funding in Fiscal Year 1967. So that the limited funds could be applied to stimulate more project starts, municipalities were persuaded in that year to accept initial grants of 10 percent of project costs with the assurance that additional increments would be forthcoming.

In Fiscal Year 1968, Wisconsin honored that commitment, raising previous years' projects another 10 percent and starting a few new projects at the 20 percent level of funding. This pattern was continued in the current fiscal year. The result, of course, was that most of the available funds had to be used to raise projects from the previous two years to the 30 percent federal aid level. Of the $4,500,000 which Wisconsin received, only $1,500,000 was available to initiate new construction. At the 30 percent federal aid level, this produced new starts of approximately $5,000,000 cost at a time when immediate sewage construction needs of at least $100,000,000 have been identified in the state.

Complicating the situation is the fact that Wisconsin communities are now eligible for 50 percent federal grants since the state has approved Interstate Water Quality Standards and a state grant program providing 25 percent of project costs.

If we were to raise those projects now at 30 percent federal aid levels another 10 percent in Fiscal Year 1970, the result would be disastrous—all of the available funds would go toward existing construction, permitting no new pollution abatement starts. This is clearly an untenable situation!

Meanwhile, the backlog of vital pollution abatement projects in Wisconsin accumulates. We now estimate that approximately 500 projects costing $300,000,000 should be commenced in the next six to ten years.

My administration has attempted to fill this void. A state bonding program has been developed and approved in referendum. The enabling legislation, when enacted, will permit Wisconsin to advance from 25 to 30 percent of the federal funds for which projects would be eligible. This is an admitted gamble, considering that some elements in Washington would like to strike the reimbursement provisions from the federal act.

Your efforts to restore construction grant funds to a meaningful level have my wholehearted support. Wisconsin and Michigan also share a common interest in maintaining and extending the reimbursement provisions of the federal act.

Sincerely,

WARREN P. KNOWLES,
Governor.

WYOMING EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Cheyenne, July 13, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I am writing with reference to your recent letter regarding the funding of the construction grant program under the Clean Water Restoration Act. Fortunately, Wyoming does not have any serious water pollution control problems and, therefore, the failure of the Congress to appropriate the full amounts that were authorized has not adversely affected my state.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

STAN HATHAWAY,
Governor.

TERRITORY OF GUAM,
Agaña, Guam, June 30, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: In your letter of June 6, 1969, just recently received, you inquired as to the impact short funding for construction grants under the Clean Water Restoration Act has had on the water pollution control and abatement program in Guam.

Guam is fortunate in being provided funds under the Rehabilitation Act P.L. 88–170. Water and sewer projects have been funded under this Act, the last being the Agat/Santa Rita sewer system which includes a sewer treatment plant. A grant under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act was obtained for this treatment.

While we have other projects planned under the water pollution control and abatement program in Guam none have reached the stage of funding. Accordingly, none have been or are being delayed because of short funding under the Clean Water Restoration Act.

I appreciate your writing to me on this subject.

Sincerely,

MANUEL F. GUERRERO.

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas,
June 24, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: The short-funding on the construction grants program under the Clean Water Restoration Act has not held back the water pollution control and abatement programs of the Virgin Islands.

Prior to 1968, the Virgin Islands never utilized the construction grants funds allocated. This was because of the low priority allocated to water pollution behind housing, water, etc. In this way approximately ten million dollars were lost.

We are now moving ahead on the construction of waste treatment plants. We are utilizing all of our 1968 and 1969 allotments and half of our 1970 this year. In addition we have expended $268,000 for three sewage treatment plants required in 1969.

The Virgin Islands are eligible for fifty-five percent grants. We have thus expended $147,400 in order to take up the slack.

Sincerely yours,

CYRIL E. KING,
Acting Governor.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S SCHOOL GUIDELINES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I sent a letter to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Finch, calling on him to bring his Department into compliance with the law with reference to the school guidelines situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on October 11 of 1968, Public Law 90–557 went into effect. This was the appropriations law for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Section 409 of that law provided as follows:

> No part of the funds contained in this Act may be used to force busing of students, the abolishment of any school, or to force any student attending any elementary or secondary school to attend a particular school against the choice of his or her parents or parent in order to overcome racial imbalance.

The act further provided that they may not withhold funds in order to accomplish these purposes.

In my own district in Georgia, Mr. Speaker, Fulton County, in which Atlanta is located, under the Johnson administration we thought we were in compliance. The irony of the situation is that I, a Republican, learned in April of this year that we cannot assign children to schools closest to their homes because this is in violation of the guidelines unless it produces integration.

We were further told that to comply with guidelines we should abandon a 6-year-old high school because every student attending that school was black although they live closer to this school than any other school. The reason for closing this school and busing these students is in order to achieve a racial balance.

We have been further told that if we do not close the school we must assign the children on a geographical basis, gerrymandering the districts, not based upon the proximity of the schools, as a means of establishing boundaries but by using race as to establishing boundaries and that the racial balance must be the same in each school.

This is in direct conflict of the law of the Congress and I call upon the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to obey the law and to bring his Department into conformity with the law. If he refuses to do so, I have no recourse but to consider the possibility of asking for his impeachment.

STATEMENT ENDORSING DIRKSEN'S PRAYER RESOLUTION

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, after a great deal of study, deliberation, and prayer, I rise today in support of voluntary prayer, not only in our schools, but also in every public facility and facet of our free society. I do not believe this is the time or the place for us to retreat from the attacks of the atheists and agnostics whose desire is to remove the honoring of our Lord from all segments of our society, and I want to be on record today as unequivocably in support of prayer.

Referring to the Bible, we will find that verse 12 in the 33d Psalm say, "Blessed is the nation where God is the Lord." Our Nation was founded by men who know the value of prayer. The nondenominational recognition of God has been practiced in this great Nation of ours ever since the first settler con-

structed his log cabin on our eastern seaboard. Based on a godly foundation, this Nation in just a few hundred years has developed from a mere wilderness into a thriving, productive land—the greatest, wealthiest, and freest nation known to man. The United States of America is the envy of the world, truly the land of milk and honey.

The men who have defended this Nation throughout the years have been men of prayer. Our first President George Washington was known to have been seen on his knees in prayer when times were dark and seemed hopeless. Abraham Lincoln told of the many times he was driven to prayer when there was nowhere else to turn. President Eisenhower in his inaugural address said:

> Before all else, we seek, upon our common labor as a nation, the blessings of Almighty God.

President Nixon, for the first time in history, has established worship services in the White House. All these men are the great leaders of a great Nation.

I believe our Nation has been blessed because we have been a Nation which honored God. I also believe that God will continue to honor us as He is given His rightful place in our society.

Our laws and moral codes are based on a godly heritage. The very religious freedom assured us by our forefathers has given us the guidelines to bring up our young people to be responsible, moral, productive citizens. The success of this great Nation of ours has come about because we have constantly been reminded of this godly heritage.

Now we see a number of minority elements, the agnostics and the atheists who would like to see the free worship of God banished from every segment of our society. They cry for the removal of our chaplains in the armed services, the removal of God from our pledge of allegiance, the removal of "In God We Trust" from our currency. They even want to restrict our astronauts from praying publicly from outer space. For the past 3 or 4 years, the aim of these groups has been to devoid our schools of prayer.

This controversy is not new to you by any means, but I am deeply concerned over the results of the refusal of the Supreme Court to review a number of lower court decisions on this subject, that prayer in the public school controversy has become confused and subject to contradictory lower court decisions. For some unknown reason, the Supreme Court has avoided clarifying its position on this vital subject.

In its historic decision in the case Murray and Schempp, the Supreme Court made it explicitly clear that the first amendment of the Constitution permits the recognition of God in public prayer. The decision further revealed that the worshipping of Almighty God is in fact a part of our national heritage.

The Court confused the issue, however, by at a later date, refusing to hear an appeal of a lower court decision. In the New York case Stein against Oshinsky, a group of parents and their 21 children were refused by a Federal Court the right to read the Lord's Prayer, hold voluntary prayer, and to thank God for His blessings before eating their lunches in school. The Supreme Court refused to hear an appeal on this decision. A thorough study of these two decisions will reveal that they are contradictory, and, therefore, have caused widespread confusion, not only in the lower courts, but also in the minds of the public as well.

We cannot have any law, ruling, or court decision that will ban the guaranteed right of Americans to worship God as they please. The strength of this Nation lies in the home, the church, and the school. To say to our children that they should honor God in their homes and churches, but cannot pray the Lord's Prayer at school or say a blessing before eating their school lunches, would be a catastrophy.

There have been in recent years a large number of resolutions submitted to Congress in an effort to clearly define the law as it refers to prayer in public schools. I am also deeply concerned that the legislative branch of this Government has also failed to take the responsibility to rule on this issue.

More than 3 years ago, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN introduced a resolution intended to define the law as it applies to prayer in public schools. This resolution over the past few years has been altered, and, as it is now written, clearly defines a responsible position on the public school prayer question.

I want to make it clear that I am against compulsory prayer in our schools, and I am completely against the promotion of state religion. I am, however, in full support of any legislation which would insure the right of every American to pray voluntarily in public as well as in the confines of his home or church.

I would, therefore, like to submit for House consideration, a companion resolution to that of Mr. DIRKSEN's Senate Joint Resolution 6.

This resolution calls for a constitutional amendment, and if passed by Congress, would have to be ratified by the individual State legislatures. If there is anyone here today that is concerned about the general feeling of the clergy and the opinion of the layman on this matter, I will assure you that when this legislation is passed, the quick ratification by the States will prove an impressive tribute to your decision.

CLARENCE MITCHELL CHOSEN BY NAACP AS RECIPIENT OF COVETED MEDAL OF HONOR, THE SPINGARN MEDAL

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

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, last week, in Jackson, Miss., more than 2,000 delegates to the national convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People—NAACP—met and paid special tribute to a man commonly referred to as "the 101st U.S. Senator" or the 436th Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Clarence Mitchell was chosen by the NAACP as its 54th recipient of its coveted medal of honor—the Spingarn Medal.

According to NAACP Executive Director Roy Wilkins, the nine-member Spingarn Medal Award Committee selected Clarence Mitchell in recognition of Mitchell's vital role as lobbyist for civil rights legislation and particularly his crucial contribution to the enactment of the fair housing title of the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

Mr. Wilkins also pointed to Clarence Mitchell's 23 years of dedicated service to the NAACP, the last 19 as director of the NAACP's Washington bureau. In Mr. Wilkins' words—

> The Spingarn Medal is awarded annually to an American of African descent for distinguished achievement during the preceding year or years. On the basis of his superb performance as our legislative representative in Washington, Clarence Mitchell richly deserves this recognition.

I agree wholeheartedly with Roy Wilkins and commend the NAACP for giving due recognition to one of the most effective, dedicated and widely respected persons in Washington.

Clarence Mitchell is indeed a rare person. He has an unusual, and remarkable combination of outstanding qualities. He moves quietly but swiftly and effectively; he speaks softly but with wisdom and authority; he is a man of faith and patience but militantly persistent and stubbornly courageous.

Clarence Mitchell does not seek the spotlight. He is a genuinely modest—a humble man—who shies away from television cameras and news reporters.

For the past 19 years, as director of the Washington office of the NAACP, Clarence Mitchell has been a "creative agitator" for change in making our Federal Government more responsive and relevant to the needs of black people, in particular, and the poor and disadvantaged in general.

Commenting on Mr. Mitchell's effectiveness as lobbyist for the 1968 fair housing bill, the authoritative Congressional Quarterly said:

> Seldom has an individual lobbyist been accorded so much credit for the outcome of a bill as was Mitchell.

In an editorial published on April 14, 1968, the Washington Post said:

> The real heroes of legislative battles are often unseen and unsung. Too often the kudos and hurrahs go to those who are most visible, while the prime movers go unpraised. A special saluate is in order, we think, to Clarence Mitchell, for the part he played in bringing the latest civil rights bill to enactment—and for the part he has played in the adoption of every civil rights measure for more than a decade past. Clarence Mitchell is the director of the Washington Bureau of the NAACP and the chief lobbyist for the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. It was he who persisted, when others faltered, in conviction that a full-scale civil rights bill with a bona fide open housing provision could be enacted in this session of Congress. It was he whose faith in Congress and the American people stedfastly thwarted and denied failure. All Americans are in debt to him.

Clarence Mitchell was also a leader in the fight for the 1957 Civil Rights Act, the first civil rights legislation in

over 80 years—the 1960 amendments to the Civil Rights Act, and the passage of the historic 1964 Civil Rights Act, without crippling amendments.

During these civil rights legislative battles, Mitchell as legislative chairman of the leadership conference on civil rights, was a commanding general in developing strategy, organizing his team of forces, and maintaining regular liaison with the White House and both the Senate and House.

Under the direction of Clarence Mitchell, the Washington bureau of NAACP has carried a major part of the successful effort to end segregation in the armed services and to eliminate Jim Crow in navy yards, schools on military posts, veterans' hospitals, atomic energy installations, and other Federal establishments.

There is much more I could say about Clarence Mitchell, the man, civil rights leader, legislative architect, dean of Washington lobbyist.

However, I think the Spingarn citation sums up the feelings of admiration and praise many of us have for our friend Clarence.

The Spingarn citation reads:

For Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr., 1969 Spingarn Medalist;

For his selfless devotion to the task of ending racial bias;

For his uncompromising rejection of racism white or black;

For his wisdom and tenacity in pursuit of just laws;

For his abiding faith in the democratic process as a means of achieving freedom and equality for all; and

For the pivotal roles he has played in enactment of civil rights legislation, particularly the Civil Rights Act of 1968 with its Fair Housing title:

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People proudly presents this 54th Spingarn Medal to its own Clarence M. Mitchell, Jr., "the 101st United States Senator."

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I have only a few things to say about Mr. Mitchell and others will have said them already, I am sure. But the complete and absolutely unremitting dedication of this man to an often thankless task that many people with his talents would consider drudgery cannot be praised enough.

His more than 20 years of devotion to his job; his constant appearance before Senate and House committees, often alone, to drive home the inequities of this country; in his total selflessness are the marks of a man deeply in love with and dedicated to his country.

His major efforts have been toward equal rights for the black people and other colored minorities of this country. But that only fully demonstrates his total allegiance to the basic principles of the country, and his dedication to the total eradication of the injustices that the principles of hate expressed at every level have forced upon us.

There have been few Clarence Mitchells in the whole history of man. It is an honor and a privilege for me to have known this one.

But the saga of Clarence Mitchell is not yet over. Nor is the job that captured his devotion. It is not the fault of Clarence Mitchell though. It is rather the fault of many of the Members who sit here today offering brief platitudes or bored silences and in some cases quietly seething anger. If the good Lord desires to put more Clarence Mitchells on this earth during the balance of this century, I hope that he allots the major portion to this august body.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of my colleagues that Clarence Mitchell, a distinguished leader, has received the coveted Spingarn Medal Award from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

The Spingarn Medal was instituted in 1914 by the late J. E. Spingarn—then chairman of the board of directors of the NAACP. The purpose of the medal is twofold—first to call the attention of the American people to the existence of distinguished merit and achievement among American Negroes, and second, to serve as a reward for such achievement and as a stimulus to the ambition of Negro youth.

Clarence Mitchell has given 23 years of outstanding and courageous service to the Washington bureau of the NAACP. Among some of his successful efforts have been the passage of the 1957 Civil Rights Act, the enactment of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and the 1965 Voting Rights Act. I feel that all Americans are indebted to Clarence Mitchell for the service that he has rendered to our country and it is in this vein that I ask this great body to recognize this truly great American.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) and to commend him on taking this occasion to allow us the opportunity to commend Clarence Mitchell for having won the 54th Spingarn Medal of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in recognition of his distinguished career in the field of civil rights.

Mr. Mitchell has been both a friend and counsel of mine for many years and I have profited greatly in both capacities. He has been able to maintain a vigorous civic life while remaining a family man and he has fought militantly on issues without engendering hatred.

Clarence Mitchell stands at the top of the list as an effective lobbyist and a crusader with a brilliant mind and dedication. His contribution in winning such legislative battles as the Civil Rights Act and the enactment of the fair housing legislation of 1968 stand as landmarks of achievement in a period of which civil rights has had many fair-weather friends but few consistent leaders with accomplishments.

I proudly join with my colleagues in saluting Clarence M. Mitchell and express the wish that his service will continue as I am sure it will for many years into the future.

CREATION OF COMMERCIAL BANKING AREA WITHIN NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION PROPOSED

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today H.R. 12768 for the purpose of creating a commercial banking area within the National Capital region, and for the furtherance of present plans to revitalize the economy of the District and to insure the free flow of commerce throughout the region.

As far back as 1924, in establishing the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Congress has recognized the need to deal with the National Capital region on an areawide basis. In the 1952 amendment to the act which created the National Capital Planning Commission, the Congress stated that:

The Congress hereby finds that the location of the seat of government in the District of Columbia has brought about the development of a Metropolitan Region extending well into adjoining territory in Maryland and Virginia; that effective comprehensive planning is necessary on a regional basis and of continuing importance to the Federal Establishment; (66 Stat. 781).

Later legislation has dealt with the region as a geographic entity on such topics as water pollution, relocation of Government offices, maintenance of parks and playgrounds, transportation, and other area problems. One regional problem though, as yet untouched by congressional action, has been the flow of commercial banking funds throughout the National Capital region.

What in specific is the problem today in District banking? At the present time, District of Columbia banks are restricted from movement outside of the District's 61-square-mile boundaries. What makes this restriction a problem? Of the 20 largest metropolitan regions in the United States, the Washington metropolitan area ranks No. 1 in growth with an average annual increase in population of 4 percent and with an average annual increase in total personal income of 8 percent.

Also No. 1 in the area of employment, the average annual growth in employment in the National Capital region far exceeds the growth rates of such major urban areas as San Francisco, Newark, and St. Louis. While the National Capital region has shown tremendous progress, this is not reflected in the District. In 1940, the population of the District of Columbia represented over 65 percent of the total regional population. By 1966, this percentage had slipped to about 30 percent. Or to state it another way, while the population of the District of Columbia since 1940 has increased only 20 percent, the surrounding suburbs have increased in population over 400 percent. The total personal income of the residents of the area by 1975 is estimated to be over $8 billion, but the District residents are only expected to share in approximately one-fourth of this income. These facts coupled with the present trend to bank at home rather than at work, have led to a sharp decline in the proportion of bank deposits in the District compared with that of the region. How sharp a decline in percentage of deposits held have the District banks been experiencing? Since 1947, deposits in the District banks have shrunk from a

total of over 80 percent of the area deposits to little better than 50 percent. While this decrease has taken place, the deposits in the suburbs have shown an increase of over 300 percent.

This drain on bank deposits has placed the District banks in a perilous position. This District of Columbia is under a congressional mandate to maintain sufficient and comfortable working and living conditions for the employees of the Federal Establishment—35 percent of all employment in the region is composed of Federal employees. The economic burden which this mandate places upon the District can and should be met by private enterprise as well as by Federal aid. In 1968, the District of Columbia banks loaned $200 million to area residents for home construction and over $400 million for commercial and industrial uses. But, with this decrease in the proportion of regional deposits, a substantial cutback in approvals will be necessary in the near future. Coupled with this cutback in loans, there will also be a cutback in employment by the banks. A cutback in employment will substantially stifle the employment goals of the District banks. These goals can be seen in the records of the two largest District banks which show that minority employment in these two banks, excluding janitorial employees, ranges from between 26 to 30 percent. This figure which is steadily increasing can be matched by no other banking institution in the United States which has resources of over $200 million and should be a model for any urban-based enterprise. If anything, we need an increase in such areas, not a cutback. But this cannot be done when banking business is being siphoned off at an increasingly rapid rate to those areas which do not represent the needs of the urban centers.

