

that part of the world. Also demonetized coin accounted for some 40,000,000 ounces during 1968, mostly from Australian and Canadian coins. More and more countries are moving away from silver coinage, and this tends to have a two-fold effect. In the first place less silver is used, and secondly the old coins are a potential future source of silver.

The United States silver coins represent the largest such source, and it is estimated that theoretically some 2,000,000,000 ounces of silver are outstanding in these coins. Undoubtedly a substantial part of this silver will never be recovered, but even if only half ultimately finds its way into the market, it is a very significant potential supply. It is estimated that the United States Treasury has already withdrawn enough coins to account for some 300,000,000 ounces of silver, and that perhaps as much as 700,000,000 ounces of recoverable silver remain outstanding. Government stocks of silver in bullion and in unmeted coins at the end of 1968 amounted to about 240,000,000 ounces according to our estimates. At the present rate of sale of 2,000,000 ounces a week these stocks will last for over two years, even without allowing for future collections.

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 25, 1969]
HANDY & HARMAN SAYS 1ST HALF NET ROSE 10 PERCENT—COMPANY ALSO EXPECTS RESULTS FOR ALL OF 1969 TO REFLECT THE SAME RATE OF GROWTH

NEW YORK.—Handy & Harman estimates first half earnings increased "in the general magnitude of 10%" from a year earlier, M. W.

Townsend, chairman and president, said in an interview.

He also expects the year's results to reflect the same rate of growth. In the first half of 1968, the company, a leading supplier and fabricator of precious and specialty metals, earned \$1.7 million, or 85 cents a share, on sales of \$100.2 million. In all 1968 Handy & Harman earned \$4.1 million, or \$2 a share, on sales of \$200.7 million.

As a result of the acquisition of Attleboro Refining Co., Attleboro, Mass., last year, Mr. Townsend said, Handy & Harman is involved in its biggest capital expansion program, with \$3.5 million earmarked for this year against \$2.5 million for the three previous years. Much of the \$3.5 million is being spent to develop a new plant for Attleboro Refining near its present site. The plant should be in operation shortly after Jan. 1.

Handy & Harman is hoping to achieve a product mix that will enable it to derive about half of its earnings from precious metals and the remainder from nonprecious metals. But the company still is in the position of a year earlier, deriving two-thirds of its earnings from precious metals and the rest from specialty metals.

"Last year we made four major acquisitions as a step toward this goal," Mr. Townsend said, "and yet the combination remained about the same. In fact it was rather like walking a treadmill just to maintain the balance we already have."

The company has made only one acquisition this year—a small company named American Clad Metal Inc.—"But we expect to do as well this year as last" with regard

to new acquisitions, he said. He described the clad metal process as "one of the good growth opportunities in the next decade since you can get out of two metals things you can't get out of one." He expects the market for clad metals to grow tenfold within the next six to eight years.

Mr. Townsend said he expected the price of silver—currently about \$1.65 an ounce—"to wander somewhat higher than it is today" during the next six months to a year, barring any international monetary crises. He said speculators in the metal have become "disillusioned as they discovered that the price could go down as well as up" and that "many people weren't choosing to wait until the price went up before selling."

Currently, he said, there is an estimated 400 million ounces of contract silver stored in vaults. "This has nothing to do with mining production," he said. "This is silver that is immediately available for sale, and its presence has been a depressing factor on the market." Another factor tending to hold the price down, he said, was the decision of the Federal Government to lift the ban on the private melting of silver coins. "However, present price levels haven't brought out any coins," he said. "To tap this source there'll have to be a higher price."

On the subject of gold, he said that—barring any international monetary crisis such as a precipitous change in U.S. monetary policy—"the price will continue to be where it is, like a Yo-Yo." Much of course depends on South Africa, the source of most of the Free World's gold. "If South Africa's gold were turned loose," he said, "the price could only go down and down."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, October 7, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. James E. Rogers, chaplain, Veterans' Administration hospital, Columbia, S.C., and national chaplain, Disabled American Veterans, offered the following prayer:

May the God of light, who hast set up candlesticks and kindled many lamps in man from the spark of love from Heaven, give you—

The light of faith to sustain you;
The light of courage to strengthen you;
The light of hope to embrace you;
The light of truth to guide you; and
The light of love to enfold you.

And may the endowments of the focused light bring a continuing beam of holy concern for justice, mercy, and compassion for all mankind.

O God, who went before preceding generations in a pillar of fire to light the way for night and day, burn brightly in our lives and those near and dear to our hearts. 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 had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3165. An act for the relief of Martin H. Loeffler;

CXV—1814—Part 21

H.R. 3560. An act for the relief of Arie Rudolf Busch (also known as Harry Bush); and

H.R. 11249. An act to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds for such Center.

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

S. 476. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Zuck;

S. 533. An act for the relief of Barbara Rogerson Marmor;

S. 981. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland shall sit at one additional place;

S. 1775. An act for the relief of Cora S. Villaruel;

S. 1797. An act for the relief of Dr. Wagulh Mohamed Abdel Bari;

S. 2096. An act for the relief of Dr. George Alexander Karadimos;

S. 2231. An act for the relief of Dr. In Bae Yoon;

S. 2443. An act for the relief of Dr. Silvio Mejia Millan; and

S.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

REV. JAMES E. ROGERS

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, it is my great privilege this morning to welcome to the House of Representatives our Chaplain for this occasion, Rev. James E. Rogers, who is the

national chaplain of the Disabled American Veterans. He was recently reelected at the national convention at Miami Beach as the national chaplain. He is chaplain of the South Carolina Disabled American Veterans, chaplain of the South Carolina Wing of the Civil Air Patrol, State chaplain of the Forty-and-Eight of the American Legion, and a distinguished American who served his country with honor and distinction during World War II as Army chaplain and as radio minister for the Armed Forces in the Pacific area. He is a Methodist. For the past 22 years Chaplain Rogers has been active in hospital ministry with the Veterans' Administration. He now serves the VA hospital in Columbia. He has won many honorary degrees and awards from various universities, colleges, and organizations. He has received the Distinguished Service Award from the Spanish-American War Veterans for long and faithful service; the Distinguished Service Award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of America for long and unselfish service to the veterans of America; commendation from the General Commission on Protestant Chaplains for meritorious service to God and country during World War II as a chaplain in the U.S. Army, and received the honorary degree of doctor of laws from the John Marshall Law School of Atlanta, Ga.