This bill also, is further recognition of the fact that the National Capital region has long since become the seat of the Federal Government. Today, with the rapid expansion of the Federal Establishment not just in employees, who have increased sevenfold in the last 50 years, but also in Government facilities located outside the District line, it is unrealistic to maintain that the Nation's Capital does not extend beyond the 61.4-square-mile limit. See appendix A for a breakdown of present and future Government employment. The burden is today upon the region, not just the District, to provide for the increase in the Federal Establishment. As population has increased, the large retail establishments have moved to the suburbs to continue their service to the residents of the area. The District banks have tried to compete for the deposits of the rapidly increasing suburban areas but because of their boundary restriction, they have met with little success. What has resulted, as I have stated before, is a decrease in the proportionate share of regional deposits in the District banks. If the challenge of the cities is to be met in Washington and the needs of the Federal Establishment are to be met on a regional basis, competition for deposits must be accomplished.

How can we increase competition and stop this drain? The bill before you would permit the District banks with the approval of the Federal Reserve Board to acquire as a holding company, a suburban-based bank. Both Virginia and Maryland banking agencies would still maintain their control of these suburban banks. In no way would this bill detract from the power of the Virginia and Maryland banking agencies and the plan would also be reciprocal with the Maryland and Virginia banking institutions. By allowing the purchase of a suburban bank by a District bank holding company, the District banks would be able to replenish their much-needed reserves of saving and time deposits. This would in turn allow an increase in loan availability to area residents and therefore, make it possible for the District banks to meet the ever-increasing loan demand of the Nation's fastest growing urban center.

We are all familiar with the basic principle of competition upon which our economic system is based. We have always felt that the needs of the people are best met by allowing members of the private sector to compete among themselves to decide who will serve the public. We allow such competition to take place within a State between individual banking institutions. And, it has been recognized many times by Congress that the problems of the people of the National Capital region must be solved on a regional level. Why then do we continue to restrict such competition in the region? Why then do we afford special privileges to suburban banks who have placed their branch offices upon the District lines without also affording them responsibilities equal to their privileges? It cannot be denied that these suburban banks have gained immeasurable benefits because of their proximity to the Nation's Capital.

The National Capital region is one geographic unit. The time has come to treat the region as a unit for banking purposes. If private enterprise is to shoulder part of the responsibilities of the metropolitan area, District banking institutions must be allowed the means to accomplish their task.

APPENDIX A

Federal Establishment: The National Capital Region should prepare for an increase of at least 130,000 Federal employees over the next 20 years. In the District, new employment should continue to be concentrated in the central employment area, although there should be a sizable growth in the rest of the city. Outside the District, allocation of Federal employment to suburban new towns can stimulate private development in the new cities.

THE PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL—NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Summary of Changes Programed for Federal Employment on Federal Sites in the National Capital Region: 1964 and 1985 [1]

	1964		1985		Changes: 1964–85	
	Number of employees	Percent of NCR total	Number of employees	Percent of NCR total	Number of employees	Percent change
Total, National Capital region	311,500	100	440,000	100	128,500	41
District of Columbia	178,200	57	259,000	59	80,800	45
Central area	151,700	49	211,500	48	59,800	39
Central employment area	125,700	41	147,200	33	21,500	17
Outside the CEA	26,000	8	64,300	15	38,300	147
Remainder of District of Columbia	26,500	8	47,500	11	21,000	79
NCR outside the District of Columbia	133,300	43	181,000	41	47,700	36
Virginia [2]	84,600	27	99,600	23	15,000	18
Immediate environs of District of Columbia	45,100	14	37,700	9	−7,400	−16
Remainder within NCR	39,500	13	61,900	14	22,400	59
Maryland [2]	48,700	16	81,400	18	32,700	67

[1] Does not include Federal employees occupying leased space.
[2] Federal employment in new towns has arbitrarily been divided equally between Maryland and Virginia. Such employment should be allocated in accordance with criteria which would result in an equitable distribution between 2 States.

FOREIGN INFORMATION ACT

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill providing for the implementation of the recommendation made by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information in its 24th report to Congress issued in May. It is called the Foreign Information Act.

I invite my colleagues to participate as cosponsors of this legislation. The bill, is an effort to translate the findings of the Commission into effective action.

The recommendation, stated briefly, is to establish a committee for the purpose of conducting a major review of U.S. foreign public information programs in their conception and execution.

More specifically, it is an effort to conduct a full and complete examination of all informational, educational, cultural, psychological, and political objectives of U.S. programs of public information in other countries; to take a hard look at the role of foreign public information considerations in the formulation and execution of U.S. foreign policy; and to make a basic study of the organization and operations of the U.S. Information Agency.

The vehicle I propose to get this job done is the same as recommended by the Commission: a committee of nine persons. Of these nine, one would be a Member of this body appointed by the Speaker. One would be a Member of the other body. Four others would represent the USIA, State Department, National Security Council, and the Commission itself, respectively. And three would come from private life as appointed by the President.

The Commission's recommendation leans in the direction of assigning the study work to a professional body as determined by the Committee. My own preference would be that the Committee approach this matter with a complete open mind as to whether the work of the study be done by a professional group or by staff selected for this specific purpose.

This entire project is, in my opinion, fully consistent with the excellent report submitted some months ago by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this body.

That report is a committee print submitted as Report No. 6 in a series on the future of U.S. public diplomacy, dated December 22, 1968.

I call attention also to the U.S. Advisory Commission's 23d report to Congress dated March 26, 1968.

The 23d report is an outstanding document which should be examined by every Member of Congress. In recommending this same examination project it says that "new directions, new dimensions, new duties, and new emphases" must be injected into our foreign information programs.

It says:

It is time for a searching reexamination of USIA mission and execution.

It expresses convincingly the real need to examine assumptions which have gone largely unexamined for many years. It specifically stresses not dollars, but direction.

The Commission's reinforcement of its recommendation this year, in the 24th report, stresses:

Effective, accurate, open communication can make the difference between peace and war. Moreover, it can make the difference in the eventual outcome of the contest now being waged betwen reform and revolution.

Mr. Speaker, the question of U.S. programs of foreign public information has a history of complexity and even controversy, going way back to World War I days when George Creel was making this country's beginning efforts in this field.

It is an issue which has gone largely unnoticed by the U.S. public and so, too, by this Congress. Until this year there was exceedingly little literature available on the subject.

I think it is no exaggeration to say that most of us in this body know very little about what the USIA is doing, why it is doing it, and how it is doing it. We know even less about the role of foreign information considerations on overall foreign policy decisions.

Yet it is also no exaggeration to say that foreign public information is one of four channels through which we as a Nation are conducting foreign affairs; the other three being diplomacy, trade, and military action.

I request that appropriate consideration be given to this proposal. There is no partisanship in this, and no personal gratification for anyone. There are no ideological lines to be drawn and no factional differences of any kind of which I am aware.

It is a matter of simple commonsense and the national welfare. Let us give heed to the longstanding recommendation of a highly responsible body, the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information by enacting legislation to support it.

Following is the text of the bill:

H.R. 12726

A bill to provide for an examination of United States Government public information activities in foreign countries

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is established the Committee for the Review of United States Overseas Information Activities (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Committee").

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Committee to review the objectives, the organization and the operations of all informational, educational, cultural and related activities of the United States Government in foreign countries; to assess the relevance and the effectiveness of such activities in terms of the support which they provide for the attainment of United States foreign policy objectives; to examine the extent to which foreign public opinion is considered in the formulation and execution of United States foreign policy, and the manner in which this is done; and to submit its findings and recommendations.

SEC. 3. The Committee shall be composed of nine members as follows:

(1) One Member of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate.

(2) One Member of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(3) One member of the National Security Council appointed by the President of the United States.

(4) One officer or employee of the Department of State appointed by the President of the United States.

(5) One officer or employee of the United States Information Agency appointed by the President of the United States.

(6) One member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information appointed by the President of the United States.

(7) Three individuals from private life appointed by the President of the United States from among individuals with knowledge and experience in the fields of information, education, and cultural affairs, one of whom the President shall designate to serve as chairman.

A vacancy in the Committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

SEC. 4. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), members of the Committee shall each be entitled to receive $100 for each day (including travel time) during which they are engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Committee.

(b) Members of the Committee who are full-time officers or employees of the United States shall receive no additional compensation on account of their services on the Committee.

(c) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Committee, members of the Committee shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as the expenses authorized by section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

SEC. 5. Five members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 6 The Committee shall meet at the call of the Chairman or a majority of its members.

SEC. 7. The Committee may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable.

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out this Act, the Committee may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, direct and contract for such studies, as it deems advisable. The Committee may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before it.

SEC. 9. The Committee may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chairman of the Committee such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Committee.

SEC. 10. The Committee shall submit a final report to the President and to the Congress not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act. Such report shall contain the results of the investigation and study conducted under this Act, together with such recommendations as the Committee may deem appropriate. The Committee shall cease to exist thirty days after submitting its final report under this section.

SEC. 11. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed $350,000.

ABUSES OF LABOR LAW BY THE NLRB

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

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, over 2 years ago when I first proposed that Congress abolish the National Labor Relations Board and in its place establish a U.S. Labor Court, the abuses of labor law by the NLRB had reached the intolerable stage. Although it seems hardly possible, the situation in the last 2 years has seriously worsened and no relief appears in sight.

As is so often the case with many Federal agencies, the NLRB has grown very fat at the expense of the American taxpayers, and it has become so mired in its own bureaucracy that any hope for self-imposed reform has long since vanished.

Since its creation as an independent agency under the Wagner Act of 1935, the NLRB has consistently fought against any change in its organization and procedure. Originally conceived as an impartial agency to carry out the intent of Congress in the field of labor-management relations, it is obvious to me that the Board has become so partisan in its decisions until that underlying philosophical concept is now looked upon as a joke.

The NLRB is under constant criticism from the American Bar Association for its disregard for needed change. Since 1941, when the Board opposed changes put forward by the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, the record has been simply appalling. No other agency of the Federal Government has so successfully resisted efforts by the Congress and the executive branch to change the status quo.

But, if its record of resisting much-needed procedural changes is shocking, the list of NLRB decisions, especially in the past 10 years or so, is just unbelievable. While I could cite any number of such decisions, one of the most memorable was the case of the J. P. Stevens Co. in which the Board decreed that an

employer must publicly confess to employees that the company was guilty of unfair labor practices despite the fact that the company maintained its innocence.

The Stevens case was symbolic. It should have proved to even the most diehard NLRB supporter that the Board was anything but neutral—that it was in fact blatantly antibusiness. In that decision, the Board issued an extremely militant release which virtually condemned the J. P. Stevens Co. The "supposedly" impartial Board issued the release even before the company had an opportunity to read the decision and prepare its defense. Instead of reading in the normal judicial language of calmness and restraint, the release could not have been more boisterous, rabid, and downright vehement if it had been written by a public relations official for the executive council of the AFL–CIO.

While the Stevens decision is only one of many in which the Board has sought to chastise business, it served to point up the very dangerous situation that we now find ourselves in; namely, that big labor controls the NLRB and as such, union leaders have worked themselves into a position where they are the sole judge of their objectives and actions.

Not only has the intent of Congress been systematically thwarted and the rights of management violated by the NLRB, but in recent years the Board has become increasingly unfair to individual workers when their rights have been trampled upon by union bosses. In case study after study, the NLRB has demonstrated that in its obsession to accommodate union leaders it will assist in coercing individual workers who dare to differ with the union overlords.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is for the American workingman, the industries that employ him, and the consumers who depend on his magnificent efforts. Since the NLRB will not police itself, it is time for Congress to step in and get tough. It does us little good to painstakingly perfect the law in regard to labor-management relations and then have an agency of the Federal Government turn right around and deliberately thwart the intent of Congress by handing down decisions contrary to the law.

If the NLRB cannot protect individual union employees from the violence and outright coercion to which they are subjected by national union leaders; if it cannot honor the letter and the spirit of the law as enacted by Congress; if it cannot assume some degree of objectivity in labor-management disputes and; if it continues to laugh up its sleeves at the American consumer, then I say let us get rid of the entire organization and start from the bottom up to give the American people something better for their money.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, the method of resolving labor-management disputes is through the court system. In fact, it is the only way to attain any predictability in labor law. Therefore, once again I urge the Congress to approve a bill I am introducing today which would abolish the NLRB and replace it with a 15-judge U.S. labor court. It is obvious that Federal judges would be more carefully selected than NLRB members and would certainly be less likely to bow to political pressure and harassment. In addition, a separate labor court would have much more prestige than the present Board since it would be more inclined to decide cases on the basis of prior decisions and those laws enacted by Congress.

While I have mentioned some of the features of this legislation in previous remarks to the House, I might reiterate that the 15 judges would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for 20-year terms with the exception of original appointees, who would serve staggered terms. Also, the General Counsel of the NLRB would be replaced by an Administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and NLRB trial examiners would be replaced by 90 Commissioners appointed by the court.

REDUCTION IN THE PERCENTAGE OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE FOR OIL AND GAS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this Congress cannot continue to delay in enacting legislation to meet one of the most urgent needs of our Nation—tax reform. I voted against the surcharge on Monday because as a tax on tax, it magnifies the inequities that exist in our tax structure. Those who have avoided paying taxes altogether because of various tax loopholes will also pay no surcharge. Those who have paid taxes at a lower rate than their incomes would indicate they should have paid will pay the surcharge at the same low proportionate rate. Temporary solutions—although one begins to wonder how "temporary" the surcharge will prove to be—are not the answer. We must have a far-reaching, comprehensive revision of our tax structure to remove the glaring inequities which place intolerable burdens on too many taxpayers and at the same time cause distortions in our economy.

I am grateful that the surcharge legislation did include tax relief for some 2 million families with incomes at or below poverty income levels, but we must go further and provide relief for the overburdened middle income taxpayer. He cannot be expected to carry the load of the taxes that should not have been collected from the poor and also be expected to pay the taxes that should have been collected from high income individuals and high profit businesses.

Fortunately the proposed surcharge legislation includes the repeal of the investment tax credit. The elimination of this unnecessary subsidy to business should eventually increase Federal revenues by nearly $3 billion annually.

Now we must reform another subsidy to business—the tax treatment of the oil and gas industry, particularly the 27.5 percent depletion allowance. Over 40 years have passed since the percentage depletion allowance for oil and gas was written into our tax laws and as is so often the case with laws that benefit powerful groups, it has acquired a sacrosanct aura through the passage of time. The mere suggestion of a change in it brings such cries of anguish that one feels guilty of blasphemy.

Under present tax law, extractive industries may choose between two methods of recovering capital costs invested in the development of natural resources. Under one method, cost depletion, such outlays may be deducted over the productive life of the property, much as other businesses may take deductions for the depreciation of capital goods. The other method, percentage depletion, permits a deduction of a flat percentage of gross income, but not more than 50 percent of net income. Percentage depletion is not limited to the cost of the investment as is cost depletion.

The highest depletion rate allowed for any extractive industry is the 27.5 percent for oil and gas. There certainly should not be anything sacred about this figure. It was a compromise between the 25 percent recommended by the House and the 30 percent recommended by the Senate when the percentage depletion allowance was first enacted in 1926. As might be expected, cost depletion is rarely used in the oil and gas industry and as a result the Treasury Department estimates the average oil and gas operator recovers his original investment at least 19 times by utilizing percentage depletion.

The result is that the effective tax rates for oil and gas producers are far less than those borne by other industries, and the Federal Government suffers a serious revenue loss. The recently published study by the Consad Research Corp. prepared under contract for the Treasury Department concluded that the elimination of the percentage depletion allowance for the oil and gas industry would result in an additional $1.2 billion in tax revenue at current production levels.

Figures published in the August 5, 1968, issue of Oil Week for 23 of the largest oil refiners in the United States show that from 1962 through 1967 the average Federal tax payment in every one of the 6 years for these companies was less than 10 percent. In 1967 Standard Oil of New Jersey, the largest of them all, paid $166 million in Federal taxes on net income before taxes of $2,098 million, or 7.9 percent. Atlantic Richfield Co. had a net profit in 1967 of $130 million and paid no Federal income tax at all. These figures are truly incredible when you consider that the individual taxpayer in the lowest bracket paid taxes at a rate of 14 percent.

The percentage depletion allowance is not the only tax privilege available to the oil and gas industry. Intangible drilling costs which include expenditures for labor, fuel, power, materials, and other expenses that do not have a salvage value incurred in bringing a well into production may be written off as a current expense in the year in which they are incurred. Other industries must capitalize these costs.

In addition to these tax benefits, U.S. companies operating abroad may claim a tax credit for income taxes paid to foreign governments. There is also a special deduction against taxable income for U.S. companies operating in the

Western Hemisphere—which of course includes oil-rich Venezuela.

All of these special benefits are justified because of national security. It is claimed that special incentives are needed because of the unusual hazards in the exploration and development in the petroleum industry to maintain sufficient production and reserves at home to meet our needs in time of emergency. The industry propaganda line has been that without these tax privileges this country would be in dire straits—becoming totally dependent upon such unstable foreign sources as the Middle East.

Even if we accept the premise that these special benefits are necessary they are wasteful and inefficient. The Consad report also concluded:

1. The elimination of percentage depletion as an option would reduce existing reserve levels by 3%. . .

2. Elimination of the option to expense intangible drilling cost would reduce existing reserve levels by from 1.9% to 4.0%, depending on the alternative tax policy.

3. Percentage depletion is a relatively inefficient method of encouraging exploration and the resultant discovery of new domestic reserves of liquid petroleum.

The Consad report also points up the inconsistency of a tax policy which purports to stimulate domestic production but in reality encourages exploration overseas. The Consad report points out that over 40 percent of percentage depletion for the oil and gas industry is paid for foreign production and nonoperating interests in domestic production.

Royalty payments to foreign countries, especially in the Middle East, are often disguised as income taxes. Royalty payments are recognized deductions from taxable income, but since income taxes to a foreign government are a credit against U.S. taxes owed, it is preferable, if the foreign government cooperates, to have these royalty payments designated as taxes. In addition to the tax incentives stimulating foreign exploration, risks are also minimized since there is an abundant supply of oil and drilling costs are low because the oil is close to the surface.

Despite vehement protests to the contrary by industry spokesmen, the American taxpayer who subsidizes the oil and gas industry, is not rewarded by lower prices as a consumer. State prorationing laws keep the prices up on domestic production.

Opponents of tax incentives point out as their major objections that the costs are hidden and that programs are not subjected to continuing review as they would be if they were budgeted items. The percentage depletion allowance for oil and gas, unchanged since 1926, is certainly a case in point.

We cannot continue this unfair tax policy in the name of national security. There must be a fairer, less expensive and more efficient method to accomplish our goals. Percentage depletion should be replaced by cost depletion, but that objective is probably unattainable in the immediate future. For the present, let us make a small beginning by reducing the percentage depletion allowance, initially, to 20 percent and look toward greater reduction in the future.

Genuine tax reform cannot be thought of solely in terms of achieving additional Federal revenue. It means increasing the equity of the tax structure even if it costs money. If it is fair to eliminate the payment of income taxes for those living in poverty, so must we distribute taxation among those who do pay in the most equitable manner. Overall, I am sure, tax reform in combination with sharp control of Federal spending will yield sufficient revenue to take the steps necessary to restore equity in the taxation of all Americans. We will be able to increase the personal exemption, increase the standard deduction and eliminate discrimination in the taxation of single individuals.

We have studied and debated long enough. President Nixon, in a letter to the minority leader of the House on Monday stated:

There is no reason why a far-reaching tax reform bill cannot be put before the House of Representatives this summer. . . .

He is absolutely right; prompt action is necessary. We cannot settle for tokenism in achieving tax reform. A reduction in the percentage depletion allowance for oil and gas is a "must" if such reform is to be meaningful.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL SAYS TAX REFORM MUST ACCOMPANY SURTAX

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

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal has made a strong plea for prompt and meaningful tax reform. In a July 7 editorial, the Journal urged the Senate to hold the surtax extension bill hostage until a meaningful tax reform package is attached to it. I commend this editorial to my colleagues:

TAX REFORM NOW

Now that the house has agreed to extend the federal income tax surcharge, the immediate priority must be a genuine start on reforming the federal tax system itself.

Congress' czar on taxation, Rep. Wilbur Mills, says that the house ways and means committee is preparing a "good, real, wholesome, effective reform measure." President Nixon, in a special letter, reaffirmed his earlier commitment to "prompt and meaningful reform." Wisconsin's Rep. John Byrnes, ranking Republican on the ways and means committee, predicts the committee will report out a reform bill by mid-August . . . "and there will be plenty of reform in it."

It sounds very tidy and conclusive. However, the obstacles ahead should not be underestimated. Beneficiaries of special tax exclusions will not easily give up their privileges. Byrnes expects that some congressmen now screaming for reform could be singing a softer tune when they see the ways and means committee's package. And the president, despite his pledge, is still on record against an essential target of any reform—the excessive oil depletion allowance.

Over the years, the federal tax system has been punctured with scores of loopholes, some designed to serve a useful social function, others created largely because some pressure group exerted enough muscle. "Meaningful" reform, therefore, means different things to different people. But, at a minimum, it should include these ingredients:

Reduction of the 27½% depletion allowance that now unjustifiably permits the oil industry—and the oil industry only—to escape its fair share of federal taxes.

Imposition of a formula that will insure that some income tax is paid by some rich citizens who now escape all, or virtually all, taxation through a maze of special preferences.

Stiff new restrictions on "conversion rackets"—devices to convert ordinary income into capital gains and thus elude higher taxes.

Tougher restrictions on gifts, estates and capital gains that can be used to preserve large concentrations of wealth from generation to generation; stricter surveillance of tax exempt foundations and special debt-equity devices that conglomerate corporations use to buy out smaller firms and avoid taxation at the same time.

The objective of all this should be to achieve equity, a fairer distribution of the costs of government, and to rebuild confidence in government.

Basic reform has been talked about and promised so often in the past that it has become almost a ritual. This time it must be made real. To insure that it is, a growing number of senators feel that reform amendments must be attached to the surtax bill or that the bill itself must be held in hostage (the tax would be kept alive through special month to month extensions) until an acceptable reform package emerges.

Crass as this strategy sounds, it makes sense. Reform efforts have floundered too often in the past. The surtax bill provides leverage this time to make at least a good start on reform. There is a special urgency involved, too. Congress is notoriously reluctant to deal with tax matters in an election year. Congressional elections are coming up next year. This means that the time for reform is now.

ENVIRONMENT HEALTH CENTER

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, on June 28, 1969, in a public ceremony, a deed for land, building, and equipment donated by the University of West Virginia and the city of Morgantown, W. Va., was turned over to the Public Health Service. The deed was accepted for the Government of the United States by Charles C. Johnson, Administrator for Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service. His remarks on that occasion indicate the use of this new facility and something of the benefits the Appalachian area will receive from the service. It is one more evidence of how the locality and the Central Government can work together for the assurance of progress. I believe Mr. Johnson's remarks will be of interest to Members of Congress and to our citizens in general, and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY CHARLES C. JOHNSON, JR.

Thank you, Dr. Harlow. I gratefully accept for the United States Government this generous gift from the University, and the people, of West Virginia.

Ladies and gentlemen, the transfer of this deed marks the beginning of a new program of great significance to all the people of Appalachia. In my opinion, it is, moreover, a program with meaning for all the people of the United States.

In a sense, what we are beginning here today should prove, once again, some truths that are fundamental to the American dream. We hope to show that the future can, indeed, redeem the mistakes of the past. We hope to show that man's control over his own destiny includes, at the very least, an

ability to change those circumstances of his life that are themselves the result of human activity—no matter how unalterable or overwhelming these may sometimes appear to be. We hope to prove, as the British statesman, Disraeli, expressed it, that "Men are not the creatures of circumstances; circumstances are the creatures of men."

As it has been remarked, I am a native of the State of Iowa. But, like most Americans, I am a mountaineer at heart. These majestic mountains have entered into the folklore and cultural heritage of all Americans, and have helped to form the heart and character of our whole Nation. Moreover, the wealth of natural resources that has flowed from Appalachia has helped to build an American economy which is the wonder of the entire world.

Perhaps we are beginning today to repay a part of the debt we owe to West Virginia and the other States of Appalachia. For in our haste to exploit certain of the areas resources, we have wasted and destroyed other, equally important, natural treasures, and have been all but indifferent to the preservation of its most precious resource, its people.

Thousands of your men who have gone down into the dust of the mines suffer from black lung; others have been killed or maimed by explosions or cave-ins. Appalachian streams that were once clear and sparkling are polluted by acid run-off. Mountain air once pure and bracing is fouled by smoking slag heaps and fumes from chemical plants and factories. In many places, your hills have been levelled, your unmatched scenery despoiled.

In Appalachia, more perhaps than in any other part of our country, we can see the price which man must pay for heedless and random manipulation of the ecological system. Yet we are paying the price elsewhere too—notably in our great cities, where the quality of life is steadily deteriorating in a morass of environmental problems that seem almost beyond solution.

Throughout the world, we stand at a point in history when man's capacity to enhance or degrade the environment has reached awesome proportions. Yet we have not fully learned to use this capacity for the benefit, rather than the harm, of our own and future generations. We have overwhelmed many of nature's processes for environmental stability and have misused, without knowing it, biological processes upon which the preservation of life depends.

I think it is important to remember, however that the problem of our time is not to choose between a healthful environment and the great benefits made possible by our technological genius and industrial progress. The problem is to assure that we have both. I believe that all over the world, people are beginning to recognize that all the various systems and sub-systems which we devise to maintain ourselves on the planet—systems of agriculture, economics, transportation, education, etc.—that all these should contribute to the *total* health and well-being of the people they were designed to serve. The challenge of our time is to put our science and technology to work to solve the very problems that science and technology have themselves created.

It is to meet this challenge, here in your section of the country, that the new Appalachian Center for Environment Health is being established. We celebrate today the first steps in the construction of a new building. But in a larger sense, we are not here just to dedicate a building site, but rather to dedicate ourselves to the vital goals which it is intended to serve.

Here in these buildings, we expect to bring the best that we have in scientific skill to bear on the *human* problems created by environmental change. Here, we hope to find, in technology, practical, workable solutions for some of the many environmental ills that plague this lovely mountain land. We believe that here in this new Center we can help the people of Appalachia reverse the trend toward environmental destruction that threatens not only their health, but their social, economic and cultural progress as well.

I think I speak for all of us who represent the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service when I say that we share your love for Appalachia and your pride in her wonderful people. With the establishment of this Center, we have become partners with the West Virginia University and with the people of Appalachia in an effort to enhance human health and well-being. I pledge the commitment of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to continuation and expansion of this partnership. We are committed as I believe all of you are—to the proposition that man need not become the pawn of blind technological forces which he himself has set in motion. We believe, indeed, that "men are not the creatures of circumstances," but that "circumstances are the creatures of men."

BRAND NAME DRUGS: DECEPTION TO BOOST PRICES AND CREATE MEDICAL CONFUSION

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, ordinary profit does not seem to satisfy our drug industry. As their prices on essential drugs soar, the elderly and growing families pay the penalty financially. Helplessly, those in desperate daily need of such medication are preyed upon for the sake of greater and ever greater drug company profits.

Drugs are not luxuries. They are essential to health, well-being, and often life itself to so many. It is a degrading spectacle to see them preyed upon when they are in extremis.

For years, drug companies have used brand names for their products, thus giving them an excuse to sell them for much higher profits. Even individual ingredients are assigned special names to give them greater appeal, even when such activity is unwarranted.

Generic names are deliberately ignored or played down, in order to deprive the public of a chance to purchase them at more reasonable rates.

In order to promote sale of these products, drug companies spend vast sums on advertising in all media. Individual patients are reached through mass media. Doctors who prescribe are reached by specialized ads in technical publications. All costs of such activity are eventually borne by patients.

Drug companies constantly arbitrarily raise prices on high-sale, brand-name products. Patients under steady medication are of course hit the hardest. At times of worst stress, the most dependent and vulnerable person is struck hardest in order for a drug company to profit most.

Drugs may be prescribed by physicians by brand or generic name. The latter is a chemical name by which a drug is known and classified. Due to profusion of drugs on the market, doctors often know only a brand name, prescribing accordingly. Often they lack knowledge of generic nature of a drug. Evidence to this effect is overwhelming. Thalidomide, the deforming tranquilizer, was sold for some time after being identified. Brand names disguised it, allowing it to wreak more havoc.

It has recently been estimated that in 1966, our elderly lost some $41.5 million in drug costs because physicians prescribed by brand rather than generic names. Think of what this would have meant to millions of these citizens with their limited incomes.

Our drug industry is a $5 billion annual operation. We cannot afford this profiteering from a major segment of our national economy. Dr. Goddard, former head of FDA, recently indicated that the rate of return in our drug industry is 18 percent on invested capital, compared to 8 to 9 percent in most other areas of endeavor.

Prescription drug costs include a staggering $800 million annual outlay for advertising and promotion, and a claimed research and development outlay of $430 million. Almost $2 spent on ads for each $1 spent on research. Further, the Federal Government is financing through research grants much of the research drug companies are engaged in, and from which they directly benefit.

Requiring that drugs be sold by generic name only could eliminate costly brand-name sales promotion. Physician confusion would be vastly reduced with resultant patient benefit. All companies would be able to offer a product, but it would be a standard product. Doctors could prescribe with far greater knowledge and confidence.

In no way do I aim to endanger physicians' initiative in prescribing. Nor do I wish to inhibit a pharmacist who fills the prescription. If, however, we insure standard methods of labeling and naming, as well as pricing by quality and quantity, we have a fair standard to operate from for benefit of all.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a third in a series of bills to insure attainment of these goals. My first bill, H.R. 7900, introduced on February 27, provided for establishment of a Federal drug compendium listing all prescription drugs under their generic name. It would provide doctors and pharmacists brand name, manufacturer, suppliers, and prices of each drug.

My second measure, H.R. 9562, introduced on March 26, provided for drug coverage under medicare for outpatients, as long as drugs were prescribed under generic names.

The measure I introduce today amends the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to require that labels on all drug containers dispensed to patients bear the generic name of the drug. In cases where there is a combination of drugs, generic names of active ingredients must appear on the label. All down the line, from physician to pharmacist to patient, pertinent facts on a given drug and prescription would be made available.

Mr. Speaker, we have arrived at a point where we must decide whose interest takes precedence. Is it the patient or the drug company whose interests are preeminent? Shall we make it easier for

the physician and pharmacist? Or do we continue to cater to an industry which is already spending vast sums on ads while Government subsidizes much of its research? Shall we allow the elderly to be penalized for the sake of drug company profit? Reform in this area is long overdue.

LOOTING AMERICA—OIL COMPANY STYLE

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I was most gratified to hear the pledge of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee on the urgent matter of tax reform. Certainly it is a fact that all loopholes remain gaping wide and A-OK as of today. No single grouping of tax privileges is more outrageous or unfair to the people of this country than those presently enjoyed by our oil industry.

With this in mind, I have garnered relevant SEC statistics on Federal taxes paid by individual oil companies in 1968. Comparing them with what was paid in 1967 makes highly illuminating reading. I have, therefore, dispatched a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, requesting most respectfully that he place oil industry tax privileges first on the agenda of his committee for purposes of tax reform.

I have included appropriate statistics on taxes paid which have just been mentioned. I offer the text of the letter and these statistics for inclusion in the RECORD for consideration of the rest of the membership of this body:

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Much has been said on the subject of tax reform in recent months. As one who joins you in your desire for meaningful, thorough-going reform, I do not think there is any better starting point than our oil industry and the numerous tax privileges it presently enjoys at expense of the public.

I have taken it upon myself to make a study of Federal tax figures paid by major oil companies in this country during 1967 and 1968. These figures are submitted by law to the Securities and Exchange Commission. All of them have been verified by that agency. I am enclosing a copy of the findings for your consideration.

I cannot adequately express the outrage that one cannot help but feel over this intolerable situation which emerges so clearly. Several illustrations are most enlightening. In 1967, Gulf Oil Corporation earned $955,968,000. It paid $74,142,000 in Federal taxes, 7.8% of its income. In 1968, that same company earned $977,321,000. It paid $8,005,000 in Federal taxes. Its percentage of Federal income taxes is .81%. Mobil paid 4.5% of $594,593,000 in 1967. In 1968, that same company paid 3.3% of $673,739,000.

In 1967, Atlantic Richfield earned $145,259,000 and paid no Federal tax. In 1968, that company earned $240,272,000. It paid $2,999,000 in Federal taxes, which is 1.2% of this staggering income. Best of all, Mr. Chairman, Sinclair Oil earned $101,265,000 in 1968. It paid no Federal tax, and the Federal government owes them a tax credit of $2,747,000.

These are talented people, indeed . . . the proletariat of Dunn and Bradstreet plowing their golden ruts. Such loot deserves some public genuflection. The oil industry makes the Mafia look like a pushcart operation. It is a fourth level of government, and its passionate devotion to old-fashioned virtues, such as greed, is amazing. Mr. Chairman, I regret I have only one Gulf Oil Corporation to give for my country.

Today, our various tax loopholes gape wide open. Through them, professional tax evaders like the oil industry churn like panzers over foot soldiers.

Our tax laws are a labyrinth of fiscal delusion made up of deliberately opaque syntax designed to deceive the layman. Mr. Chairman, such outrages speak for themselves. We are paying foreign taxes for oil companies in the form of foreign tax credits. We are paying for their well drilling expenses. We are paying for their 27½% foreign and domestic oil depletion allowances. We are paying for their phony gas station games and the offshore pollution they cause by their drilling. Only the few benefit. Only the majority pay.

I earnestly urge you to place thorough, complete tax reform of oil industry privilege first on your agenda, with total elimination of the foreign and domestic depletion allowances first on the list.

I thank you for your courtesy.

Sincerely,

BERTRAM L. PODELL,
Member of Congress.

TAXES PAID BY A SELECTED GROUP OF THE NATION'S LARGEST REFINING COMPANIES—1967 AND 1968
[In thousands]

	Net income before tax	Federal tax	Percent	Foreign, some State's tax	Percent	Profit after tax
Standard Oil, New Jersey:						
1967	$2,098,283	$166,000	7.9	$700,000	33.0	$1,232,283
1968	2,303,587	223,999	9.7	802,907	34.8	1,276,681
Gulf:						
1967	955,968	74,142	7.8	303,539	31.8	578,287
1968	977,321	8,005	8.1	342,997	35.1	626,319
Texaco:						
1967	892,986	17,500	1.9	121,100	13.5	754,386
1968	1,019,930	23,800	2.4	160,600	15.8	835,530
Mobil:						
1967	594,593	26,900	4.5	182,300	30.7	385,393
1968	673,739	22,000	3.3	223,500	33.2	428,239
Standard Oil, California:						
1967	513,067	6,000	1.2	85,400	16.6	421,667
1968	569,431	16,700	2.9	100,900	17.7	451,831
Standard Oil, Indiana:						
1967	366,847	74,021	20.2	10,576	2.9	282,250
1968	395,064	74,678	18.8	10,892	2.7	309,494
Shell:						
1967	342,022	44,940	13.1	12,233	3.6	284,849
1968	387,767	63,378	16.3	12,298	3.2	312,091
Cities Service:						
1967	165,289	32,347	19.6	5,105	3.1	127,837
1968	138,613	12,683	9.2	4,594	3.3	121,336
Union:						
1967	163,820	10,400	6.3	8,457	5.2	144,963
1968	164,232	5,955	3.6	7,045	4.3	151,232
Sun:						
1967	146,946	24,700	16.8	13,670	9.3	108,576
1968	227,790	44,290	19.4	19,070	8.4	164,430
Atlantic-Richfield:						
1967	145,259	----------	.0	15,254	10.5	130,005
1968	240,272	2,999	1.2	37,713	15.7	199,560
Marathon:						
1967	138,520	3,700	2.7	60,962	44.0	73,858
1968	155,335	4,350	2.8	67,659	43.6	83,326
Sinclair:						
1967	130,017	10,585	8.1	24,060	18.5	95,372
1968	101,265	−2,747	.0	27,429	27.0	76,583

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT? JAY HANLON'S PERCEPTIVE COMMENTARY

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the problems facing our younger generation today are many and complex. An article appeared recently in the Manchester Union Leader published in Manchester, N.H., regarding one aspect of the problems facing teenagers. The article is a perceptive commentary deserving careful reading by lawmakers, whose laws so often defeat in part at least, their stated purpose.

Jay Hanlon's candid views concerning the summer employment problem facing the young should be carefully read. I commend Mr. Hanlon for his perception and excellent contribution to the cause of sensible legislation. I urge that the Congress and State legislatures read and heed his words—a loud clear call for commonsense and a return to reason:

JAY HANLON'S NOTEBOOK

Anyone who has ever wondered to himself—as I have—"what in the world is the younger generation coming to?" might well ponder the problems facing the younger generation when it comes to finding summer employment.

Said one of my kids the other day: "It almost seems as though no one wants us to work, that they want us to have little or nothing to do all summer so they can criticize us for being lazy and bawl us out when we get into trouble."

With my customary fatherly understanding, I promptly said he was crazy, that there are plenty of jobs available for the kid who really wants to work. And in his usual, respectful filial manner, he said it was me that was crazy and he challenged me to look into the matter.

So I did. And doggone it, he's right! Well, at least he's more right than wrong. Even my quick research shows there are too few steady summer jobs for teenagers, especially those in the 14 to 16 age group.

The villain here is not private enterprise, as you might first suspect. Rather, it is a combination of factors, foremost among them the complexities of state and federal labor laws and minimum wage provisions and, to a lesser extent, insurance companies which have an indirect say in the age of kids to be hired by certain industries.

Said the president of one of the state's largest construction companies: "I'd love to hire teenagers during the summer but my insurance company won't even let me look at a kid under 18. And if I do hire 18-year-olds, unskilled though they are, I have to pay them the same hourly rate I pay skilled workers who are breadwinners. I know it isn't right but that's the way it is."

Said a prominent hotel executive: "We are extremely limited in who we can hire and the hours we can work a kid. The laws as to hours and wages have taken away the necessary flexibility you must have in the hotel industry if you are to work teenagers."

The hotel man also noted with some chagrin that even in this enlightened age of fair employment practices and non-discrimination, that women are still treated as minors in the eyes of labor law which prohibits them from working more than 48 hours.

But getting back to teenagers, the hotel man has a teenager who he would like to employ this summer. "I'd like him to learn the business as I did, but I don't know how I can do it without showing favoritism in the hours he could work."

A State official in the field of employment candidly admits that the state and federal child labor laws "are much too restrictive and are in need of major overhaul." He noted the paradox wherein society expects teenagers to act more like adults yet continues to treat them as kids through its labor laws.

Asked why then he doesn't push for the much-needed reforms, he said, "Let's be practical. I'd get my head shot off by every do-gooder group in the state, claiming I was trying to turn back the clock and exploit little children."

Speaking of child labor, it is noteworthy to reflect on the Dunfey clan whose enterprises now gross some $13 million annually and provide employment for some 2,000 persons. Had today's restrictive child labor laws been in effect—or rigidly enforced—in the mid-1940s when the Dunfey brothers, then teenagers, opened their clam stand at Hampton Beach, it is entirely possible the Dunfey hotel chain would not exist today.

The tragedy in this picture lies in the fact that today's teenagers want to work; they want to be productive, they want to be involved and they want to make money. Indeed many of them must make money if they are to help put themselves through school and college.

Some teenagers call it being relevant. And while I'm not sure just what they mean by that overworked word, if they want to work I'm all for it, whatever their reasons may be.

Yet when they apply for summer jobs all too often they are turned away because our outmoded laws or minimum wage provisions or some other government-decreed regulation or restriction have failed to keep pace with the needs and demands of today's highly competitive business, commerce and industry.