He has received degrees from Atlantic Christian College and Duke University Divinity School. He also attended graduate school at Northwestern University, Concordia Lutheran Seminary, Garrett Theological Seminary, and the

University of Chicago Theological School.

Chaplain Rogers married Mildred McKeithen of Florence, S.C., and they are the proud parents of four wonderful children.

He is a great patriotic American and dedicated Christian and I want to welcome him to the House this morning on behalf of the South Carolina delegation and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I hope you will meet this distinguished American, the national chaplain for the Disabled American Veterans.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart full of great sorrow that I announce the untimely death yesterday of our former colleague, Joseph Y. Resnick.

Joe Resnick was both a colleague in the Halls of Congress and a dear personal friend. I know my colleagues join me in mourning his passing.

Congressman Resnick was one of a large number of us who were first elected to the 89th Congress and came here in January 1965 with a spirit and commitment to active legislation that left the imprint of the 89th Congress freshmen on our history.

My association here in the Congress with Joe Resnick opened the door to a valued personal friendship that carried on despite his retirement from Congress this year. He was a man of great warmth and possessed a sincere interest in the public weal.

That Joe Resnick did not return to the 91st Congress meant the loss of a well-meaning, hard-working, and devoted Congressman. That he has died at such an early age means the tragic loss of a valued friend.

He will be sorely missed.

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

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, to the thousands in the Hudson Valley who knew him as "Joe" Resnick, the death of our former colleague and my predecessor who served in the 89th and 90th Congresses, at such a young age, is a deep tragedy. I am personally saddened by the news.

In his brief 44 years, Congressman Resnick, the son of immigrants to this country became a millionaire. In his lifetime his tremendous energy and native ability led to a number of significant inventions, the creation of a business empire, and finally to the Halls of Congress. He was a rare individual and we who knew him and the country will be poorer by his death.

Mr. Speaker, Joe Resnick had a natural political sense. He will be remembered for his loyalty to his party, and to his ideals and convictions. I remember him as a worthy and courageous opponent.

In his 4 years in Congress, he brought a new dimension of work and service to the people of the Hudson Valley whom he represented. He set a high standard of concern for the people of his district for all who follow him.

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

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

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the two gentlemen in the well, Congressman Wolff and Congressman Fish, in their expressions of regret at the passing of a former colleague of this House, a very good friend of mine. Although I knew Joe Resnick for a comparatively short time, namely the period of his service in the House of Representatives, I got to know him and his family quite personally.

I am deeply saddened by the passing of this good friend and former colleague. Joe Resnick was known and liked by many Members of this House. While the death of a friend is always a shocking experience, it becomes more so when one dies in the prime of his life. A member in good standing in his community and a member of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, well thought of by its members, he was indeed an honorable man.

At 45, Joe Resnick was still a young man with a full life before him. The father of three sons and a daughter, he was indeed approaching the threshold of the good years.

In his relatively short life, however, Joe accomplished a great deal. Along with his brothers he managed to build his \$7,000 electronics firm into a \$45 million corporation.

But his greatest contribution was in the area of public service. Elected in 1964 to the House of Representatives he was the first Democrat to win a seat from his district in the Hudson Valley. During his tenure he served with great enthusiasm and vigor.

Representing a farming community he became a freshman on the Agriculture Committee. He spoke out against the American Farm Bureau Federation for what he thought to be a failure on its part to speak out in the best interests of the farmers. Always on the side of the disadvantaged he was a key figure in the case of Lt. Comdr. Marcus A. Arnheiter regarding his removal by the Navy from his command.

In the field of civil rights he was a vigorous champion, not fearing anyone or anything that he thought stood in the way of the cause. While running for the Democratic nomination for the Senate in 1968 he came in third; but his defeat did not dull his fighting spirit.

For personal integrity and honesty Joe Resnick was beyond reproach. In fact in his first term as a Congressman he advocated a code of ethics for the Members of the House.

Joseph Resnick will be sorely missed not only for the friendship he gave so freely but also for his keen intellectual mind.

To his charming and lovely wife and to his children and the rest of his family I extend my sincerest condolences and

sympathies on the loss of so vital an individual.

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

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I join my colleagues in this tribute to our former colleague, Joseph Resnick. I was shocked to learn this morning of his untimely passing. As I look back on his 4 years of service in this House, I recall the sincerity and the dedication which marked his efforts. Joe Resnick was outraged by injustice and sought to correct it, whether the victim was a black tenant farmer in the South or a high-ranking naval officer or a family denied to right to adopt a child because of discrimination. He would not hesitate to take on the establishment, as evidenced by his investigation of the powerful American Farm Bureau.

It was as a freshman Congressman that he joined me when I initiated the challenge to the Mississippi congressional delegation. He was very conscious of the risk to his career which was involved in opposing the House leadership at that time.

Although he and I disagreed quite sharply over the war in Vietnam, nevertheless we remained firm friends. I always admired and respected him for having the courage of his convictions which he expressed fearlessly.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Resnick and to their children, Jeffrey, Debbie, Todd, and David.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wish to join with the distinguished gentleman in the well in expressing my profound shock and disbelief in learning of the passing of our former colleague. As one who came to the Congress with Joe, and as an officer of the 89th Democratic Congressional Club, I want to express for all of us the profound sorrow that not only his family and relatives must feel, but for all of his constituents whom he served so well. We certainly will remember his leadership, the vigor with which he represented his constituents, and his constant belief that we had an obligation and a responsibility to help solve the social ills of this country. I send Mrs. Resnick and his family my sincere and heartfelt condolences.