This, of course, only adds to the teenager's list of frustrations, real or imagined, and serves to turn him further away from the so-called Establishment he is forever complaining about.

Additionally, and equally important, it leaves far too many teenagers idle time to reflect on what's wrong with the society that expects them to become responsible citizens, yet denies them the chance to become dues-paying members.

Next time you have occasion to wonder what the younger generation is coming to, you might ask yourself, instead, what are we doing for the younger generation by way of that all-important summer job?

PASSPORT CRISIS 1969

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Morning Record of Meriden, Conn., published on June 28, 1969, an editorial which adds a new dimension to the passport-granting facilities problem.

Citizens in Connecticut wishing to travel abroad this summer have been put to great inconvenience in their attemps to procure passports. As the number of Connecticut applicants for passports has grown, the facilities for issuing passports have been diminished; hence Connecticut applicants and those from the other Northeastern States have been experiencing what the Record calls "unnecessary and intolerable" inconvenience.

The Meriden Record's editorial goes beyond the inconvenience aspect of the passport problem. The paper very properly asks what would be the typical American reaction to such a gigantic snafu occurring annually in a foreign country. The typical American response, the Record points out, would most probably be a quick denunciation of the inability of foreigners to do anything right.

For several years now I have been pressing the State Department to exhibit more of the American traits of ingenuity and efficiency when it comes to the issuance of passports. While advocating the same thing, this editorial puts the case for administrative reform in a persuasively different context. The article follows:

UNNECESSARY AND INTOLERABLE

As it has been doing for years, the Middlesex Superior Court is still accommodating area residents by issuing passports for foreign travel. An earlier report from official sources announced the closing of passport offices in Bridgeport and New Haven, coupled with notification that only one office in Hartford will remain open to serve the entire state. The Middletown court, however, expects to remain open at least until September.

This cut-back announcement provoked prompt protest, spearheaded by newspaper editorials, and the intervention of Congressman John Monagan, who has urged an expansion of passport-granting facilities in the state.

The effects of the closing of such facilities have been felt in New York. New York City passport agency offices, already overcrowded and under-staffed, were swamped this week with applications from persons seeking to go abroad this summer. Among them were applicants from Bridgeport and other Connecticut communities who had turned to New York City for help.

An unidentified official of the Passport Agency in New York called the present situation—which exists on a national scale—a "disgrace." "My experience is that a situation like this has to reach crisis proportions before it gets better," he said. To the thousands of New Yorkers who stood in line for hours awaiting the processing of their applications, and to the Connecticut residents who have had to make appointments weeks in advance at the Hartford issuing office, the situation appears to have already reached crisis proportions.

If such a gigantic snafu occurred in a foreign country. Americans would be quick to denounce it as a typical example of the inability of foreigners to do anything right. But it happens right here in the good old U.S.A., in an affluent, automated, computerized nation which is only a few days away from putting a man on the moon.

For a country whose inhabitants make a fetish of efficiency, such incompetence is intolerable as well as inexcusable. The Passport Office of the State Department should act at once to clear up the mess and to prevent its recurrence.

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION ONE UNIT FOR ORDERLY PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government have long recognized that the National Capital region must be regarded as one unit for orderly planning and economic development. Let us look at the history of such recognition.

In 1966 in a transmittal letter to Congress on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Compact—Public Law 89–774, 80 Stat. 1324—President Lyndon Johnson spoke of the needs of the citizens of the entire Washington metropolitan area.

This is the Congress which promised its citizens of the Nation's Capital a new system of mass transportation. I hope it will also be the Congress which extends that promise to the citizens of the entire Washington Metropolitan Area.

The economic well-being of this region—and the efficient functioning of the government itself—depends more and more each year on adequate mass transportation.

This recognition of the needs of the entire Washington metropolitan area was not new. Congress has many times before recognized that because of the rapid expansion of the Washington area, any attempt to deal with area problems must be done at the regional level. In 1960, Congress passed the Washington Metropolitan Region Development Act:

The Congress hereby declares that, because the District which is the seat of the government of the United States and has now become the urban center of a rapidly expanding Washington Metropolitan Region, the necessity for the continued and effective performance of the functions of the government of the United States at the seat of said government in the District of Columbia, the general welfare of the District of Columbia and the health and living standards of the people residing or working therein and the conduct of industry, trade, and commerce therein require that the development of the District of Columbia and the management of its public affairs shall to the fullest extent practicable be co-ordinated with the development of other areas of the Washington Metropolitan Region and with the management of the public affairs of such other areas, and that the activities of all the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government which may be carried out in, or in relation to, the other areas of the Washington Metropolitan Region shall, to the fullest extent practicable, be co-ordinated with the development of such other areas and with the management of other public affairs; all toward the end that, with the cooperation and assistance of the other areas of the Washington Metropolitan Region, all the areas therein shall be so managed as to contribute effectively toward the solution of the community development problems of the Washington Metropolitan Region on a unified Metropolitan basis.

In this act, the Washington Metropolitan Region Development Act, Congress defined the Washington metropolitan region to include "the District of Columbia, the counties of Montgomery and Prince Georges in the State of Maryland, the counties of Arlington and Fairfax and the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church in the Commonwealth of Virginia—Public Law 86-527, 74 Stat. 224."

The legislative history of this definition goes back to 1924 with the establishment of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. By means of this Commission, Congress attempted "to develop a comprehensive, consistent, and coordinated plan for the National Capital and its environs in the States of Maryland and Virginia, to preserve the flow of water in Rock Creek, to prevent pollution of Rock Creek and the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers, to preserve forest and natural scenery in and about Washington, and to provide for the comprehensive, systematic, and continuous development of park, parkways, and playground systems of the National Capital and its environs"—40 U.S.C. 71(a), June 6, 1924, 43 Stat. 463.

In 1952, the provisions relating to the creation and duties of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission were revised. In restating the purpose of the newly named National Capital Planning Commission, Congress stated that:

The Congress hereby finds that the location of the seat of government in the District of Columbia has brought about the development of a Metropolitan Region extending well into adjoining territory in Maryland and Virginia; that effective comprehensive planning is necessary on a regional basis and of continuing importance to the Federal Establishment; . . . As amended July 19, 1952, c. 949, § 1, 66 Stat. 781.

Here also was included a definition of the National Capital region:

"[R]egion" or "National Capital region" means the District of Columbia; Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland; Arlington, Fairfax, Loudon, and Prince William Counties in Virginia; and all other cities now or hereafter existing in Maryland or Virginia within the geographic area bounded by the outer boundaries of the combined area of said counties. (As amended July 19, 1952, c. 949, § 1, 66 Stat. 781.)

Perhaps the greatest amount of legislation concerning the National Capital region—Washington Metropolitan area—has dealt with transportation. In 1960, in a congressional statement of findings and policy on the National Capital Transportation Act of 1960, Congress stated that:

The Congress finds that an improved transportation system for the National Capital region (1) is essential for the continued and effective performance of the functions of the government of the United States, for the welfare of the District of Columbia, for the orderly growth and development of the National Capital region, and for the preservation of the beauty and dignity of the Nation's Capital; (2) requires the planning on a regional basis of a unified system of freeways, parkways, express transit service on exclusive rights-of-way, and other major transportation facilities: . . . Pub. L. 86-669, Title 1, § 102, July 14, 1960, 74 Stat. 537.

And also:

The Congress therefore declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government, in cooperation with the State and local governments of the National Capital region, and making full use of private enterprise whenever appropriate, to encourage and aid in the planning and development of a unified and co-ordinated transportation system for the National Capital region. Pub. L. 86-669, Title 1, § 102, July 14, 1960, 74 Stat. 537.

As with other legislation dealing with the region, the statute provided a definition of the National Capital region with the same geographic area as had been provided by the act of July 19, 1952, which was previously cited. To further the intent of the Transportation Act of 1960, Congress approved the regional compact for mass transportation negotiated by representatives of Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia. In the preamble to the joint resolution of September 15, 1960, concerning the compact, it was stated that:

Divided regulatory responsibility is not conducive to the development of an adequate system of mass transportation for the entire Metropolitan Area, which is in fact, a single integrated, urban community.

And further:

This Compact adequately protects the National interest in mass transit service in the Metropolitan Area and in the Nation's Capital and properly accommodates the national and state interest in and obligations toward mass transit in the Metropolitan Areas. (Preamble to Act of September 15, 1960.)

In the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, further recognition was given to the idea of a single integrated, urban community. By stating the purpose behind the establishment of a coordinated regional transportation system, Congress emphasized that the problems were not limited to any one section or segment of the National Capital region:

A coordinated system of rail rapid transit, bus transportation service, and highways is essential in the National Capital region for the satisfactory movement of people and goods, the alleviation of present and future traffic congestion, the economic welfare and vitality of all parts of the Region, the effective performance of the functions of the United States Government located within the Region, the comfort and convenience of visitors to the Region, and the preservation of the beauty and dignity of the Nation's Capital. (Pub. L. 89-173, § 2, Sept. 8, 1965, 79 Stat. 663.)

In reviewing this mass of congressional legislation for the region, we must also look to the courts to find out what, if any interpretation, has been applied to these statutes. In the recent case of *D.C. Transit System* v. *Washington Metro. Area Transit Comm'n* (376 F.2d 765), a case decided by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the court interpreted congressional approval of the transit compact of 1961 as an election by Congress to treat the National Capital region as a geographic entity.

When Congress consented to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Regulation Compact in 1961, it elected to treat the Metropolitan Area of Washington as a geographic unit. (376 F.2d 765, 767 (1965).)

Therefore, by means of executive, legislative, and judicial acts, the National Capital region has been dealt with as a geographic entity on such matters as transportation, water supply and sewage disposal, parks and recreation areas, relocation of Government agencies, and in general, those areas which in reality demand regional action.

Mr. Speaker, if the Federal Government has determined that the National Capital region must be treated as a unit in the areas I have listed, what sense does it make to limit commercial banks in the District of Columbia to the 61 square miles of the District? I do not think it makes sense, and I am pleased to join in the introduction of legislation to provide for more banking competition in the National Capital region.

RAISING THE INTEREST ON SAVINGS BONDS

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have expressed my feeling that the interest on series E and H bonds had to be raised if those patriotic Americans who have been buying such bonds, usually systematically under payroll plans, were to receive equitable treatment from our Government. The clear need to increase the return on such bonds was succinctly stated in a recent editorial of the Miami Herald which I here quote in full:

It's unfair, and nearly everyone knows it. Persons and institutions who can afford to lend the Treasury tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars can earn 'rent' of 6½ per cent or more. Small investors buying Series E and H bonds through payroll deductions get only 4¼ per cent if they let Uncle use their money for a full seven years.

Both groups are making loans to the federal government. Both should receive a fair return.

The Treasury recognizes the inequity, according to Rep. Dante Fascell and is reviewing the whole complex setup. Action is in order, as we suggested in these columns recently.

Management of the swollen national debt isn't easy. Neither is the effort to control inflation, which gets a big lift when individuals save money instead of spending it. Still, if wage earners are expected to continue buying savings bonds through payroll deductions, the Treasury will have to give them a better deal.

An editorial in today's Wall Street Journal indicates that increasing the interest rate from 4¼ to 5 percent would make U.S. savings bonds so attractive as investments that a greater portion of the national debt would be financed at the low rate of 5 percent. I agree with all parts of the editorial except its headline, "The United States Is a Poor Investment." In my book the United States is never a poor investment. The full purport of the editorial, however, which I am inserting, explains what its writer means by the headline.

The Treasury several months ago assured me that it was aware of the need to increase the interest rates on savings bonds and that it was considering proposing legislation for that purpose. This information was given to me in my capacity as chairman of the Legal and

Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations because the subcommittee had been considering the economic problems raised by the ever-increasing numbers of conversions of such bonds by their purchasers. I was, therefore, delighted by the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury on Tuesday confirming that the administration will ask that interest paid on U.S. savings bonds be raised. I trust that submission of the administration's legislative proposals, already long overdue, now will be hastened.

The editorial from the Wall Street Journal follows:

THE UNITED STATES IS A POOR INVESTMENT

It is, at any rate, for those people who put their money in U.S. savings bonds. Awareness of the situation appears to be growing, since savings bond redemptions last month exceeded sales for the seventh month in a row.

The trouble, of course, is the legally fixed 4¼% interest rate, a rate well below what individuals can obtain at savings and loan associations and elsewhere. The Treasury wants Congress to raise the ceiling to 5%, a rate that would be more competitive.

When savings bonds are competitive, they offer perhaps the least inflationary way to finance a portion of the Federal debt. That's a matter that is of prime concern right now.

While the Federal budget situation has improved in recent months, the debt is still very much a burden. It's about time for the Government to offer the public an incentive more solid that patriotism for helping to carry the load.

HIGHWAY SAFETY COMMENTARY No. 6

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to continue my series of commentaries on the need for highway safety. The shocking number of highway accidents, which over the Memorial Day and the Fourth of July weekends claimed more than 1,200 American lives, is accepted all too complacently by many citizens and public officials. Public apathy and governmental neglect cannot duck the fact that in 1968 alone, more than 55,000 people lost their lives as a result of traffic accidents.

In analyzing the problem of highway safety, three different aspects come into play. First is the driver. Second is the vehicle, which the driver must control—barring mechanical failure, which could cause the driver to become manipulated by the vehicle. Third is the the line of travel, or the road. The condition of the road also plays an important role in the ability of driver and car to operate properly.

Clearly, safety standards should be determined in such a way as to take into consideration the interdependent nature of these three factors. This is not always done. Standards for highway safety are determined by three independent agencies. The Bureau of Public Roads adopts or concurs in acceptable standards of highway design and traffic control devices. The National Highway Safety Bureau prescribes vehicle safety standards for almost all motor vehicles and is developing Federal highway safety standards, which eventually will be used by the States to define many characteristics of drivers. The Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety develops and enforces standards through regulations which apply to the safety of operation and equipment and the qualifications and hours of service of drivers of motor vehicles in foreign and interstate commerce, and the transportation of hazardous materials.

The compatibility of the safety standards developed for the driver, the vehicle, and the road, is questionable when we realize that these three interrelated aspects of automobile safety are being regulated in such a diverse manner.

To emphasize this very important point, I wish to include for the benefit of my colleagues the following study done by the National Transportation Safety Board. The study concerns the compatibility of standards for drivers, vehicles, and highways. The examples that are found in the appendix of this study attest to the incompatibility between the safety standards for the driver, the vehicle, and the road. The study follows:

A STUDY OF COMPATIBILITY OF STANDARDS FOR DRIVERS. VEHICLE, AND HIGHWAYS

This study considers the problems of everyday traffic situations in which the interrelationships of all elements of the traffic safety system—drivers, vehicles, and the highway environment—are not adequately described by existing standards. The results of incompatibility of standards are described and interpreted in terms of existing problems and future difficulties in achieving a systems view of highway operations. Incompatibility of standards is seemingly a technical problem but it is much more. It contributes to (1) confusing safety decisions (2) the failing of the elements to operate safely within the system and (3) retarding advanced development. This adds up to traffic accidents and the loss of lives. Incompatibility arises from the wide variety of organizations which create and influence standards and the variety of their goals.

The extent of possible coordination of standards available to the Federal Highway Administrator is quite broad. He exerts statutory authority or other forms of leadership over most of the standards or other technical descriptions which define performance of all three elements of traffic safety—the driver, the vehicle, and the highway. The Bureau of Public Roads adopts or concurs in acceptable standards of highway design and traffic control devices, and compliance with these standards is now a condition for the receipt of Federal aid for much of the most advanced highway construction programmed or underway in the United States today.

The Bureau of Public Roads is the leading user of these standards, which are also employed by many other jurisdictions. The National Highway Safety Bureau prescribes mandatory vehicle safety standards applicable to almost all motor vehicles. It has published 16 Federal Highway Safety Program Standards, with others in the developmental stage, which are being used by the States to define many characteristics of drivers and as guidelines for their highway safety programs. The Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety is responsible for the promulgation and enforcement of regulations which apply to the safety of operation and equipment and the qualifications and hours of service of the drivers of motor vehicles in foreign and interstate commerce and the transportation of hazardous materials.

The standards considered in this study are those which in some way prescribe the performance of a part of the driver-vehicle-highway system. These prescriptions take many different forms and are called by other names as well as "standards." One form of standard, for example, is the Snellen eye chart used to test the vision capabilities of drivers. These charts imply, but do not describe, the ability of the driver to see the other parts of the system, such as signs and traffic controls or vehicle instruments. Another form of "standard" is drawings showing preferred layout of highway intersections from which the types of movement and maneuvers a vehicle and its driver will encounter could be determined, and the directions of necessary visibility analyzed. Descriptions of standard instrumented dummies which represent the human body in crash injury tests are another type of standard. These dummies can be used in standard tests which relate the stresses felt by the body to the speed of impact. We are not concerned here with descriptions or standards which are internal to one element of the system, such as the strength of concrete in the pavement, the voltage used for vehicle lights, or standards for threaded fasteners or the driver's eyeglass prescription.

These standards and descriptions, when assembled, constitute the primary language in which the combined safe operation of the driver, the vehicle, and the highway is described, analyzed, or controlled. The standards are used by engineers in designing highways and vehicles and by maintenance men in renewing them. To the degree that this language of the standard describes the working relationships between drivers, vehicles, and highways, it makes the operation understandable and controllable. The fact that standards must serve to interrelate drivers, vehicles, and highways, as parts of an operating system, is illustrated by four examples in the appendices of this report. Example 1 (Windshield Visibility and Traffic Signing) explains how a description of visibility through the windshield in a vehicle safety standard is incompatible with the method of specifying in a traffic manual the placement of traffic signs. The incompatibility prevents the resulting unsafe operation of vehicles at intersections from being obvious to the traffic engineer or the vehicle engineer when they make their design decisions.

The second example (Driver Vision Capability and Traffic Signing Legibility) shows the lack of any relationship between specifications for drivers' vision requirements used by driver licensing agencies and standards for traffic sign lettering used by highway departments. This obscures the significance of the interrelationship of sign placement, allowable speeds, and State vision requirements, creating a potential hazard through unrealistic sign placement.

The third example (Rearview Mirror Visibility and Geometric Design of Highways) shows how the vehicle standards for visibility through the rearview mirror, side windows, outside rearview mirror, and standards for geometric design of highways are stated in different terms, preventing certain direct comparisons which would immediately reveal the hazards involved in certain highway situations which vehicles cannot meet. Compatible standards would point to the design alternatives for resolving the hazards.

The fourth example (Compatibility of Vehicle Design Standards and Highway Design Standards) indicates the existing gap between the methods of describing the ability of vehicles to withstand crashes with minimal injuries to their occupants and specifications for highway crash barriers into which the vehicles will crash. The specifications of vehicles in terms of crash behavior of parts and the specifications of barriers in terms of resistance to crashes of a narrow range of vehicles are still widely separated. The initial problem of compatibility is to insure that the test methods of

the near future will someday make the results comparable. When that is achieved, it will be possible definitively to reduce injuries in a vehicle which crashes into barriers through coordinated requirements of vehicle and barrier standards.

These four examples reveal present and future problems in safety, but the *incompatibility of standards also influences operational efficiency of highway systems.* For example, the problems of traffic sign placement and of uncoordinated visibility conditions in merging lead to congestion as well as to accidents. The confusion of uncoordinated sign sizes, vision requirements, and speed can lead not only to drivers passing a desired turnoff but to accidents.

The problem caused by incompatible standards can severely inhibit future development of the Nation's highway system. There is an increasing tendency among system designers to consider the traffic system as a whole and to define carefully the boundaries of operation in which the driver, the vehicle, and the highway operate. For example, the proposed Century Expressway concept [1] seeks to raise safe vehicle operating speeds in a logical way by establishing a special class of drivers, vehicles, and highways. Operations are then planned for efficiency at high speed, and safety will be achieved by defining operations according to known conditions. The New York State Safety Car system concept sought to establish types of vehicles according to existing highway and street environments and a known range of variations in drivers. These vehicles would operate most efficiently and with highest safety over a specified range of highway environment and driver conditions. The vehicle would be subject to operating restrictions when used in an environment for which it was not designed.

The New York Safety Car Feasibility Study reported one of the problems of incompatibility of standards, as it related to future vehicle design. "It is well-recognized that the driver, the road, the other named factors are only poorly defined from the standpoint of safety performance at present. Nevertheless, the vehicle's performance cannot be defined except in relation to these other factors. The program will attempt to use existing definitions, but will necessarily have to create some new definitions. These definitions are intended to be stated in terms of performance wherever possible, *since it is only in terms of mutually compatible definitions of performance that the different elements of a traffic system can be assembled and seen as an operational system.* Definitions based on design or construction always require an intermediate step of interpretation before they can be used to relate one part of the traffic system to another . . ." [2] Emphasis in original.)

The development of a framework for compatibility in these standards is urgent. New standards or technical descriptions for drivers, vehicles, and highways are being rapidly developed by many agencies without organized attention to their compatibility with standards for all other parts of the system. Thus, the number of standards which will someday have to be changed, is increasing. Further, the need to understand more directly the operating interrelationships is increasing because the range of characteristics of the system is increasing. Speed capabilities of vehicles on the roads have increased, but congestion (zero speed) on high-speed roads also seems to be increasing. The range of vehicle sizes and weights is tending to increase. Larger and heavier vehicles are being advocated and, at the same time, very small and lightweight vehicles are entering the system.

The task of developing compatibility in these standards is a technical problem, but also a problem in organization and authority. There are estimated to be thousands of standards or descriptions which are in some way useful in interrelating driver, vehicle, and highway. It may be eventually necessary to change tests or measurements in many of these standards. This cannot be done overnight, but it must be done eventually if substantial inefficiency and loss of safety are to be avoided.

Present standards arise from the many groups concerned with portions of the driver-vehicle-highway system. Some of these groups outside FHWA include the American Association of State Highway Officials, Institute of Traffic Engineers, International Association of Chiefs of Police, National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, National Association of County Officials, American Municipal Association, Society of Automotive Engineers, American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, American Medical Association, National Safety Council, and the United States of America Standards Institute; the National Bureau of Standards and the General Services Administration which are within the Federal Government.

In general, it has not been a conscious goal of these sources to create descriptions that can facilitate integrating functions of driver, vehicle, and highway into an operating system. Rather, they have been concerned with other valid problems such as adding more standards, creating uniformity of the same type of standard on a national basis, and deciding the degree of safety warranted in a standard. These problems do not produce coordination between different kinds of standards.

There is active liaison and consultation among many of these groups, but liaison and consultation have not provided a sufficient relationship to insure coordination among autonomous standardizing agencies having different goals and interests and separated from one another geographically. One of the most important sources of highway standards, the American Association of State Highway Officials, states the role of its standards thus:

"The question arises as to whether the changes herein to update the Blue Book, after a period of a decade, are bold or radical enough to reflect sufficient vision so that highways constructed in rural areas with this book as a guide will be fully adequate for the life of the highway. The answer is that the contents are based on the facts and trends as they were found. To design highways for the future is not the province of the maker of guides and standards but rather that of the designer himself, who in the planning and design stages, must choose values for those elements which are basic to highway design from the data available to him and the trends which reveal those values . . . The 1954 Blue Book proved to be a valuable tool and served highway engineers well. It is hoped that this updated Blue Book will be equally serviceable." [3]

This role may seem adequate to highway interests in relation to the practical problems of highway construction as they are seen today by the highway building professions. The words do not actively consider the needs or goals of other parts of the system, however. Standards must support the vitally necessary coordinated operational systems view of highway transportation or they may slow the development of future concepts.

The department of Transportation has often employed or approved the use of standards originated by private organizations in order to fulfill its highway responsibilities. With these standards comes the technical framework wihch reflects the approach taken by the originating organization and may or may not provide for new situations. The need for compatible technical standards and descr ptions used by the Bureaus and Offices within DOT is implied by the mission assigned to DOT. The significant missions are to:

(1) provide leadership in the identification and solutions of transportation problems;

(2) stimulate technological advances in transportation; and

(3) facilitate the development of a coordinated transportation service.

DOT does not have full regulatory authority in all transportation areas, but it does have various functions of leadership and initiative in all areas.

It is clear that this type of coordination will require the development of new and different relationships between FHWA and the standards-writing agencies. It is possible that some changes of direction are needed in research or the employment of research funds to determine the full scope of desirable compatibility.

It is also apparent as a practical consideration that some period of time will be required to develop coordination of standards and to develop organized communications between the numerous independent standard-setting organizations. A technique for dealing with this delay is needed during the interim. The examples in this study show that it is possible to create interim transitional definitions based upon existing technical knowledge which will enable the linking of a number of existing standards in a compatible manner by defining their relationship. Such transitional definitions could be the subject of technical attention through a coordinated effort within the Federal Highway Administraiton. Other standardizing agencies could be consulted.

An example of an interim transitional definition will best illustrate the point that is being made here. In example No. 2 on Driver Vision Compatibility and Traffic Sign Legibility (see Appendix), it is shown that charts or tables can be developed for a given sign that will relate the distance such a sign can be seen by persons with various specified visual acuity, and the amount of warning time that will need to be provided at various speeds to enable the performance of required maneuvers. As a first approximation, these charts could be calculated as suggested in example No. 2. Traffic signs can be classified according to their primary purpose (e.g., regulatory or informational), or as to their letter or symbol size, and given classification numbers which would refer to a specific chart or table. The chart or table would set forth the detailed specifications for the installation of signs of each classification. The charts or tables could be made available as part of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways or other such technical publications. In this particular case, the interim transitional definition would require nothing more than the preparation of a chart or table and its adoption by the Federal Highway Administration as authorized.

In light of the need for compatible standards, the Safety Board makes the following recommendations:

1. That the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration work with a view to having all new standards for drivers, vehicles, and highways developed or prescribed or approved by the Bureau of Public Roads, the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety, and the National Highway Safety Bureau compatible in all aspects and that existing standards are brought into operational compatibility as soon as possible. Such compatibility should be described in terms of operational performance of drivers, vehicles, and highways in the highway system and make more apparent the interrelated effects determined by the standards.

2. That the Federal Highway Administration assert leadership among such standardizing or standards-influencing organizations as the American Association of State High-

Footnotes at end of article.

way Officials, Institute of Traffic Engineers, International Association of Chiefs of Police National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances, National Association of County Officials, American Municipal Association, Society of Automotive Engineers, American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, Vehicle Equipment Safety Commission, American Medical Association, National Safety Council, and others to take the necessary steps so that standards for drivers, vehicles, and highways originating within these organizations will be technically compatible. This effort should include a detailed review of the communication and field of responsibility factors which may determine the technical framework of standards. The review should recommend steps by the Federal Highway Administration that may be necessary to insure compatibility of future standards.

3. That, as an intermediate step, until the time when compatibility of standards is obtained, FHWA develop technical definitions of an interim transitional nature to bridge the gaps of incompatibility among existing standards used by the various Bureaus of FHWA. Such interim transitional definitions may be employed to assist the understanding of the relationships between rules, regulations, specifications, and other documents as needed to insure the coordinated safe operation of the driver-vehicle-highway system.

APPENDIX

Example 1. Windshield visibility and traffic signing

The first example for the need for technical coordination of standards to provide a completely defined system is in the area of windshield visibility and traffic signing. The National Highway Safety Bureau describes the angular visibility through vehicle windshields in terms of vertical and lateral angles. These angles are employed to describe requirements for windshield defrosting and defogging systems [4] and windshield wiping and washing systems.[5] In the case of defrosting and defogging systems, certain angular zones must be cleared after a prescribed period of operation. In the case of wiping and washing systems, the windshild wipers must clear angular zones which are defined in the same manner employed to define defrosted and defogged zones. In both cases, the angles of visibility are determined in relation to the driver and do not consider the variations in visibility of roadside objects created by changes in driver eye height, which is not subject to a standard. This makes it difficult to analyze the visibility of signs and traffic signals when establishing the locations of these devices, since the eye height can range from as low as 3 feet for a small car to over 7 feet for a bus or 8 or 9 feet for some trucks.

On the highway side of the standards problem, the locations of signs and signals are defined in terms of horizontal and vertical distances from locating points at the surface of the pavement. For example, consider the traffic signal problem. The *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways*,[6] concurred in by the Federal Highway Administrator, defines the height of a traffic signal in terms of distance to the bottom of the signal housing above the pavement grade. The maximum height is 17 feet, and this requires that a driver must be able to see to a minimum height of approximately 20 feet in order to view the usual three indications (i.e. red, amber, green). The transverse location of these signal faces is defined in terms of linear distance from the edge of the pavement. The minimum requirement is that the signal shall be no more than 10 feet off the edge of the pavement.

These dimensions are operationally related to the location of highway stop lines because drivers must be able to see the traffic signals when their vehicles are halted at the stop lines. In the same Manual, the stop line locations are defined in terms of the distance from the nearest edge of the intersecting roadway. Where there is a crosswalk, the stop lines are ordinarily placed 4 feet in advance of the crosswalk.

If there is no crosswalk, the stop lines should be placed no more than 30 feet from the nearest edge of the intersecting roadway. The Manual does not require the use of a stop line, but makes the stop line optional. Where there is no stop line, motorists normally tend to stop at various locations a few feet from the edge of the intersecting roadway.

These two methods of definition, one angular and the other linear, do not prevent analysis of operating conditions, but they make such analysis very difficult. An analytical placement of a stop line would require not only knowledge of the windshield defrosting and defogging system standard, but also the use of trigonometric calculation and the determination of whether visibility was provided at the contemplated location for all extremes of the vehicular standard. This would require a rather complex analysis.

Not only does this incompatibility imply increased workload for the traffic engineer, but it appears that the difficulty of relating the two standards may have contributed to an existing inadequacy in operational visibility. For example, under the Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 103 for Windshield Defrosting and Defogging Systems, a vehicle which has been in operation for 40 minutes will meet the standard if the windshield is sufficiently cleared to provide an upward angle of visibility of 7°. (See Table I, Motor Vehicle Safety Standard 104, (1969).) It can be shown by calculation that for a vehicle in which the driver's eye height is 55 inches above the ground, this standard would not insure that a traffic signal which meets the standard of the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* could be seen at any point closer than 126 feet from the traffic signal. At any closer point, a driver would be required to move from his normal seated position in order to see the traffic signal. This distant location at 126 feet is much farther from the traffic signal than the stop line would be placed at allowable locations in the Manual. The standards do not reveal that the driver must move or indicate what movement would be required.

In the lateral direction the same standard for defrosting and defogging indicates an angle of 16° visibility to the left is assured after 40 minutes of driving. Here calculation shows that the driver would have to be located at least 56 feet from the allowable traffic signal location in order to see the traffic signal from his normal seated position. This location in the street is also much farther from the traffic light than is contemplated by the *Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices*. Again, the standards do not reveal the problem.

This form of incompatibility also applies to visibility when windshield wipers must be used, with exactly the same problems.

The practical operating difficulty which arises from the confluence of these incompatible standards is the following. When windshield wipers or defrosting units are in operation and an automobile approaches an intersection on a red signal, the driver will normally stop at the stop line. At that point, he is already well within the zone from which either the overhead traffic signal or a traffic signal located to the left could not be seen from the normal seated position. In order to detect the changes of signals, it is necessary for the driver to lean far to the right, downward or forward to a degree that is not specified or determinable from the standards. If the traffic engineer foresees this difficulty, he can forestall it by placing enough additional traffic signals so that at least one can be seen through the cleared angle of the windshield. However, there is nothing in the standards of the traffic control devices manual nor in the vehicle standards which would allow the traffic engineer to compare directly the performance of the traffic signals. He would have to analyze the vehicle safety standards, select the applicable angle for a variety of visual conditions, and make trigonometric calculations for each possible location of a traffic signal which might solve the problem.

A problem of this type can be resolved by studying the respective standards and writing additional definitions which describe the performance of the various locations of the signals as related to the motor vehicle standards. These might be called interim transitional definitions. For example, descriptive charts could be furnished with each traffic signal to guide its installation based upon the visibility standards. Such charts would be prepared for both overhead and side locations and would indicate the minimum normal visibility distance as a characteristic of the signal location for a given motor vehicle safety standard. The development of a chart would also require a restatement of the Motor Vehicle Safety Standard so that the visibility statement includes the factor of variable eye height of the driver. Thus it is seen that in order to understand the operational implications of the highway and the vehicle safety standards, it is necessary to study their effects in specific operational situations and, in this case, to revise the standards so that the effects can be directly visualized to guide practical decisions. This can be accomplished by coordinative liaison among those responsible in establishing these standards.

Example 2. Driver vision capability and traffic signing legibility

The second example for the need for technical coordination of standards to provide a completely defined system is in the area of standards for driver vision capability and traffic signing legibility. What is involved is the difficulty in integrating such factors as (1) requirements of driver vision testing, including variations among the States; (2) traffic sign letter heights and sizes: (3) placement of signs relative to highway features; and (4) allowable speeds. The lack of definitions coordinated in an operational system makes it unnecessarily difficult to analyze these factors at highway locations, and problems are created.

The Federal authority to prescribe Highway Safety Program Standards may, in the future, encompass minimum requirements for driver vision to be employed by the States. Thus, the study of these factors is an appropriate Federal problem. An examination of the 1967 vision requirements for motor vehicle operators in all States revealed that the minimum visual acuity required varied from 20/40 to 20/70. This form of driver vision standard is universal, but it describes vision in terms of comparison of the subject driver with other drivers, not directly in terms of what letter sizes would be needed at what distances in order to insure that letters of the signs could be read. Highway personnel who place signs are thus unable to consider the range of driver acuity in the same form as that employed to licensed drivers. Signing practices originate in handbooks and manuals developed on a national basis.

It is difficult to describe in these manuals the variations in vision requirements among States or different speed limits. In some States, vision requirements are not uniform within the State. For example, in some States, visual acuity must be at least 20/40 without glasses but only 20/70 with glasses. Thus, several States now license some drivers who are unable to detect words on signs until they are 43 percent closer to the sign than other drivers licensed in the same

Footnotes at end of article.

States. These drivers will therefore have less time to react to traffic signs, not only in their own State, but in States where more stringent visual acuity standards apply.

In addition to the variations in visual acuity, the States also have a variety of speed limits. Some of the States having very high speed limits also employ the lowest standard for visual acuity while, conversely, some States having the lowest speed limits, have the highest standard of visual acuity. Drivers do not, of course, operate only in their own States.

These are apparent inconsistencies, and well-known. The point here, however, is that the significance of these differences among States in highway operations is difficult to explain and analyze because the different standards for driver vision, traffic sign letter height, size, and placement are technically incompatible. The nationally distributed manuals [7] do not attempt to account for these differences.

On the highway side of the standards problem, the operational requirement for safety is to know the time of advance warning provided by a specific sign under conditions where the speed limit and driver vision capability are given. If standards allowing such comparisons were available, it would be immediately clear as to what operational hazard may result when low-vision drivers from other States operates under sign placements established for local speed and vision requirements. An example will illustrate, *The Manual for Signing and Pavement Marking of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways*, concurred in by the Bureau of Public Roads, requires the use of an EXIT (XX) M.P.H. sign where it is necessary to indicate a lower speed on an exit ramp. The Manual requires that the sign shall be mounted on the right-hand side of the ramp roadway just beyond the gore, with the exit speed indicated by the sign being the safe speed as determined by the conditions of the exit road at each individual location. Sign size, along with letter and numeral sizes, are pictorially illustrated in the Manual. The aforementioned EXIT (XX) M.P.H. sign is required to be 48 by 60 inches. The critical portion of the sign, the numerical speed indication, is required to be 16 inches in height. Let us assume that the exit requires a 20 m.p.h. sign located on a 60 m.p.h. Federal-Aid expressway and that this location is in a State where 20/70 vision is allowed legally (visiting drivers will have 20/70 vision in any case).

A motorist having 20/20 vision [8] is, according to the Snellen standard, able to read the 16-inch numerals indicating the required safe speed at a point 920 feet from the sign, as shown by a calculation based on the Snellen chart definition. For 20/70 vision, this distance is reduced to 263 feet. Thus, the driver having 20/70 vision, traveling at the highest legally allowed speed of 60 m.p.h. at this location, has 3 seconds for perception, reaction, and braking to reduce his speed from 60 m.p.h. to the posted ramp speed of 20 m.p.h. At this point, he is well within the zone where he does not have the necessary distance available to him to complete safely the functions of perception, reaction, and braking. This does not mean that the operations at these exits are all unsafe, because drivers do not rely entirely on signs as indications of slower speed. It does mean that the placement of the sign does not provide assurance that it is adequate under actually existing conditions.

A problem of this type in a State can be resolved by studying the respective standards, assuming a national visual acuity requirement, and writing additional descriptive definitions which rate the performance of signs based upon visibility distance at a given speed. One method would be the creation of a so-called interim transitional definition that would coordinate the Snellen chart with sign heights by the use of charts. A more advanced approach to a coordinated standard could account for driver reaction time. As with the previous example of traffic signal placement, it is seen that in order to design operations properly in a certain traffic situation, it would be necessary to apply only the signing standard and the highway speed limit to determine the appropriate location of the sign.

Example 3. Rearview mirror visibility and geometric design of highways

Operational difficulties of significant proportions are implied by conceptual incompatibility between the standard for rearview mirror [9] visibility and allowable forms of geometric highway design adopted by the Bureau of Public Roads as suitable for the Federal-Aid Highway System. The Federal-Aid Highway System and the Interstate System not only allow, but frequently employ, entry of vehicles into traffic lanes at such angles that visibility of approaching vehicles is not assured by the Federal rearview mirror requirements or by other requirements for vision directly through windows.

Figure 1 and Figure 2 (figures not printed in the RECORD) show several of the types of intersection design allowable on the Federal Highway System in which vehicles must merge into another lane or perform a weaving maneuver while potentially being overtaken by traffic approaching from the left or right rear. These Figures are examples only, and many other illustrations are shown in *A Policy on Geometric Design of Rural Highways*.[10]

Figure 1 shows weaving sections in which vehicles transfer from one road to another by crossing all lanes from the left to right to left. Figure 2 shows types of rotary interchanges in which vehicles must enter lanes tangentially from the right. In dual rotary roadway (Type D, Figure 2), a vehicle must cross a lane in which traffic may be approaching from the left rear. These traffic maneuvers are acceptable on all Federal-Aid Highways. Tangential entries are allowable on the Interstate System, and in fact are the normal method of entry to high-speed lanes on that System. These geometric design policies state standard conditions which must be met by vehicles. However, there are no numerical descriptions that can be related to vehicle vision.

The other type of standard is the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 111 which specifies "requirements for rearview mirrors to provide the driver with a clear and reasonably unobstructed view to the rear." This standard requires an inside rearview mirror which provides the driver a view to the rear of at least 20°. The line of sight, however, may be partially obscured by seated occupants or by head restraints. Since the degree of obscuration is indefinite, almost any proportion of obscuration is allowable under the standard. In practice, in such vehicles as station wagons, the obscuration may approach 100 percent, so that an outside mirror on the driver's side is also required. This standard provides a view having a horizontal angle such that all points up to 8 feet out from a tangent plane 35 feet behind the driver's eyes can be seen. Again, the line of sight may be partially obscured by rear body or fender contours. The meaning of the word "partially" is not definite. The standard speaks of linear dimensions related to the vehicle, but analysis of the position of the point which must be seen shows that it approximates an angle of vision to the left rear of 13° leftward from the axis of travel of the vehicle. This means that the driver cannot reliably see a car to his left rear in the outside mirror until his vehicle has turned sufficiently so that it is within about 10° of the axis of the lane with which he seeks to merge.