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

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

Mr. GILBERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my deep and profound shock at the untimely passing of our distinguished former colleague, Joseph Resnick.

During the period of time that Joe served in the House, he was an inspiration to all of us. Joe started from a humble background and worked his way up to become one of the true millionaires of our country, but, at the same time never forgetting his humble background.

He always had a feeling for the underprivileged and the poor. As we look back at his record and his philosophy, we find he projected this at every particular opportunity. Joe made his mark in business, Joe made his mark in the State of New York, and the Halls of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend to his family my most profound condolences.

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

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I knew Joe Resnick only as a public person, a man with whom or against whom I debated, a man whose intense concern for the public good plunged him into controversy and into public office. He was always a vigorous, committed, and intelligent advocate of his point of view. He worked hard to repay what he felt to be his deep personal debt to this country, which he loved dearly and which is a better place for his having lived in it.

All of us share the grief of the people of his community, and all of us wish there were some way we could lighten the burden and the grief now thrust on to his family.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI).

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, we mourn the tragic loss, in the prime of his life, of our distinguished former colleague, Joseph Y. Resnick, whose recent death has bereaved his family and his many friends.

During his 4 years in Congress Joe Resnick fought for those people who could not fight for themselves, who could not get help anywhere else.

In his work in Congress, Joe Resnick was dedicated and untiring on every issue. His words and his vote were always recorded on the side of humanity. His courageous spirit was undaunted in the face of opposition. He was a good friend and a staunch ally.

Indicative of his concern over the "average man" was his struggle to have Navy Lt. Comdr. Marcus A. Arnheiter reinstated in the naval service. Although unsuccessful in his efforts, his willingness to take the side of the underdog facing powerful influences once again proved his fearlessness.

Although much could be said for Mr. Resnick's friendliness, his wisdom, and his industry, what impressed me, more than any other of his many fine qualities, was his deep belief in justice. He knew that any steps that we might take toward world peace would have to be founded upon justice.

For this reason he firmly supported the Johnson administration's Vietnam policy. Some regard this stance as the major factor in his defeat in a senatorial primary. If this be so, it can go to prove that Joe Resnick valued principle above opportunity.

To his grief-stricken wife and children, I express the deepest sympathy for their loss of a devoted father and husband, a man who was a credit to them, to the Congress, and to the country.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am

deeply saddened by the untimely death of our former colleague, Joe Resnick, former Congressman from the State of New York.

I had the privilege of serving for a short time with him, but had known him personally for a long time. Born into a modest home, he showed unrivaled ability to fulfill the American ideal of material success. Yet such economic well-being never changed him from the compassionate, concerned man I knew him to be.

His life reflected his concern for the dispossessed and downtrodden. No cry for justice left him unmoved. No request for involvement fell on his ears without a sincere response. His congressional career reflected this, and his work outside government set an example for all those who seek a guide to such behavior. Charity, kindness, and honesty always guided his motives and actions. His backbone was of steel and even in opposition, no one could question his sincerity.

Those who knew him well mourn him deeply. Those in need of a courageous public-spirited friend have lost significantly. He shall be missed. May God grant peace and repose to his soul.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to pay tribute to our former colleague who has been so suddenly taken away from us and at such an early age. Joe Resnick certainly made his mark in this House, as so many other Members have already commented. He did this primarily by virtue of his tremendous energy and by his very great courage. I do not believe I ever knew a Member of the House who was more determined to fight for and to speak out for what he believed in, regardless of the consequences. Joe Resnick, regardless of what it might have done to his political fortunes, was a determined supporter of our policy in Vietnam, for example, and a very strong and outspoken supporter of President Johnson, even though that might not always have been popular in parts of New York State in the election year of 1968. Perhaps more than anyone else he put meaning into the newly adopted primary law in New York in 1968 by waging a very determined campaign. The result did not reflect the energy and dedication Joe put into the campaign, but that was due in part at least to factors beyond his control. What is important is that he believed the people of New York should select their statewide candidates, not just the boys in the back room. And he put his own career where his mouth was.

Many of us did not always agree with everything Joe Resnick said, or did but all of us admired his courage and his determination. Virtually by means of those qualities he managed to turn around a congressional district in 1964 that had never before in its history elected a Democrat, and became a Member of this House by virtue of a tireless and very vigorous campaign. In his brief career here Joe Resnick brought some-

thing to this House which has been meaningful to all of us who knew him and had the privilege of serving with him. We will certainly miss him in the years to come, and we are all deeply saddened that such a remarkable and successful career, in business as well as in politics, should have been cut off so early.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY).

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I join the sentiments expressed. Joe was a dear personal friend. I grieve over his passing. My wife Gail joins me in deepest condolences to his wife Ruth.

Joe was a fighter, a loyal man, a man of courage. One never doubted where he stood on any issue.

I might say to those who might have lost touch with him since he left the House, in recent months he has been implementing in the private enterprise sector many of the same principles he stood for here. He inaugurated a new enterprise to hire unskilled workers and train them. Right to his dying breath he fought for those principles that he stood for here in the House.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANLEY).

Mr. HANLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I join in an expression of profound regret with respect to the passing of our former colleague, my good friend Joe Resnick.

Joe Resnick made his mark first as a family man, then in the private sector, and subsequently in government. Certainly his service to our Nation as a Member of the 89th and 90th Congresses has earned the gratitude of every progressive thinking American.

I had hoped so much to one day see Joe Resnick reenter public life. Obviously God had another plan for him.