Now let us see what happens. If the driver approaching the lane cannot see approaching traffic in his inside rearview mirror (and this is normally the situation), he looks to the left rear through the side windows of the vehicle by twisting his head and upper body to the left rear. While doing this, it is extremely difficult to see forward. The view to the left rear under this circumstance through the windows is not assured under the windshield defrosting and defogging standard [11] nor the windshield wiping and washing standard,[12] nor is there assurance that the outside rearview mirror will be operative in weather. A driver who wishes to be assured of adequate vision in this direction during merging must roll down his window whenever the glass is obscured. At that time, those inside the car will be subjected to whatever wind or weather may enter through that window.

It is very evident that this situation is not only undefined by the standards, but under weather conditions, is downright hazardous whenever the side windows are partially obscured. Drivers may, in this circumstance, come to a complete stop in a lane which does not require stopping, and they may be approached by other vehicles from the rear proceeding at reasonable merging speeds. When a driver seeking to merge is second in line among cars seeking to merge, he must simultaneously observe the merge and the car ahead to determine whether its driver will be successful in merging or will stop. It is virtually impossible under these circumstances to maintain adequate vigilance both forward and to the left rear.

The point in this analysis is not that the situation is hazardous, for anyone who has attempted to merge under these circumstances, in an automobile of current manufacture, is generally aware that a hazard is present. The point is that the standards used to describe the vehicle's vision capability and the standards which describe the road situation are not compatible and do not directly reveal the shortcoming.

It is theoretically impossible for highway intersection designs to be characterized by standards language in terms of specific requirements for vision from vehicles necessary to negotiate the intersection safely. For example, a tangential entry into a traveled lane might require angular vision from the driver's location of 90° in both directions from the axis of travel of the vehicle. Such a requirement, of course, would be immediately appreciated as very difficult to obtain by current rearview systems and efforts to design a better system could be begun on a logical basis. On the other hand, if it is not possible to provide vision from the side windows or rearview vision reliably in bad weather, the highway entry might be designed and standardized to allow merges with only forward vision through the windshield.

An example of a description which can be employed to develop a transitional definition is the description of "Field of Vision of the Driver" found in FHWA Notice of Proposed Consumer Information Regulation issued 12/10/68. This description includes a chart which characterizes blindspots of rear vision. Classes of blind areas could be established in this chart and used as a basis for classifying highway intersection designs according to whether the design did or did not require visibility in the blind areas. If designs which meet the predominant blind area classes are impractical, then it is immediately obvious that a superior system or a higher standard of vision is required on the vehicles.

It is not the Safety Board's objective to indicate any specific solution to this problem, but to point out that compatibility of standards is necessary in order to conceive fully of the problem that is raised.

Example 4. Compatibility of vehicle design standards and highway design standards

Another area requires close coordination between highway standards and vehicle crash safety standards in order to minimize injuries resulting from collisions. At present,

Footnotes at end of article.

there are Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards which seek to minimize injuries in collisions, but these standards are based on tests of individual parts of the car employing methods having no direct relationship to real crash objects encountered on highways. There are also highway standards under cognizance of the National Cooperative Highway Research Program which are used by the Bureau of Public Roads. For example, Report No. 54 [13] of the NCHRP describes location, selection, and maintenance of highway guardrails and median barriers. This Report was circulated to regional administrators and division engineers of the BPR on October 2, 1968. The Director of Public Roads strongly advocates consideration of the information in actions pertaining to barrier and guardrail installation and maintenance.

This document is a considerable advance over the earlier discussions of guardrails, providing warrants for the use of guardrails based upon a variety of highway variables. Variables such as embankment geometry and location of various roadside obstacles are considered. However, the statement in the Report as to performance of the guardrails or barriers indicates that they were tested by only one type of vehicle. That vehicle weighed 4,000 to 4,200 pounds and was traveling at 60 to 65 miles an hour and struck the barrier system at a 25° impact angle.[14]

This method of testing is an advance over earlier barrier designs which were often made up locally according to opinions of the person in charge of the highway. The test does not, however, consider what will happen when the barriers are struck by vehicles of less than average test size and weight or vehicles of greater than average test size and weight. The barriers are not standardized for performance, but are characterized by their design and by the amount of deflection which they will allow under the single rather narrow type of test proposed. The various barriers described allow different degrees of deflection under the test collision, but the significance of impact upon the vehicle of the various degrees of deflection is not discussed.

This is a situation in which the state of the art of highway barrier standards and the state of the art of vehicle collision standards are growing but have not yet come together. In a next step it would be quite practical to characterize barriers and other roadside hazard objects by more than one type of performance test and to include a large range of vehicles. It would also be possible to establish standard test objects for vehicle crash impact testing which would represent the various barriers and the other hazardous features of roads, such as embankments, bridge columns, trees, and utility poles.

The long-range goal of compatible design and construction of vehicles and highways is that vehicles which run off the road into roadside obstacles will be harmlessly deflected and that the injury-preventing features of the vehicles will coordinate with those of the highway obstacles in every case. This goal cannot possibly be achieved unless both the vehicle and the highway obstacles are defined in an interrelated and detailed way. Only a small portion of this task has begun at the present.

FOOTNOTES

[1] A Future Intercity Highway Concept, by Robert A. Wolf; presented before the Third Annual Meeting of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, November 29 to December 2, 1966.

[2] *Feasibility Study, New York State Safety Car Program, Final Report,* State of New York, Department of Motor Vehicles, August 31, 1966, p. 1–8.

[3] *A Policy on Geometric Design of Rural Highway,* American Association of State Highway Officials, Washington, D.C., 1965, p. v and vi.

[4] Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 103, Windshield Defrosting and Defogging Systems, DOT, FHWA, NHSB, Effective January 1, 1969.

[5] Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 104, Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems, DOT, FHWA, NHSB, Effective January 1, 1969.

[6] *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways,* U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, Washington, D.C., June 1961.

[7] *Manual for Signing and Pavement Marking of the National System of Inter-State and Defense Highways,* American Association of State Highway Officials, Washington, D.C., 1961.

[8] The definition (Snellen) is that 20/20 vision is that of a person who can read letters of 5 minutes of arc letter height. In the Snellen system of measurement, visual acuity decreases in direct proportion to the base index (i.e., 20/40 vision is half of the normal 20/20 vision and would require approach to one-half the distance to allow the same letters to be read).

[9] Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 111, Rearview Mirrors, DOT, FHWA, NHSB, Effective January 1, 1968.

[10] *A Policy on Geometric Design of Rural Highways,* American Association of State Highway Officials, Washington, D.C., 1965.

[11] Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 103, Windshield Defrosting and Defogging Systems, DOT, FHWA, NHSB, Effective January 1, 1969.

[12] Motor Vehicle Safety Standard No. 104, Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems, DOT, FHWA, NHSB, Effective January 1, 1969.

[13] National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 54, *Location, Selection, and Maintenance of Highway Guardrails and Median Barriers,* Highway Research Board, Washington, D.C., 1968.

[14] National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 54, *Location, Selection, and Maintenance of Highway Guardrails and Median Barriers,* Highway Research Board, Washington, D.C., 1968, Page 6.

WHAT DO YOU GIVE AN UNCLE WHO HAS EVERYTHING?

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues and to the people of our country a superb and timely advertisement which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on July 3:

WHAT DO YOU GIVE AN UNCLE WHO HAS EVERYTHING?

Uncle Sam is 193 years old this year. It's hard to think of anything he doesn't have already.

So we've decided to give him our best.

The respect and belief we practice at McDonald's every day. We show our respect by flying the American flag. We back our belief by demanding American products in all our 1150 restaurants.

And that belief doesn't stop with beef raised on American farms either. Every nail, brick, and splinter at McDonald's is American. Then there's cheese from Wisconsin. Apples from Washington. Potatoes from Idaho. Our buns are made from Kansas wheat. And our sparkling cold Coca-Cola comes from Georgia.

We're not embarrassed to offer our rich uncle an American hamburger. It's his kind of sandwich.

And we serve it at his kind of place.

McDONALD'S CORP.

THE WARREN ERA—AN ASSESSMENT

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, contemporary assessments of the Warren era of the Supreme Court are beginning to appear with regularity. Many commentators seem to be engaged in a contest to pile up enough favorable words and images to balance what they seem to know will be the historical assessment of the Warren era. Some of the glowing tributes we have been subjected to of late would lead the unsuspecting to believe that the Court singlehandedly saved the country from a terrible plague, or rescued the Nation from some horrible foe. The facts of the matter are quite the opposite and I believe that sooner or later, judicial scholars will come to realize that the Warren era did more to rend the constitutional fabric of this great Republic than did any other Court in any previous 16-year period.

Shakespeare, in the play "Julius Caesar," had Mark Antony speak prophetic words applicable to the Warren era when he said, "the evil that men do lives after them." This is certainly the case with the effect of the decisions of the Court during the past 16 years. I want to bring to the attention of our colleagues an assessment of the Warren era by a judicial scholar which strips away the attempts to "praise Caesar" and looks at the evil that has been left behind.

In an article in this morning's Wall Street Journal, Mr. Richard W. Duesenberg, of St. Louis, an attorney and former professor of law at New York University, has in a straightforward manner, described the evil. His comments are valuable and instructive; they lead one to conclude that it may take another 16 years to repair the damage done during the Warren era. The article follows:

THE WARREN COURT AND CIVIL LIBERTY: AN APPRAISAL

(By Richard W. Duesenberg)

Amid accolades of "civil rights" supporters, the turbulent Warren era of the Supreme Court has drawn to a close. In the years ahead analyses of the period may not be so kind as those of contemporary commentators.

Cited in support of the Warren Court's supposed orientation are numerous decisions, from the school prayer cases to due process in criminal proceedings, the politics of election, and not least those emerging from the race controversy. The retired Chief Justice himself opined that the apportionment, school desegregation and criminal due process decisions were his most important.

These decisions, of course, do not make up anywhere near the totality of the Court's rulings over the 16-year span during which Earl Warren exercised whatever influence flows from the chair of Chief Justice. Even if they did, an impressive argument can be made that in some of them were sown the seeds of a judicial autocracy potentially antiethical to those political institutions of the country designed to allow expression of individual action. Earl Warren's best-loved cases may themselves be examined to illustrate the point.

ONE MAN, ONE VOTE

With the 1962 decision of *Baker v. Carr* the Court began its series decreeing that rep-

resentative government presumes election according to geographic spread of population. These are the cases that established the "one man, one vote" principle by which the elective bodies of all states must now be selected. In the finale to this line, the Court applied the same principle under the Constitution to the Federal House of Representatives. The opportunity to remake history has effectively been denied the Court as to the Federal Senate, for that body was clearly and specifically ordained to be made up of two members from each state, the Constitution itself speaking expressly to the point.

The states from which these cases came all had constitutional mandates of nondiscriminatory representation. Had the Court merely enforced these, much of its objective of fairer representation would have been achieved. It went considerably further, however, when the Chief Justice, expressing the spirit of the decisions, wrote that the "plain objective" of the Constitution is to exact "equal representation for equal number of people."

On the surface, to rule that elective bodies should be chosen on a criterion of geographic population seems fair enough. But at stake is a much more sophisticated issue. The political philosophy undergirding these decisions is one requiring representative government to be more egalitarian than the Constitution ever demanded. One clear principle that emerged from the incisive debates accompanying the forging of the Republic was that the voice of the majority was not to be the *vox dei* and that on certain matters majority opinion would nevertheless be ineffective.

De Tocqueville long ago observed that there is no necessary correlation between pure democracy and freedom. And the founding fathers seemed to believe that government representation of people and of interests would assure greater protection of individual and minority rights than pure democracy. This thought was at the very foundation of the concepts which spawned federalism, the system of checks and balances accomplished through separation of the Executive, Legislative and Judicial functions, and the sanctioning of unequally constituted bicameral legislatures.

Chief Justice Warren apparently disagreed, for otherwise he could not have reasoned that equal protection is denied when legislators do not represent equal numbers of citizens. Many others, too, in contemporary America seem not to grasp that the majority can be as totalitarian as any other power group.

THE POWER OF QUANTITY

If, as one commentator has written, *Baker v. Carr* and the cases built upon it was the Warren Court's "single biggest piece of judicial activism," it also reads into the Constitution a "winner-takes-all" philosophy of democratic government. It thus exalts the power of quantity in derogation of the individual as the object of protected civil rights. The logical practical extension of this is to minimize the qualities that each constituent of society represents and to crush private interests wherever they are alleged to collide with those of the majority.

The "public will," whatever that may be, sooner or later assumes a mystical quality of superiority over private action and private rights. It becomes the rallying point, when the stage is set, for political activists to assume the role of spokesmen for an entire population. History records this story too often for there to be much doubt.

Another Warren Court landmark—though not one in which the Chief Justice wrote the opinion—can be cited to test its reputation for allegedly being a tribunal that championed individual freedom over state power. In mind is *Jones v. Mayer*, the famous—or infamous—"fair housing" decision in which it was declared that an owner of property may not refuse to sell to another on the ground of race or religion.

That decision has generally been hailed as one of the Warren Court's civil-rights high points, because, according to its supporters, it gives everybody the right and freedom to buy or live wherever he desires. What a staggering misunderstanding of concepts and terms. Absolutely no connection exists between the status of being free, in a political sense, and having a "right" to live where one chooses. The standard rationale for characterizing the "fair housing" decision as an expansion of freedom is to declare that one is not free unless he is free to buy where and what he wants.

The illogic of this reasoning is demonstrated conclusively by showing that if one has the right to live where he wishes, then someone else living there must surrender his possession to the demanding party. The "right to buy" assumes the power to deny another the right to withhold sale. To phrase it somewhat differently, the decision is an expression of authoritarianism and not of liberty. Analyzed correctly, in a free society, one has only the right *to offer* to buy but never the right to buy until a willing seller and a willing buyer have come to terms.

To speak of promoting freedom and liberty through fair-housing legislation or judicial decree is to engage in a potentially disastrous and insidious perversion in the meaning of the basic condition of a good society, the condition of liberty.

Also involved in the "fair housing" decision was as flagrant an abuse of judicial authority as ever the Court has perpetrated. Unlike with the issues presented in the school desegregation and reapportionment cases, the legislature had spoken on the subject of "fair housing." Yet the Court saw fit on the flimsiest of authority to supersede the expressed will of the elected representatives of the people.

Lawyers understand full well that courts engage in judicial legislation, but unless one's objectivity is blurred by enthusiasm for the results reached in this particular case, it cannot be doubted that this time the Court seemed to see no limit to its self-assumed role of alternate legislature. And this by the least democratically constituted of all our governmental institutions.

MORALITY NOT AT ISSUE

Lest these comments on the "fair housing" decision be misconstrued, they go only to the twisted understanding of freedom and the expanded role of the Court that the decision evinced. As such, they are directed as a challenge to a main pillar among those giving the Warren Court a "civil rights" appearance. Comment is not being offered on any moral issue that may be involved in an individual's refusal to sell based simply on the color or creed of a potential purchaser. That is another issue.

Where the retired Chief Justice has better earned his reputation is in the school desegregation, criminal due process and free speech decisions. By relying on psychological and sociological evidence, the Court ruled in the school desegregation case of 1954 that separate facilities for white and black children were inherently unequal and harmful and thus deprived the latter of equal treatment under law. Accepting the weight of this evidence, it effectively put an end to an earlier decision from the Reconstruction period by saying that its test of equality could not be met through segregated facilities. For this reason the Court banned segregation in public educational institutions, and ultimately in a variety of other public facilities. But it did so in a reasonably solid legal fashion, albeit not without criticism.

On the other hand, when in the final days of Chief Justice Warren's last term the Court ruled illegal the exclusion from a private club of persons on the basis of race or religion, its action clearly bore the seeds of authoritarian interference with private conduct. Even one of the Court's long-standing champions of integration decisions was prompted to write that the Court's interpretation of the Commerce Clause was giving "the Federal Government complete control over every little remote country place of recreation in every nook and cranny of every precinct and county in every one of the 50 states."

Clear strides in the protection of the individual against ruling power came in the area of criminal procedure. Strangely enough, the Warren Court has here suffered its most hostile criticism. Some aspects of these decisions may have gone too far in protecting criminals at the expense of the public's right to adequate and effective police protection. But to rule that a defendant has an inherent right to legal counsel and to exclude in criminal proceedings evidence obtained in violation of due process are noteworthy accomplishments. Ironically, so far as concerns the reputation of the Warren Court, the procedural rights carved out for the individual in this area hopefully are not ones that the vast majority may expect to invoke. They are nonetheless important, and the fundamental concepts underlying these decisions are not at war with the classic political philosophy of liberty and freedom on which our political institutions were founded.

Somewhat the same comments may be made concerning the free speech cases of the Warren years, since most of them involved literature of questionable quality or social value. The Court has taken an almost absolutist approach to the protection of speech, undoubtedly more under the influence of Justices Douglas and Black than of the Chief Justice. Though some room for regulation through censorship was carved out as to the commercialization of pornographic materials, the right of verbal expression was well-guarded by the Warren Court.

Missing from most supporting comments on the Warren Court's accent on the individual has been a long sequence of cases where private action in the business sector has succumbed to Government power abetted by Warren Court decisions. No less than 43 of 45 cases brought by the Department of Justice in the antitrust field were decided in favor of the Government. Not all of these involved a behemoth of industry; nor were they necessarily helpful to individual citizens. It is much too simple to dismiss these cases, and others involving issues of property rights, as not indictments of the Warren reputation for protecting individuals because they involved business arrangements. Business activities are a matter of private action and are entitled to consideration in the array of social enterprises carried on by citizens of a state. To the extent that they are restricted, an issue of state authority against private conduct is at stake. And that is, when all is said and done, the central theme of civil rights.

LONG-RANGE CONSEQUENCES

The purpose of these comments has been not to criticize the now retired Chief Justice or the Court over which he has presided. In the long run, the reputation of Earl Warren, or for that matter of any Chief Justice, is not important to the country. What is critical is to recognize that certain long-range consequences are implicit in every decision rendered by the nation's highest court, and that the implications of these consequences should constantly be weighed against the libertarian objectives of our Constitutional system. Doing this, the popular conception of the Warren Court begins to waver.

If professor Bork of the Yale Law School is right in identifying as one reason for dissatisfaction with the Warren Court that "It has assumed an omnicompetence in problems of political philosophy, economics, race relations and criminology . . . that no small group of men, particularly no group with very limited investigatory facilities, could conceivably possess," then the power that this posture presumes—taking into account the historical frailty of human nature in the

misuse of power—might well prove inimical to civil rights.

Freedom depends upon the insistence on limited authority in those who govern; yet many among us—including, it seems, the activists of the Court of recent years—appear to be moving away from the tenet of our founding that basic human freedoms are a matter of indefeasible right and not a concession granted by ruling authority.

It was Voltaire who defined freedom as a condition of fragmented power, a perceptive observation. Against this test—considered after the emotionalism surrounding the decisions of the Warren Court has worn away—the reputation of the Court as one expanding the right of private action may not long endure.

PEACEFUL USES OF OCEAN SPACE

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution which expresses the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the adoption of a treaty governing the use of the deep oceans and their resources.

The draft suggested in my resolution is broadly modeled on the treaty relating to the peaceful uses of outer space which was formulated under United Nations auspices in 1967.

Just as man reaches for the "oceans" of the moon, so does he probe the oceans of earth. But there are no international laws which regulate the exploration and exploitation of the deep waters; indeed, in that area we have a potential source of great conflict among nations.

The countries of the world now look to the oceans as future sources of food, fuel, and a host of other commodities which are rapidly vanishing from land sources. Even more, the world waterways continue to fulfill their traditional function of providing an extra defense for nations against attack. However, the wood frigates of old have been replaced by nuclear-powered, nuclear-armed craft which stalk one another above and below the ocean surface. There is the danger, then, of an underseas arms race which would push mankind even closer to nuclear disaster. While there are international agreements to regulate arms control on land, there are none which apply to the oceans.

Mr. Speaker, these considerations have been the object of intensive discussion in the United Nations during the past 2 years; this discussion has been of great interest to the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, which I have the honor to Chair, and to the Congress as a whole.

As many of my colleagues will recall, last December, the United Nations General Assembly formalized its concern for this issue through the creation of a standing Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction. As congressional adviser to this Committee, I have been especially interested in its considerations of the legal, scientific, and humanitarian principles which ought to be incorporated into an international, U.N.-sponsored declaration or treaty on the oceans.

In general, Nations should agree that, as stated in my resolution:

The exploration and use of ocean space and the resources in open space shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all mankind, and shall be the province of all mankind.

This fundamental principle must be recognized if we are to draw benefits from the deep oceans rather than drawing a new field of conflict.

It is also urged that there be freedom of scientific investigation in ocean space and that States should facilitate and encourage international cooperation in such investigation. This principle must also be treated as basic to the requirements of future survival; it is a principle which the late President John F. Kennedy eloquently recognized in his inaugural address:

Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together, let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

I should like, at this point, to compliment my friend and colleague, Senator PELL, of Rhode Island, who was the first in Congress to prepare a draft treaty on the oceans and to introduce it in the other body. I am delighted to join with Senator PELL in endorsing the concept of such a treaty.

I would note, however, that what is required now is a full discussion of the issues involved in the draft treaty. Neither I nor any Member of this House can be in a position to approve each and every draft principle in the resolution without such discussion. A full consideration of the principles here presented must take place as well in the United Nations Committee and within our own executive branch. In this way we will prepare a sound base for the future treaty.

With this objective in mind, I have introduced this resolution. Let us move toward a new world of law in the use of our ocean depths.

Mr. Speaker, the text of my resolution follows:

H. RES. 478

Whereas the development of modern techniques for the exploration of the deep sea and the exploitation of its resources carries with it the threat of legal confrontation, between nations of the world over the ownership and jurisdiction of the bed of the deep sea and the superjacent waters, and the resources therein; and

Whereas the threat of anarchy now exists in the field of scientific exploration and commercial exploitation of the deep sea and its resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should make such efforts, through the United States delegations to the United Nations, as may be necessary to place before the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction for its consideration at the earliest possible time the following draft resolution outlining a number of suggested principles for governing the activities of nations in ocean space:

"DECLARATION OF LEGAL PRINCIPLES GOVERNING ACTIVITIES OF STATES IN THE EXPLORATION AND EXPLOITATION OF OCEAN SPACE

"Preamble

"The General Assembly,

"*Inspired* by the great prospects opening up before mankind as a result of man's ever-deepening probe of ocean space—the waters of the high seas, including the superjacent waters above the continental shelf and outside the territorial sea of each nation, and the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas of the high seas outside the area of the territorial sea and continental shelf of each nation,

"*Recognizing* the common heritage of mankind in ocean space and the common interest of all mankind in the exploration of ocean space and the exploitation of its resources for peaceful purposes,

Believing that the threat of anarchy exists in the exploration and exploitation of ocean space and its resources,

"*Desiring* to contribute to broad international cooperation in the scientific as well as the legal aspects of the exploration and exploitation of ocean space and its resources for peaceful purposes,

"*Recalling* the four conventions on the Law of the Sea and an optional protocol of signature concerning the compulsory settlement of disputes, which agreements were formulated at the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, held at Geneva, Switzerland, from 24 February to 27 April 1958, and were adopted by the Conference at Geneva on 29 April 1958,

"*Recalling* the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, which was unanimously endorsed by General Assembly resolution 2222 (XXI) of 19 December 1966 and signed by sixty nations at Washington, London, and Moscow on 27 January 1967, and considering that progress towards international cooperation in the exploration and exploitation of ocean space and its resources and the development of the rule of law in this area of human endeavor is of comparable importance to that achieved in the field of outer space,

"*Recalling* General Assembly resolution 2467A (XXIII) of 20 December 1968, which provided for the establishment of a Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction,

"*Recognizing* that the problems resulting from the commercial exploitation of ocean space are imminent,

"*Believing* that the living and mineral resources in suspension in the high seas, and in the seabed and subsoil of ocean space, are free for the use of all nations, subject to international treaty obligations and the conservation provisions of the conventions on the Law of the Sea, adopted at Geneva on 29 April 1958,

"*Convinced* that international agreement on principles governing the activities of States in the exploration and exploitation of ocean space and its resources would further the welfare and prosperity of mankind and benefit their national States,

"*Solemnly declares* that in the exploration of ocean space and the exploitation of its resources States should be guided by the following principles:

"I—GENERAL PRINCIPLES APPLICABLE TO OCEAN SPACE

"1. The exploration and use of ocean space and the resources in ocean space shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all mankind, and shall be the province of all mankind.

"2. Ocean space and the resources in ocean space shall be free for exploration and ex-

ploitation by all nations without discrimination of any kind, on a basis of equality of opportunity, and in accordance with international law, and there shall be free access to all areas of ocean space.

"3. Ocean space is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.

"4. There shall be freedom of scientific investigation in ocean space and States shall facilitate and encourage international cooperation in such investigation, but no acts or activities taking place pursuant to such investigation shall constitute a basis for asserting or creating any right to exploration or exploitation of ocean space and its resources.

"5. The activities of States in the exploration and exploitation of ocean space and its resources shall be carried on in accordance with international law, including the Charter of the United Nations, and the principles set forth in this Declaration, in the interest of maintaining international peace and security and promoting international cooperation and understanding.

"6. States bear international responsibility for national activities in ocean space, whether carried on by governmental agencies or non-governmental entities or nationals of such States, and for assuring that national activities are carried on in conformity with the principles set forth in this Declaration. The activities of non-governmental entities and nationals of States in ocean space shall require authorization and continuing supervision by the State concerned. When activities are carried on in ocean space by an international organization, responsibility for compliance with the principles set forth in this Declaration shall be borne by the international organization itself.

"7. In the exploration of ocean space and the exploitation of its resources, States shall be guided by the principle of cooperation and mutual assistance and shall conduct all their activities in ocean space with due regard for the corresponding interests of other States.

"8. States shall render all possible assistance to any person, sea vehicle, or facility found in ocean space in danger of being lost or otherwise in distress.

"9. States engaged in activities of exploration or exploitation in ocean space shall immediately inform other interested States and the Secretary-General of the United Nations of any phenomena they discover in ocean space which could constitute a danger to the life or health of persons exploring or working in ocean space.

"II—USE OF OCEAN SPACE EXCEPT SEABED AND SUBSOIL

"1. All States have the right for their nationals to engage in fishing, aquaculture, in-solution mining, transportation, and telecommunication in the waters of ocean space beyond the territorial seas of any State.

"2. This right shall be subject to the treaty obligations of each State and to the interests and rights of coastal States and shall be conditioned upon fulfillment of the conservation measures required in the agreement entitled 'Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas', adopted by the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea at Geneva on 29 April 1958.

"3. Any disputes which may arise between States with respect to fishing, acquaculture, in-solution mining, conservation, and transportation activities of States in the high seas shall be settled in accordance with all the provisions of such convention setting forth a compulsory method for the settlement of such questions. The provisions of Article 27 and Annex 4 of the International Telecommunication Convention, signed at Geneva on 21 December 1959, shall be applicable to any disputes which may arise between States with respect to telecommunication activities in the high seas.

"III—USE OF SEABED AND SUBSOIL OF OCEAN SPACE

"1. In order to promote and maintain international cooperation in the peaceful and orderly exploration, and exploitation of the natural resources, of the seabed and subsoil of submarine areas of ocean space, States shall engage in such exploration or exploitation only under licenses issued by a technically competent licensing authority to be designated by the United Nations, and to be independent of any State.

"2. The natural resources referred to in this Article consist of the mineral and other nonliving resources of the seabed and subsoil together with living organisms belonging to sedentary species, that is to say, organisms which, at the harvestable stage, either are immobile on or under the seabed or are unable to move except in constant physical contact with the seabed or the subsoil.

"3. The activities of nationals and nongovernmental entities of States in the exploration of submarine areas of ocean space and the exploitation of the natural resources of such areas shall require authorization and continuing supervision by the State concerned, and shall be conducted under licenses issued to States making application on behalf of their nationals and non-governmental entities. When such activities are to be carried on by an international organization, a license may be issued to such organization as if it were a State.

"4. It shall be the duty of the licensing authority to act as promptly as possible on each application for a license made to it. In issuing licenses and prescribing regulations, the licensing authority shall apply all relevant provisions set forth in this Declaration, shall give due consideration to the potential impact on the world market for each resource to be extracted or produced under such license, and shall apply the following criteria:

"(a) The license issued by the licensing authority shall (i) cover an area of such size and dimensions as the licensing authority may determine, with due regard given to providing for a satisfactory return of investment (ii) be for a period of not more than fifty years, with the option of renewal, provided that operations are conducted with the approval of the licensing authority (iii) require the payment to the licensing authority of such fee or royalty as may be specified in the lease (iv) require that such lease will terminate within a period of not more than ten years in the absence of operations thereunder unless the licensing authority approves an extension of the period of such license, and (v) contain such other reasonable requirements as the licensing authority may deem necessary to implement the provisions of this Article and to provide for the most efficient exploitation of resources possible, consistent with the conservation and prevention of the waste of the natural resources of the seabed and subsoil of ocean space.

"(b) If two or more States apply for licenses to engage in the exploration of the seabed and subsoil of ocean space or the exploitation of its natural resources in the same area or areas of ocean space, the licensing authority shall, to the greatest extent feasible and practicable, encourage cooperative or joint working relations between such States and be guided by the principle that ocean space shall be free for use by all States, without discrimination of any kind, on a basis of equality of opportunity. But, if it proves impractical for the license to be shared, the licensing authority shall determine which State shall receive the license with due regard given to the encouragement of the development of the technologically developing States.

"(c) A coastal State has a special interest in the conservation of the natural resources of the seabed and subsoil of ocean space adjacent to its territorial sea and continental shelf and this interest shall be taken into account by the licensing authority.

"(d) A coastal State is entitled to take part on an equal footing in any system of research and regulation for purposes of conservation of the natural resources of the seabed and subsoil of ocean space in that area, even though its agencies or nationals do not engage in exploration there or exploitation of its natural resources.

"(e) The exploration of the seabed and subsoil of ocean space and the exploitation of its natural resources must not result in any unjustifiable interference with navigation, fishing, or the conservation of the living resources of the sea, nor result in any interference with fundamental oceanographic or other scientific research carried out with the intention of open publication.

"(f) A State or international organization holding a license is obliged to undertake, in the area covered by such license, all appropriate measures for the protection of the living resources of the sea from harmful agents and shall pursue its activities so as to avoid the harmful contamination of the environment of such area.

"5. Subject to appropriate regulations prescribed by the licensing authority and to the following provisions, a State or international organization holding a license is entitled to construct and maintain or operate on the seabed and subsoil of ocean space installations and other devices necessary for its exploration and the exploitation of its natural resources, and to establish safety zones around such installations and devices and to take in those zones measures necessary for their protection:

"(a) The safety zones referred to in this paragraph may extend to a distance of 500 metres radius around the installations and other devices which have been erected, measured from each point of their outer edge. Ships of all nationalities must respect these safety zones.

"(b) Such installations and devices do not possess the status of islands and have no territorial sea of their own.

"(c) Due notice must be given of the construction of any such installations, and permanent means for giving warning of their presence must be maintained. Any installations which are abandoned or disused must be entirely removed by the State or international organization responsible for its construction.

"(d) Neither the installations or devices, nor the safety zones around them, may be established where interference may be caused to the use of recognized sea lanes essential to international commerce and navigation.

"6. To the greatest extent feasible and practicable, the licensing authority shall disseminate immediately and effectively information and data received by it from license owners regarding their activities in ocean space.

"7. If a license owner has reason to believe that an activity or experiment planned by it or its nationals or nongovernmental entities in the area covered by its license would cause potentially harmful interference with activities of other States in the peaceful exploration and exploitation of such area of ocean space, it shall undertake appropriate international consultations and obtain the consent of the licensing authority before proceeding with any such activity or experiment. Any interested State which has reason to believe that an activity or experiment planned by a license owner would cause potentially harmful interference with activities in the peaceful exploration and exploitation of submarine areas of ocean space may request consultation concerning the activity or experiment and submit a request for consideration of its complaint to the licensing authority, which may order that the activity or experiment shall be suspended, modified,

or prohibited. Review of any such order shall be allowed in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 12 through 16 of this Article.

"8. All stations, installations, equipment, and sea vehicles, machines, and capsules used on the seabed or in the subsoil of ocean space, whether manned or unmanned, shall be open to representatives of the licensing authority, except that if there is objection to this procedure by the licensee, such facilities shall be open only to the Sea Guard of the United Nations as set forth in Article VII of this Declaration.

"9. Whenever a license owner fails to comply with any of the provisions of a license issued to it under this Article, such license may be canceled by the licensing authority upon thirty days notice to the license owner, but subject to the right of the license owner to correct any failure of compliance within a reasonable period of time to be specified by the licensing authority, and, in any event, to request review of the decision of the licensing authority as set forth in paragraphs 12 through 16 of this Article.

"10. Any dispute which may arise under this Article between license owners and the licensing authority, shall first be submitted for settlement by the licensing authority, which shall determine its own procedure, assuring each party a full opportunity to be heard and to present its case.

"11. In all cases of disputes under this Article, whether among license owners or between license owners and the licensing authority, the licensing authority shall be empowered to make awards.

"12. In the case of any dispute under this Article, if the licensing authority shall not have rendered its decision within a reasonable period of time or if any party to a dispute under this Article desires review of the decision of the licensing authority, such dispute shall, at the request of any of the parties, be submitted to a standing review panel which shall consist of not more than three members to be appointed by the International Court of Justice. The decision of the licensing authority shall be final and binding upon all parties to a proceeding before it unless a request for a review of such decision is made under this paragraph within a period of thirty days from receipt by such parties of notice of such decision.

"13. No two members of the panel may be nationals of the same State. No member may participate in the decision of any case if he has previously taken part in such case in any capacity or if he is a national of any party involved in the case.

"14. Members of the panel shall serve at the pleasure of the International Court of Justice. The Court shall fix the salaries, allowances, and compensation of members of the panel. The expenses of the panel shall be borne by each party to proceedings before the panel in such a manner as shall be decided by the Court.

"15 The panel shall determine its own procedure, assuring each party to the proceeding a full opportunity to be heard and to present its case.

"16. The panel shall hear and determine each case within a period of ninety days from receipt of a request for review of such case, unless it decides, in case of necessity, to extend the time limit for a period not exceeding thirty additional days. The decision of the panel shall be majority vote and shall be final and binding upon the parties to the proceeding; except that if any party to the proceeding desires review of the decision, or if the panel has failed to render its decision within the period prescribed in the preceding sentence, the case shall be within the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice as contemplated by paragraph 1 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and may accordingly be brought before the Court by an application made by such party.

"IV—USE OF SEABED AND SUBSOIL OF OCEAN SPACE FOR PEACEFUL PURPOSES ONLY

"1. The seabed and subsoil of submarine areas of ocean space shall be used for peaceful purposes only.

"2. The prohibitions of this Article shall not be construed to prevent—

"(a) the use of military personnel or equipment for scientific research or for any other peaceful purpose;

"(b) the temporary use or stationing of any military submarines on the seabed or subsoil of ocean space if such submarines are not primarily designed or intended for use or stationing on the seabed or subsoil of ocean space; or

"(c) the use or stationing of any device on or in the seabed or subsoil of ocean space which is designed and intended for purposes of submarine or weapons detection, identification, or tracking.

"3. All States shall refrain from the implacement or installation on or in the seabed or subsoil of ocean space of any objects containing nuclear weapons or any kinds of weapons of mass destruction, or the stationing of such weapons on or in the seabed or subsoil of ocean space in any other manner.

"4. All States shall furthermore refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in the conduct of the activities described in paragraph 3 of this Article.

"5. All stations, installations, equipment, and sea vehicles, machines, and capsules, whether manned or unmanned, on the seabed or in the subsoil of ocean space shall be open to representatives of other States on a basis of reciprocity, but only with the consent of the State concerned. Such representatives shall give reasonable advance notice of a projected visit in order that appropriate consultations may be held and that maximum precautions may be taken to assure safety and to avoid interference with normal operations in the facility to be visited. All such facilities shall be open at any time to the Sea Guard of the United Nations referred to in Article VII of this Declaration, subject to the control of the Security Council as set forth in such Article.

"V—REGULATIONS ON THE DISPOSAL OF RADIOACTIVE WASTE MATERIAL IN OCEAN SPACE

"1. The disposal of radioactive waste material in ocean space shall be subject to safety regulations to be prescribed by the International Atomic Energy Agency, in consultation with the licensing authority referred to in Article III of this Declaration.

"2. In the event of the conclusion of any other international agreements concerning the use of nuclear energy, including the disposal of radioactive waste material, to which all of the original parties to the international agreement implementing these principles and parties, the rules established under such agreements shall apply in ocean space.

"VI—LIMITS OF CONTINENTAL SHELF

"In order to assure freedom of the exploration and exploitation of ocean space and its resources as provided in this Declaration, there is a clear necessity that fixed limits must be set for defining the outer boundaries of the continental shelf of coastal States. For the purpose of the provisions of this Declaration, the term 'continental shelf' is used as referring (a) to the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas adjacent to the coast but outside the area of the territorial sea to a depth of 550 metres, or to a distance of 50 miles from the baseline from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured, whichever results in the greatest area of continental shelf, (b) to the seabed and subsoil of similar submarine areas adjacent to the coasts of islands. In no case, however, shall the continental shelf be considered for such purposes to encompass an area greater than the area (exclusive of territorial sea) of the State or island to which it is adjacent. Recognizing the desirability of achieving agreement on unsettled questions relating to defining the boundaries of the continental shelf, States shall accept any agreements which may be reached in the event a conference is convened to consider such questions as provided for in Article 13 of the Convention on the Continental Shelf, adopted at Geneva on 29 April 1958; and any agreement so reached shall become effective for purposes of this Declaration when approved by the conference.

"VII—SEA GUARD

"1. In order to promote the objectives and ensure the observance of the principles set forth in this Declaration there shall be established as a permanent force a Sea Guard of the United Nations which may take such action as may be necessary to maintain and enforce international compliance with these principles.

"2. The Sea Guard shall be under the control of the Security Council of the United Nations, in consultation with the licensing authority referred to in Article III of this Declaration. Paragraph 3 of Article 27 of the Charter of the United Nations shall be applicable to decisions of the Security Council made with respect to the Sea Guard. The licensing authority shall be responsible under the Security Council for the supervision of the Sea Guard in connection with the performance by the Sea Guard of such duties as the licensing authority may deem appropriate to assign or delegate to the Sea Guard for purposes of the implementation of Article III of this Declaration.

"3. States are encouraged to provide to the Sea Guard such personnel and suitable scientific and sea patrol vessels as are necessary for the establishment and maintenance of the Sea Guard.

"VIII—NATIONAL LAWS TO APPLY TO CRIMES IN OCEAN SPACE PENDING INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON CODE OF CRIMINAL LAW

"Pending agreement upon an international code of law governing criminal activities in ocean space and the institution of an appropriate tribunal with jurisdiction over violations of such code of law, personnel of States and non-governmental entities of States and international organizations engaged in activities of exploration or exploitation in ocean space shall be subject only to the jurisdiction of the State of which they are nationals or the State which bears responsibility for their activities in respect of all acts or omission occurring while they are in ocean space, unless otherwise provided for by international law or in this Declaration;

"*Requests* the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction established by General Assembly resolution 2467A (XXIII) of 20 December 1968 to prepare a draft international agreement to implement the principles set forth in this Declaration;

"*Requests* the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction to report to the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly on the progress of its work on such draft agreement."