I take this opportunity, in behalf of Mrs. Hanley and myself, to express our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Resnick and the family.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. ADAMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF), in this tribute to our former colleague Joe Resnick. I also want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK). Those of us who were officers and close to Joe in the 89th Congressional Club, who came here with him in 1965, thought a great deal of Joe. We shall miss him very much.

We extend our deepest sympathy to his family. I know I speak for the other Members of the Congress who came here in 1965, when I say he was a man of courage who served in the finest traditions of this House.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to those of my colleagues who have expressed regret upon the passing of our late colleague, Joe Resnick. It is a very shocking thing for all of us to have him go at such a very young age,

and it is particularly sad for his very delightful family, his wife and children whom I know quite well and who are wonderful people.

Certainly, it is difficult for them to lose him as both father and husband during the prime of his life.

The political life of the State of New York will be the poorer, as well. Joe was a very colorful politician, a man of strong beliefs which were frequently expressed in the most vigorous terms. He was a man with whom, frankly, I found myself in disagreement at times, but I will miss him on the political scene in New York because he added to its life, to its vibrancy, and to its color, and I certainly join my colleagues in expressing our most sincere regret at his untimely death.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentleman from New York, in expressing my deep sorrow at the death this morning of our former colleague, Joseph Resnick.

It is difficult to accept the shocking news that this fine person, who we knew as an earnest, kind, and intelligent Member of this House, reached an untimely death at the age of 45.

Joe Resnick came here as one of the bright, enthusiastic young Members of the 89th Congress. He had, through his own efforts, reached remarkable success as a businessman engaged in electronics and plastic research and development.

Coming from the area of Hyde Park, N.Y., one of his earliest influences was the political philosophies of Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt. As he grew to manhood, Eleanor Roosevelt was always an inspiration to him. Probably more than anything else in his life, the marvelous work of this great lady started him on the path to his political career. In 1964, on the event of his 40th birthday, on July 13, the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation honored him for his philanthropic work with a dinner, at which Adlai Stevenson was the guest speaker. It was one of the greatest days in his life.

Joe Resnick brought with him to the House sound judgment, an intelligent and penetrating mind, and a deep commitment to good government. During his tenure here, he served his district, his State, and his Nation with undeniable distinction. I was privileged to be one of the many friends he made in the Congress, and I missed him when he resigned last year.

Joe's death will leave an everlasting void with all who knew him. Death at such a young age is always sad and untimely, but Joe Resnick leaves unfinished so very much good work which only someone with his capabilities, his interests, and his wonderful thoughtfulness toward his fellow man could complete.

Mrs. Corman and I are deeply grieved and extend to Mrs. Resnick and their children our deepest sympathy. Our thoughts and prayers are with them.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I learned of the untimely death of a former colleague of ours, Joseph Y. Resnick.

Born 45 years ago in Ellenville, N.Y., he served two terms in the House, representing the 28th District of New York.

Death is ever so tragic, but when it

comes to a man of the age of 45—an age when men begin to show their hidden capabilities, it is doubly tragic.

I know of no man who had a wider friendship in this House of Representatives than Joe Resnick. He was recognized as a leader and a dedicated public servant. We who have admired his spirit will recall the single-handed fight he waged against the American Farm Bureau Federation charging that it abused its tax-exempt status and failed to speak in the best interest of its membership.

While a freshman in Congress, he pushed for a congressional code of ethics.

I have had the distinct pleasure of serving with Joe Resnick on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and I recall his concern for welfare of the servicemen and their survivors. Because of his service as a radio officer in the U.S. merchant marine during World War II he was an influential member of this committee and contributed much to its deliberations on important veteran legislation.

Joe Resnick will be missed by all those who knew him and worked with him.

In this time of great loss and sorrow, I extend to his wife, Ruth, his children, his brothers and his sister, my most heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is always sad to comment upon the demise of a colleague or former colleague. Joseph Resnick was a loyal friend of mine, a faithful public servant, a devoted and loving husband and father.

He made his mark on the history of this body by dint of hard labor, conscientious work, and truly dedicated service. He was of great courage, a valiant dissenter, unafraid to wipe away the cobwebs of longstanding, outmoded practices. He earned much unjustified criticism for that courage but he stood firm—firm as a rock—for the principles he believed in. Joe Resnick carried his banner high, at times impatient of apathy, returning to the attack again and again. This voice of vigor, this probing, prodding mind are at rest, but the legacy he left behind will continue to challenge the very best in us.

Our heartfelt sympathy goes to his dear wife and children.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the vigorous voice of our former colleague, Joe Resnick, has been stilled. His untimely death yesterday at the young age of 45 is a great loss to all of us.

Each of us knew Joe Resnick as a fiery, enthusiastic combatant. We will remember his recent fight to get the farmer a stronger voice in Federal legislation—this came from a New York Congressman. Joe Resnick put himself into the forefront of that battle and he relished every minute of it.

When the news of his death reached us, I knew that each Member must have been reminded immediately of their favorite story involving Joe. I could fill pages with nostalgia in this respect.

However, the thing I will always remember Joe Resnick for was his great loyalty. Joe was a Democrat; he chose this party as a responsive voice for his people, for all people. Joe was faithful to the philosophies and programs of the Democratic Party. And he was especially

loyal to President Lyndon B. Johnson. I know of few men who would pitch in so wholeheartedly for the policies and principles of President Johnson. Joe was a great friend in many a troubled time. Often, just through the force of his character and personality, Joe would sponsor and speak out on legislation in areas where many feared to tread—and Joe would move it along.

A colorful period has ended with the death of our friend, Joe Resnick.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life, character, and service of the late Honorable Joseph Y. Resnick.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PROGRAM AGAINST CRIME

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly frequent that we rise in the morning and pick up a newspaper and find some member of the administration blasting the Congress for foot-dragging or going slow with the legislative program.

I refer to this morning's article in the Washington Post in which the Attorney General has blasted the Congress for its failure and for stalling on the administration's crime program. I should like to report to the Attorney General that we are moving in this area.

If he were aware, he would know this morning the House Committee on Education and Labor reported out the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, which is being supported by over 80 Members of the House.

I would certainly agree with the Attorney General that in the area of crime the increase in the field of drugs and narcotics is probably the most alarming. As a matter of fact, the increase over the last 8-year period is more than twice that of any other area of crime. We have a 344-percent increase in the narcotic and drug abuse crime field in the last 8 years, which is more than twice that of any single other crime. Most importantly and most seriously in the same period of time the crimes committed in the field of narcotics and drug abuse by young people under 18 years of age increased by 1,860 percent.

I am suggesting that the education bill which we passed out of the committee this morning may do more than a host of the crime bills the administration proposed to this Congress in dealing with this problem. I would suggest that the Attorney General, instead of throwing harpoons at the Congress, come up here and testify and lend his prestige and support to this type of legislation, as has been done, I suggest, by over 30 Members on the other side of the aisle. I would welcome his support for this legislation which I think will do more than anything thus far proposed by him.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 3, 1969, due to a longstanding previous commitment in my congressional district, I was unable to vote on rollcall Nos. 198, 199, and 200. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 198, "nay" on rollcall No. 199, and "yea" on rollcall No. 200.

THE PRESIDENT'S SCHEDULE

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I was made aware of some remarks made in the RECORD by my colleague from Ohio (Mr. LUKENS) about me and about the President's schedule, in which he said I made it public. Actually, I took it off the wire. The White House made it public. The gentleman keeps calling me the well-traveled Congressman from Ohio. I would like to say to him that I have not traveled as much in 20 years as the President he has been defending has traveled in 9 months. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LUKENS), if he has the courage he says he does and the guts to run for the Senate, which he has been saying he is going to, will become well-traveled, too. He will travel back to Ohio next year to stay.

THE FLIGHT OF A CUBAN PLANE TO FLORIDA

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all Members of the House have read about the incident of the Cuban plane being flown into Florida without being picked up on radar, except for the time when the pilot of the plane went up high enough to see where he was so he could get to Florida easier.

I think it is interesting to note that we do have some fairly important installations in south Florida and in the southeastern part of our country. I might further note that Air Force I, the President's plane, was at the airport where this defecting Cuban landed. Yet the Defense Department spends \$80 billion for the defense of this Nation and we are not even protected from a plane from Cuba, only 90 miles away.

Now, I am going to suggest and urge in writing—and I hope other Members will join me—that the Armed Services Committee investigate this situation where the southeastern part of this country has no defense, in effect, when planes can come in at 30 or 40 feet and not even alert any of our aircraft to get out to meet them or do anything about it. The pilot of the defecting Cuban plane simply wiggled the wings of his plane and they let him come right in, not knowing whether he had a bomb or anything else in his plane. The President's plane was sitting right there at that airfield and

the President himself was at Key Biscayne. It is an absurd situation and something ought to be done. For \$80 billion our defense system should alert and protect us from planes flying in from Cuba—particularly when our President is in Florida.

HOUSE ACTION ON THE ABM REPRESENTS NO GREAT VICTORY FOR THE ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader, claimed that the teller vote Thursday and the recommittal motion Friday on the ABM question represented great victories for the administration and he chided the press for not describing them as great victories.

As far as the recommittal vote was concerned, it could just be that the press recognized that motion for what it was—a phony trick designed to confuse rather than enlighten the American people.

No less an authority than the gentleman who made that motion Friday described it in Sunday's Milwaukee Journal by saying:

It was just a parliamentary gimmick.

I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. O'Konski) for his candor on this matter, but I would respectfully suggest to the gentleman from Michigan that when he seeks to rely on such a transparent and artificially contrived motion to falsely inflate congressional support for ABM deployment, he is leaning on a mighty weak reed. He is revealing the growing weakness of his own position and is contributing little to public understanding of the issue at hand in this House. Far from being a victory for the Nixon administration or anyone else, that sleight-of-hand motion was really a defeat for the public's right to understand what is going on in the House.

PROPOSAL TO TAKE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OUT OF FEDERAL BUDGET

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a proposal to take the operation of the Export-Import Bank out of the Federal budget and out from under the control of the Congress.

History is replete that the Banking and Currency Committee and the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and their counterparts in the Senate, have without exception given the Export-Import Bank all the authority they requested. It has been my privilege to chair the subcommittee that has handled this item for years, and without exception we have recommended approval of all authority for spending they ever requested.

It would appear that recently we may have acquired some thinskin admin-

istrators in the Export-Import Bank who seem resentful of being asked questions.

This new proposal appears to be another effort to further fragmentize foreign aid and assistance. Only in this instance, the bureaucrats hope to completely bury this item, taking it out of the budget, away from the legislative committees, the Committees on Appropriations, and the Congress.

In other words, they want to operate *carte blanche*. I have spoken to 15 Members of this body about this proposal and not one of them could give any reason why the Export-Import Bank should be removed from control of the Congress.

Since this new approach is being proposed, I believe it is time to mention that the Export-Import Bank is becoming more loose in its operation. There is the regular window for the normal type of loans that have been approved for years. Window No. 2 provides for industrial loans up to 25 years. Window No. 3 lowers the credit criteria, and even makes provision to charge off weak credits.

Maybe our committee has been too lenient and it is time to reappraise the Export-Import Bank before they outsmart themselves and get into trouble.

PERMISSION FOR SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Economic Development of the Committee on Public Works may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mechanical and Electrical Equipment of the Committee on House Administration be allowed to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOUSE MOVING LEGISLATION ON EVERY LEVEL

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, over a month ago I indicated in the well of this House that we would probably see quite a bit of publicity about the 91st being a "do nothing Congress." Already the charge is being leveled. In yesterday's paper we were accused of "dragging our feet."