HEARINGS ON SHIPMENT OF LETHAL NERVE GAS ACROSS COUNTRY BY RAIL

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

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, recently the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, which I have the privilege to chair, held hearings on the Army's proposed shipment of lethal nerve gas across the country by rail. Fortunately, the subcommittee has been successful in urging the Army to follow recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences in detoxifying and burning the gas at the various storage sites.

But, the issue of nerve gas disposal continues to trouble our society. Voices have been raised throughout our Nation in opposition to the continuing proposals to ship various forms of the gas, contained in canisters or rockets, to seaboard ports for dumping in the ocean. The international implications of such ocean-dump proposals are as staggering as the threat to human life.

Mr. Speaker, in the midst of all the eloquent arguments against the dumping proposals, we find perhaps the most articulate, sensitive, and perceptive statements in a series of letters I received from a fourth-grade elementary school class in New Providence, N.J.

The teacher of that class, Mrs. Albert Boyance, conducted a discussion of current events in which the subject of the Army's proposed shipments arose. The children in the class concluded that the proposal was not wise and wrote to me expressing their concern.

Mr. Speaker, these are among the most moving and fascinating letters I have ever received. To be sure, Mrs. Boyance must be congratulated for conducting this discussion on public affairs and in suggesting the letters. But what is truly inspiring here is the simple eloquence and concern expressed by members of the class. We find a reverence for life which transcends all other considerations. It is this reverence which is so tragically absent from so many deliberations in our Government.

If there is a generation gap here, it is only that the wisdom in these letters is far beyond the years of their authors. One cannot help but wish that our own discussions could be as straightforward and clear as those of this fourth-grade class. Here we find no statistics, no charts, no computers, no chemical analyses of the pros and cons of sending the gas up, down, or straight across; rather, the leitmotif is simple: nerve gas is deadly, and deadly materials are not for dumping in the ocean or transporting through populated cities.

Mr. Speaker, in simplicity there is often more than grace; there is, indeed, truth. The words of Mrs. Boyance's class say it all better than I; so, I am placing the text of these letters in the RECORD at this point that the Members of this House may consider the pearls of wisdom which have come out of the mouths of babes:

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 20, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: I am very worried about them putting the Nerve gas in the ocean. They will kill many things in the ocean. I hope they change their minds about the nerve gas.

Thank you.

KAREN TUSCANO.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 20.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: This nerve gas is very dangerous. I think you better stop it now. A lot of lives are in danger. These riots for example, some people could smash it. Why couldn't you freeze it? Nobody could smash it then. But please do something.

From,

LAURA A. NEVILL.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 20, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: Our fourth grade is very interested about the nerve gas. I would be very happy and so would a lot of people if you could do something about it. Because a great deal of lives are in danger. I would rather have them take it apart than lose my life. Maybe we could get a paper started and have people sign their names. I hope you will do something.

Sincerely yours,

KATHLEEN A. HAYES.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 21, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: Could you find out for me if they could put the nerve gas somewhere it wouldn't pollute the oceans and be a danger to people's lives? I am very concerned about this affair. I think that others should be concerned about it, too.

Sincerely,

DENISE FUCHS.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 21, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: I think the Army should send the nerve gas to a woods or land that isn't being used and bury it. If they put it in the ocean people won't be able to swim in it.

Yours truly,

NANCY LIDDY.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 20, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: I am firmly against the shipment of nerve gas across the state. Especially through Elizabeth. It is a very populated city and many people could be killed with that turn in the railroad. But I suppose railroad is the cheapest. I presume that the army doesn't care about nature and just *has* to have money in their pockets. Let men die but at least let nature live on. But man wants to live too. Why take the chance of all death? Stop the nerve gas shipment. I want all forms of life to live but not with pollution.

Sincerely,

LIA M. COOPER.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 20, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: How come the Army is shipping nerve gas across the country? If they put the nerve gas in the ocean it will kill the fish and we will eat them. I do not think it is right. Do you? The Army has not been fair to their country.

What if a can of nerve gas breaks?

Yours truly,

KAYDEE FAIRMAN.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.
May 20, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: I would like to tell you that I think dumping the gas in the ocean is not a very good idea. It could kill all the fish and sea turtles and the rest of the living things in the ocean. And we couldn't go swimming any more. I would like it if you would make up your mind which one of the two are you going to do. I would rather you to break it down so it will then be harmless, to animals, plants, and especially to people.

Sincerely yours,

MEG MORONEY.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 20, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: When they ship the nerve gas across country what if an accident happens and the tanks burst open or they burst when they get it to a great depth in the ocean? It would be more adivsable to take the gas apart.

Sincerely,

MICHAL RADOM.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 20, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: I think that the nerve gas should not be shipped across our State. The Army should neutralize it where it is!

Yours truly,

BRAD TOMLINSON.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 20, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: I am very concerned about this nerve gas. It is not right for them to put nerve gas in the ocean. Just think how would they like it if they were a fish and someone came along and dumped nerve gas near you and you died. Why can't they just take it apart? Because they're just lazy. It will pollute the water, too.

Sincerely,

RACHAEL ROBERTS.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 20, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: I do not think that the Army should dump the nerve gas in the ocean because it will kill the people when they go swimming and it will kill the seaweed too. And it will kill the fish and we will not have any more fish to eat.

Yours truly,

RUTH ANN FARAGI.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 21.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: Our class has been talking about the nerve gas. I think that it is better to take the nerve gas apart since they can put it together they should be able to take it apart so that it would not hurt anything. I would like you to use your influence to stop them from shipping the nerve gas then dumping it in the ocean.

MARY STASHBIK.

SUMMIT, N.J.,
May 20, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: I would be glad if you could tell me about the nerve gas. The army wants to put it in the ocean but some big fish like a shark could break the can. But what will happend if they burn the gas? I think it will give out more pollution in the air which we don't need. After years to come the ocean can get polluted. So I would like to know why it can't be stopped.

PETER PAUL SECOLI II.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 20, 1969.

DEAR SIR: In class we were talking about the shipment of nerve gas. I think that they should break it down into something useful. They should at least destroy it. They said that by the time the cans deteriorated the nerve gas would be destroyed. Why take chances? If it wasn't destroyed by then it would pollute all the water in the world little by little. Why risk the whole world if the nerve gas can be destroyed in another way?

DAVID SMITH.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 21, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: About the nerve gas. Why can't the army keep it where it is? Also I read in the paper that the nerve gas can be made so it is not harmful but it will cost about a million dollars. Which

would they rather have people die or use a million dollars? I think they should think about that. I think somebody that could do something about this should read this letter.

Sincerely yours,

JANET STUMPF.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 20, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: I think it is terrible for the army to dump the nerve gas into the ocean. Anything could happen. If the container broke it might kill the fish and other life under the ocean if it got that far. It might break on the train and kill other people. I think you should use your influence to make them think about other ways to dispose of it before it's too late. Thank you.

Your friend,

EILEEN ARNOLD.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 21, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: I am concerned about the nerve gas travels. I don't think that it is safe to put it in the ocean. I think that it could make water pollution. I think that they should think more about it.

Sincerely,

JANET WINKELMAN.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 20, 1969.

DEAR SIR: That nerve gas is getting to be a problem. I think we should burn it. If they put it into space it might land on something and blow up. And we might live there some day. They shouldn't put it in the sea because there are so many things in the sea it all might blow up! Only one thing about burning it, it might blow up!

From,

DEIRDRE GEDDIS.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.
May 20, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: I think if they dumped the nerve gas in the water the cans would open and the fish may drink it then the men that catch the fish may get sick and may die.

MARY JANE NATALE.

NEW PROVIDENCE, N.J.,
May 20, 1969.

DEAR MR. GALLAGHER: How come you can't make the nerve gas into something useful or burn it or find some way to destroy it? Because if some cans are broken some people could die. That is not very good to ship it across Elizabeth or the rest of the country.

STEVE CLYDE.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CAREY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for Thursday, July 10, 1969, on account of death in family.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for July 14, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes on July 14, and 60 minutes on July 15, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

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

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. WATSON, for 10 minutes, today.

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

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN, for 30 minutes, on July 15.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

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

All Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) to have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the special order given by Mr. DIGGS today.

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

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. LATTA.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. SCHADEBERG.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. BROCK.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee:))

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama.

Mr. CULVER.

Mr. MATSUNAGA.

Mr. BRASCO.

Mr. GAYDOS in three instances.

Mr. REES.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in five instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. RYAN in five instances.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. NICHOLS in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. BLATNIK in four instances.

Mr. RANDALL in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

Mr. WOLFF in three instances.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. DULSKI in three instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in four instances.

Mr. REUSS in six instances.

Mr. EDMONDSON in three instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. ECKHARDT in two instances.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. BOGGS in two instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4153. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 14, 1969, 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:

941. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of agreements signed under Public Law 480 in May and June 1969 for foreign currencies, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

942. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report of an Antideficiency Act violation by the Federal Aviation Administration, pursuant to the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665(1)(2)); to the Committee on Appropriations.

943. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to adjust the salaries of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, and other members of the District of Columbia Council; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

944. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a Volunteers in the Park program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

945. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property adjacent to the Ford's Theatre in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

946. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report relative to the awarding of the Young American Medals for Bravery and Service for 1967, pursuant to the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

947. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the administration of the leave system for Federal employees by amending title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs, H.R. 11959. A bill to amend chapters 31, 34, and 35 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase the rates of vocational rehabilitation, educational assistance, and special training allowance paid to eligible veterans and persons under such chapters; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 12781. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 257. A bill to prohibit the intimidation, coercion, or annoyance of a person officiating at or attending a religious service or ceremony in a church in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 91–362). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 4183. A bill to provide that the widow of a retired officer or member of the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who married such officer or member after his retirement may qualify for survivors benefits; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 4184. A bill to equalize the retirement benefits for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are retired for permanent total disability; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6947. A bill to amend the act of October 13, 1964, to regulate the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9548. A bill to amend section 15–503 of the District of Columbia Code with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 91–366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9549. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–367). Refererd to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9551. A bill to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to authorize members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force to participate in the Metropolitan Police Department Band, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9553. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Act to authorize the computation of overtime compensation for hospital employees on the basis of a 14-day work period (Rept. No. 91–369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 4181. A bill to amend title 12, District of Columbia Code, to provide a limitation of actions for actions arising out of death or injury caused by a defective or unsafe improvement to real property (Rept. No. 91–370). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1783. A bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ADAIR (for himself, Mr. BRAY, Mr. ROUDEBUSH, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. LANDGREBE):

H.R. 12721. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 12722. A bill to establish a committee to examine the oversea information activities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 12723. A bill to provide benefits for members and survivors of members of the Philippine Scouts on the same basis as such benefits are provided for other members of the Armed Forces and their survivors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 12724. A bill to expedite delivery of special delivery mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 12725. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purposes of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. FRIEDEL, and Mr. BEALL of Maryland):

H.R. 12726. A bill to provide for an examination of U.S. Government public information activities in foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 12727. A bill to provide cost-of-living adjustments for employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 12728. A bill to end discrimination in the availability of Federal crop insurance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 12729. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of certain rail-highway grade crossings in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 12730. A bill to continue certain rules relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 12731. A bill to amend section 5723(b) of title 5, United States Code, relating to length of service required by teachers in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools when travel and transportation expenses are paid to first post of duty; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 12732. A bill to designate certain lands within the Passage Key National Wildlife Refuge in Florida as "wilderness"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. ANNUNZIO):

H.R. 12733. A bill to amend section 3(d) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 12734. A bill to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 12735. A bill to provide that the membership of local selective service boards reflect the ethnic and economic nature of the areas served by such boards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12736. A bill to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12737. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to add to such act a new title dealing especially with kidney disease and kidney-related diseases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 12738. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12739. A bill to provide increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12740. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of Anthony Sadowski; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12741. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the first $5,000 received as civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAZEN:

H.R. 12742. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 12743. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 clarifying the definition of conscientious objector so as to specifically include conscientious objection to military service in a particular war and to remove the requirement of religious training and belief; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. MILLS, Mr. RIVERS, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. COWGER, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MIZE, Mr. STANTON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, and Mr. ASHBROOK):

H.R. 12744. A bill to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of

the late Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself, Mr. AYRES, Mr. BARING, Mr. BELCHER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BETTS, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROTZMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. DELLENBACK):

H.R. 12745. A bill to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDMUNDSON, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FOREMAN, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GROVER, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of California, and Mr. KING):

H.R. 12746. A bill to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. KYL, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCULLOCH, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCDONALD of Michgan, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MATHIAS, Mrs. MAY, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. NELSEN, and Mr. NICHOLS):

H.R. 12747. A bill to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. PELLY, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. SISK, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. SLACK, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 12748. A bill to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. TALCOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. ULLMAN, Mr. UTT, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WATSON, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. WINN, Mr. WOLD, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. WYATT, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. QUIE):

H.R. 12749. A bill to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 12750. A bill to amend section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to permit the granting of reduced-rate transportation to guides or dog guides accompanying totally blind persons; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 12751. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to ban glue and paint products containing toxic solvents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 12752. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 with respect to donable surplus property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 12753. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, to require that the label of drug containers, as dispensed to the patient, bear the established name of the drug dispensed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 12754. A bill to provide additional protection for the rights of participants in employee pension and profit-sharing retirement plans, to establish minimum standards for pension and profit-sharing retirement plan vesting and funding, to establish a pension plan reinsurance program, to provide for portability of pension credits, to provide for regulation of the administration of pension and other employee benefit plans, to establish a U.S. Pension and Employee Benefit Plan Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 12755. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the issuance of nonimmigrant visas to certain aliens entering the United States under contracts of employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 12756. A bill to require that State plans under titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act provide for the establishment and maintenance of health and safety standards for rental housing occupied by recipients of assistance under such titles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 12757. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1964, providing for the establishment of the Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site and the Johnstown Flood National Memorial in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself and Mr. SKUBITZ):

H.R. 12758. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a Volunteers in the Park program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 12759. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that such chapter shall not apply with respect to the sale or delivery of certain ammunition for rifles or shotguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 12760. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the U.S. Labor Court, and for other purposes; on the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 12761. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 12762. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 12763. A bill to incorporate the Historic Naval Ships Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. FISHER, and Mr. ROBERTS):

H.R. 12764. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the coastline of certain States as being, for the purposes of that act, the coastline as it existed at the time of entrance into the Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 12765. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high-timber-yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12766. A bill to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 12767. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 12768. A bill to amend section 3(d) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 12769. A bill to establish the calendar year as the fiscal year of the U.S. Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 12770. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. HENDERSON):

H.R. 12771. A bill to clarify and strengthen the cargo-preference laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANDGREBE:

H.R. 12772. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 12773. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KOCH, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mr. LEGGETT):

H.R. 12774. A bill to provide a more effective approach to the problem of developing and maintaining a rational relationship between building code requirements and building technology in the United States, through the establishment of a National Institute of Building Sciences which can establish standards and make definitive technical findings available to all sectors of industry and government; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. REES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. WHALEN):

H.R. 12775. A bill to provide a more effective approach to the problem of developing and maintaining a rational relationship between building code requirements and building technology in the United States, through the establishment of a National Institute of Building Sciences which can establish standards and make definitive technical findings available to all sectors of industry and government; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 12776. A bill to provide cost-of-living adjustments for employees in the postal field

service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 12777. A bill to implement the Federal employees' pay comparability system by adjustments in the rates of compensation of employees holding positions under either the classified general schedule, or within the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, or under section 412 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BUTTON, Mr CLARK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of California, and Mr. KLUCZYNSKI):

H.R. 12778. A bill to create a Department of Youth Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. NIX, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. POWELL, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. REES, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. MCCULLOCH, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 12779. A bill to create a Department of Youth Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 12780. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act, and to provide additional Federal assistance in connection with the construction, alteration, or improvement of airports, airport terminals, and related facilities, to provide relief of congestion at public airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 12781. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.J. Res. 812. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.J. Res. 813. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Res. 478. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should make all necessary efforts to place before the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and Ocean Floor Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction a resolution endorsing basic principles for governing the activities of nations in ocean space; 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. CORMAN:

H.R. 12782. A bill to extend the term of U.S. Letters Patent No. 2,579,304; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 12783. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tuneo Yamada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 12784. A bill for the relief of Joseph C. Petrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

STEMMING THE TIDE OF POPULATION GROWTH

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 9, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, Representative GEORGE BUSH and 60 of my colleagues in the House, in a display of political and ideological nonpartisanship rare in congressional annals, joined me in sponsoring a population bill designed to provide the United States with a coordinated, comprehensive, and effective population policy which, if enacted, will establish the machinery by which the United States will be able to move to curtail uncontrolled population growth at home. The measure was sponsored by Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland, and 22 of his colleagues in the other body.

It was noted at the time that the scope of the problem, of great import and consequence nationally, was worldwide in nature. If present population growth continues unabated, the present world population of 3½ billion will double to 7 billion by the year 2000. Even more critical is the fact that 80 percent of this increase will occur in the developing nations of the world. In low-income countries, population is doubling every 25 years or less. This means currently available and new education and health facilities will be immediately subjected to intolerable burdens, and indeed, will be inadequate as soon as built. Resources needed for industrial development will have to be diverted to meet ever increasing needs of people who are undernourished, undereducated, undertrained, and unemployed—living in the kind of squalor most Americans cannot even begin to imagine. Rapid population growth makes it virtually impossible to improve conditions of the poor in underdeveloped countries by nullifying any chance to increase per capita income. Unrestrained population growth is indeed the treadmill which undermines all efforts to improve the lot of our fellow human beings in most parts of this planet.

A distinguished panel established by the United Nations Association of the United States of America has prepared an excellent report on the world population situation which is worthy of the attention of every Member of this distinguished body, indeed of every American. The panel was chaired by John D. Rockefeller III, the distinguished chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation and consisted of an impressive group of businessmen, educators, and professionals, including former Budget Director David Bell, Director of AID John A. Hannah, former President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development George D. Woods, and others. The report does an excellent job in defining the problem, pointing up the need for action and setting forth reasons for involvement of the United Nations and the U.N. system. It establishes a population commissioner to serve as an international administrator of population programs. It describes the activities of a variety of United Nations agencies formulating policies which can be relevant and acceptable to participating member nations and which policies would be executed by participating governments. It sets forth the type of programs that could be undertaken in the areas of technical assistance, training, and operational research projects. It points up the need for meaningful research and notes the contribution that could be made by the U.N. system to a comprehensive, balanced, coordinated population program.

This report is most timely. Both Secretary General U Thant and World Bank President Robert S. McNamara have sounded warnings about the crisis we face throughout the world. Secretary General Thant gives us 10 years to reverse the world population growth before it becomes an irreversible and unmanageable catastrophe. Mr. McNamara called the situation one of "dynamic misery, continuously broadened and deepened by a population growth that is totally unprecedented in history."

I would commend to my colleagues a careful reading of the national policy panel report. In my judgment it reflects a sober analysis of the most critical problem confronting us next to the elusive attainment of world peace. The report is moderate, politically feasible and a useful guide to the architects of our foreign policy. Within the near future I will ask my colleagues to join me in sponsoring a resolution urging the President to make the recommendations of the report part of our foreign policy. The summary and recommendation of the panel follows:

The Panel believes that high fertility and high rates of population growth impair individual rights, jeopardize national goals and threaten international stability.

The Panel believes that all governments in developed and developing countries should attempt to ensure that their peoples have knowledge of and access to family planning information and services, and that the vast majority of such governments need policies intended to reduce the rate of population growth.

The Panel welcomes the increasing level of bilateral commitments in the field of population and family planning and hopes that through discussions in forums like OECD, existing and potential donor countries may decide to devote even greater resources to these activities.

The Panel believes that the UN system has a legitimate concern with the population problem and is uniquely qualified to make an important practical contribution towards its solution.

The Panel believes that the World Health Organization has an especially important role to play in support of national family planning programs and should make a major effort in this area.