I said before, and I say it again; this

has been a very active Congress so far as the House of Representatives is concerned.

I do not know how you feel about it, but I am getting a little bit tender about being the target of these unfair brickbats. I find it irksome that the House is rarely given credit, despite the fact that the real legislative work is going on in this Chamber.

Whenever anyone is given credit for any great happening in Congress the source of that happening is always attributed to the other body.

I think there ought to be a little discrimination on the part of the pundits in the terms of who is doing what and where the foot dragging is, if it is anywhere.

You and I both know that we are extremely busy in our committees and we have very important legislation moving on every level. I would just hope that the press would take note that if there is going to be some discrimination in passing out the brickbats then let there also be some discrimination exercised as to who gets all the credit.

I have always said, if you want to be in the limelight, you ought to take the tomatoes as well as the applause. Let the other body take note and may the press mark well.

REREFERRAL OF H.R. 14186, LICENSING OF PERSONNEL ON CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) I request unanimous consent that the bill H.R. 14186, to provide for the licensing of personnel on certain vessels, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means on October 3, 1969, be referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT, SELECT COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Antitrust Enforcement of the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives be permitted to sit today, tomorrow, and the following day for purposes of taking testimony during general debate in the House.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will be constrained to object to scheduling committee meetings in advance of the schedule of the House. I have no objection to the committee sitting, at the request of my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, today. If he would amend his unanimous-consent request accordingly, I would not object.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I respect-

fully defer to the gentleman's suggestion. I think it is a sound one. I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Antitrust Enforcement of the House Small Business Committee be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, administration spokesmen appear today to be in a state of jubilation with the announcement that the rate of unemployment has increased to 4 percent, which is the most critical rise in 8 years. What kind of planning is that? How can the deliberate creation of misery for so many serve to reduce interest rates, the cost of consumer goods, and the impact of inflation?

FUNDING OF EDUCATION

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) a few moments ago said that he asked a significant number of Members of this House to join in a resolution calling for amending the continuing resolution so as to provide for an expenditure in the Office of Education consistent with the level passed by the House when we considered the HEW appropriation bill, as against the level of last year's appropriation called for in the continuing resolution.

Our HEW subcommittee hearings ran from the latter part of January through the month of May, some 4 months. In the other body, I think it should be noted, somewhat in line with the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA) that body has not even begun hearings on the HEW appropriation. Here we are, nearly one-third of the way through the new fiscal year, and they have not even gotten around to holding hearings in the other body on some of these appropriation bills. As of this moment we have enacted only one of the 13 regular appropriation bills into law.

That is why I am introducing a bill today to make the fiscal year coincide with the calendar year, and I shall take a special order for this evening to speak on the subject of making this change.

LUXURIES CAN BE CUT FROM DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, while I voted in favor of the military procurement au-

thorization bill, H.R. 14000, may the RECORD show that I supported amendments that would have cut over \$2 billion from the military spending.

It is my belief, after long study and observation, that the Defense Establishment could absorb that much of a cut and still make enough improvements in operations so that our military effort would not be impeded.

Currently, I believe there are too many inefficiencies, that this is too much of a champagne-limousine operation. We can cut the luxuries without hurting our efforts in the field.

The people want and are entitled to lean, efficient operation in all areas of Government. Congress must assert itself and give the people this type of economy. We are untrue to our trust if we do any less.

PROFESSOR HUMPHREY'S "LECTURE IN ECONOMICS"

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it seems former Vice President Hubert Humphrey is taking his role as a college professor seriously. For example, take note of his recent "Lecture in Economics" given to the boys at "AFL-CIO U."

Professor Humphrey has quite a bit to say as he tries to blame our Nation's problems on the Nixon administration. The current inflation and high interest rates, he says, are all the Nixon administration's fault. It is the present administration that is holding back the good guys at "AFL-CIO U," he charges. The evil administration is in cahoots with the fat cats in the corporation board rooms, he says, and also with those nasty Southern Republicans.

But as a professor, Mr. Humphrey has forgotten something that any first-year economics student can tell you—there is a timelag of around 18 months for economic policy to really set in. Had it not been for the expansionary money policies of the Johnson-Humphrey administration we would not be in the situation which is facing us today. Yes, professor, the fire was started 4 or 5 years ago and you helped hold the match. Fortunately, President Nixon is pursuing a course that will bring us back on the right track in the economy. Thank goodness we have a firefighter in the White House for a change.

So, Professor Humphrey, do not mislead the boys at "AFL-CIO U." Tell them the truth. The spend and tax and spend policies followed by your administration have brought on the present inflationary spiral. And I do not think the people are going to let you forget it.

SENATE MINORITY LEADER MAY WANT TO RECONSIDER HIS "TURN ON HEADLIGHTS" PROPOSAL FOR "MORATORIUM WEDNESDAY"

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I notice that the minority leader of the other body has proposed that next Wednesday, on Moratorium Day, all those people who support this administration turn on their headlights as a symbol of support. It occurs to me he may want to reconsider that proposal, for up where I come from, we turn on our car headlights on during the day to identify a funeral cortege.

I would not want to believe that the minority leader wants to bury this administration quite so soon, even though it has not addressed itself to most of our problems of the day.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

JOHN VINCENT AMIRAULT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2552) for the relief of John Vincent Amiraault.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

REFERENCE OF CLAIM OF JESUS J. RODRIGUEZ

The Clerk called House Resolution 86, referring the bill (H.R. 1691) to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. BEATRICE JAFFE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1865) for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice Jaffe.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

AMALIA P. MONTERO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6375) for the relief of Amalia P. Montero.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

VISITACION ENRIQUEZ MAYPA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6389) for the relief of Visitacion Enriquez Maypa.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

YAU MING CHINN (GON MING LOO)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1438) for the relief of Yau Ming Chinn (Gon Ming Loo).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CAPT. MELVIN A. KAYE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1453) for the relief of Capt. Melvin A. Kaye.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROBERT G. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3723) for the relief of Robert G. Smith.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. RUTH BRUNNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9488) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Brunner.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

TO INCORPORATE THE PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1783) to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1783

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following persons, to wit: Burton Little, Chickasaw, Alabama; Tom Goggin, Phoenix, Arizona; Leonard Chrysler, Los Altos, California; Wayne L. Capson, Garden Grove, California; George Boschet, Silver Spring, Maryland; Robert Classon, New York, New York; Edward G. Maxwell, Miami, Florida; Claude C. Beckham, Irmo, South Carolina; Benny Tschetter, Sioux Falls, South Dakota; Frederick T. Gill, Valley Station, Kentucky; Lee M. Gresham, Wixom, Michigan; Conrad M. Standing, Memphis, Tennessee; Curley Gullet, Denver, Colorado; Charles Swartz, Marblehead, Massachusetts; Bolivar Rivera, Rio Pedras, Puerto Rico; James Schwlem, Pasadena, Texas; Robert T. Kiggins, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Glenn E. Mayer, Hines,

Illinois; John Novak, Richmond, Virginia; and such other persons as are members of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, and their associates and successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of Paralyzed Veterans of America (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation").

SEC. 2. The persons named in the first section of this Act, or their successors, are hereby authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be—

(a) to preserve the great and basic truths and enduring principles upon which this Nation was founded;

(b) to form a national association for the benefit of persons who have suffered injuries or diseases of the spinal cord;

(c) to acquaint the public with the needs and problems of paraplegics;

(d) to promote medical research in the several fields connected with injuries and diseases of the spinal cord, including research in neurosurgery and orthopedics and in genitourinary and orthopedic appliances; and

(e) to advocate and foster complete and effective reconditioning programs for paraplegics, including a thorough physical reconditioning program, physiotherapy, competent walking instructions, adequate guidance (both vocational and educational), academic and vocational education (both in hospitals and in educational institutions), psychological orientation and readjustment to family and friends, and occupational therapy (both functional and diversional).

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have perpetual succession and shall have power—

(a) to sue and be sued;

(b) to acquire, hold, and dispose of such real and personal property as may be necessary to carry out the corporate purposes;

(c) to make and enter into contracts;

(d) to accept gifts, legacies, and devices which will further the corporate purposes;

(e) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal and State law;

(f) to adopt and alter a corporate seal;

(g) to establish, regulate, and discontinue subordinate State and regional organizations and local chapters or posts;

(h) to choose such officers, representatives, and agents as may be necessary to carry out the corporate purposes;

(i) to establish and maintain offices for the conduct of the affairs of the corporation;

(j) to adopt and alter a constitution and bylaws not inconsistent with law;

(k) to publish a newspaper, magazine, or other publications;

(l) to adopt and alter emblems and badges; and

(m) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to accomplish the objects and purposes of the corporation.

SEC. 5. The corporation shall have no power to issue capital stock or engage in business for pecuniary profit or gain.

SEC. 6. The corporation shall be nonpolitical and, as an organization, shall not furnish financial aid to, or otherwise promote the candidacy of, any person seeking public office.

SEC. 7. Any American citizen shall be eligible for membership in the corporation who was regularly enlisted, inducted, or commissioned, and who was accepted for, or was on, active duty in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard of the United States, or our allies. Service with the Armed Forces must have been terminated by discharge or separation from service under conditions other than dishonorable: Pro-

vided, however, That persons otherwise eligible for membership who are on active duty or who must continue to serve after the cessation of hostilities are also eligible for membership: And provided further, That membership shall be limited to such persons as have suffered spinal cord injuries or diseases whether service connected or nonservice connected in origin.

Sec. 8. The headquarters and principal place of business of said corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia, but the activities of said organization, as set out herein, shall not be confined to said city, but shall be conducted throughout the several States and any territory or possession of the United States.

Sec. 9. In the event of a final dissolution or liquidation of such corporation, and after the discharge or satisfactory provisions for the discharge of all its liabilities, the remaining assets of the said corporation shall be transferred to the Veterans' Administration to be applied to the care and comfort of paralyzed veterans.

Sec. 10. The corporation and its State and regional organizations and local chapters or posts shall have the sole and exclusive right to have and use in carrying out its purposes the name "Paralyzed Veterans of America," and such seals, emblems, and badges as the corporation may lawfully adopt.

Sec. 11. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, executive committee, and committee, having any of the authority of the executive committee; and shall keep at its registered office or principal office a record giving the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote; and permit all books and records of the corporation to be inspected by any member or his agent or his attorney for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

Sec. 12. As a condition precedent to the exercise of any power or privilege herein granted or conferred, the corporation shall file in the office of the Secretary of each State or of any territory or possession of the United States, in which organizations, chapters, or posts may be organized, the name and post office address of an authorized agent upon whom local process or demands against the corporation may be served.

Sec. 13. Such provisions, privileges, and prerogatives as have been granted heretofore to other national veterans' organizations by virtue of their being incorporated by Congress are hereby granted and accrue to the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

Sec. 14. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 7, after line 2, insert the following new sections:

"Sec. 14. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, director, officer, or employee of the corporation or be distributable to any such person during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to officers and employees of the corporation or to prevent their reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the corporation's board of directors.

"(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its members, officers, directors, or employees. Any director who votes for or assents to the making of such a loan, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such a loan until the repayment thereof.

"Sec. 15. The corporation shall be liable

for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

"Sec. 16. The provisions of sections 2 and 3 of the Act of August 30, 1964 (36 U.S.C. 1102, 1103), entitled "An Act to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law" shall apply with respect to the corporation."

On page 7, line 3, strike out "Sec. 14" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 17".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

MRS. IRENE G. QUEJA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 564) for the relief of Mrs. Irene G. Queja.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FAVORING THE SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this concurrent resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

DELILAH AURORA GAMATERO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2817) for the relief of Delilah Aurora Gamatero.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. SABINA RIGGI FARINA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3629) for the relief of Mrs. Sabina Riggi Farina.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PLACIDO VITERBO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3955) for the relief of Placido Viterbo.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM PATRICK MAGEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9001) for the relief of William Patrick Magee.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

WILLIAM D. PENDER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 901) for the relief of William D. Pender.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2302) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MILLOYE M. SOKITCH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3571) for the relief of Miloye M. Sokitch.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION ON CLAIM OF PHILIP J. FICHMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10658) conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Philip J. Fichman.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LT. COL. SAMUEL J. COLE, U.S. ARMY, RETIRED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 267) for the relief of Lt. Col. Samuel J. Cole, U.S. Army (retired).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 267

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lieutenant Colonel Samuel J. Cole, United States Army (retired), is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$10,322.59, representing the amount

of overpayments of retired pay received by the said Lieutenant Colonel Samuel J. Cole, for the period from August 15, 1947, through September 30, 1964, as a result of administrative error in the computation of his creditable service for pay purposes less the amount due under the Act of April 14, 1966 (80 Stat. 120). In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Lieutenant Colonel Samuel J. Cole, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

(b) No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 12, before "shall" insert "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

RICHARD VIGIL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 620) for the relief of Richard Vigil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 620

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to Richard Vigil, of Denver, Colorado, in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Richard Vigil against the United States for personal injuries suffered by him, including the loss of his right arm, when he accidentally exploded a projectile, property of the United States, found near the boundary of Camp Hale, a United States Army base located in Leadville, Colorado, the said Richard Vigil having been eleven years of age at the time such accident occurred: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

RAYMOND C. MELVIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 632) for the relief of Raymond C. Melvin.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CAPT. WILLIAM O. HANLE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 882) for the relief of Capt. William O. Hanle.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

REFERENCE OF CLAIMS OF BRANKA MARDESSICH AND SONIA S. SILVANI

The Clerk called House Resolution 498, to refer the bill (H.R. 4498) entitled "A bill for the relief of Branka Mardessich and Sonia S. Silvani" to the chief commissioner of the court of claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

COMDR. JOHN N. GREEN, U.S. NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2477) for the relief of Comdr. John N. Green, U.S. Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2477

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Commander John N. Green, United States Navy, of Santa Barbara, California, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of \$8,079.55, representing overpayments of active duty compensation received by him for the period from June 1, 1951, through June 30, 1967, while he was serving as a member of the United States Navy, such overpayments having been made through administrative error in overcrediting service to Commander Green and the computation of his pay on the basis of the overcredited service.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Commander John N. Green, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section.

SEC. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

MRS. BARBARA K. DIAMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2963) for the relief of Mrs. Barbara K. Diamond.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PEDRO IRIZARRY GUIDO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5000) for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. CORDOVA. Mr. Speaker, I object and ask that this bill be now considered.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The Chair will state to the gentleman that it requires two objections.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Two objections are heard and, under the rule, the bill is recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BERT N. ADAMS AND EMMA ADAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7567) for the relief of Bert N. Adams and Emma Adams.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JOHN F. FUENTES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11500) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Fuentes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ROSE MINUTILLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12089) for the relief of Rose Minutillo.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MAJ. LOUIS A. DEERING, U.S. ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11968) for the relief of Maj. Louis A. Deering, U.S. Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 11968

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Major Louis A. Deering, United States Army, the sum of \$10,516.45, in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Major Louis A. Deering against the United States for reimbursement for the loss of household goods and personal effects which were destroyed by fire on August 31, 1966, while stored pursuant to official Army orders, the payment of such sum to be in addition to any amount paid to the said Major Louis A. Deering for such losses under the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes", approved August 31, 1964, as amended (31 U.S.C. 240-243): *Provided* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike "\$10,516.45" and insert "\$2,147.77".

On page 2, line 9, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

IRVING M. SOBIN CO., INC., AND/OR IRVING M. SOBIN CHEMICAL CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1782) for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Co., Inc., and/or Irving M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

OPPOSING THE GRANTING OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE IN THE UNITED STATES TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called House Resolution 422, opposing the granting of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 422

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not approve the granting of permanent residence in the United States to the aliens hereinafter named in which cases the Attorney General has submitted reports to the Congress pursuant to section 244(a) (1)

of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended:

XXXXXXXXXX, Latkovic, Ivan.
XXXXXXXXXX, Strucic, Vladimir.
XXXXXXXXXX, Amool, Mohammed Ali.
XXXXXXXXXX, Amool, Sedighe Hanhai.
XXXXXXXXXX, Pecarina, Luka.
XXXXXXXXXX, Clagnaz, Giorgio.
XXXXXXXXXX, Roach, George; also known as

Rock, George.

XXXXXXXXXX, Moulagiannis, Dmitrios T.
XXXXXXXXXX, Pavlovic, Marko.
XXXXXXXXXX, Mavrovich, Miro.
XXXXXXXXXX, Puentes-Rivera, Antonio.
XXXXXXXXXX, Sovich, Stefano.
XXXXXXXXXX, Yamada, Isao.
XXXXXXXXXX, Yamada, Mitsui.
XXXXXXXXXX, Yamada, Katsumi.
XXXXXXXXXX, Pecksan, Tann.
XXXXXXXXXX, Yee, Kwok Chew; also known as

Yee, Tow.

XXXXXXXXXX, Ching, Leung.
XXXXXXXXXX, Ging, Leong Moy; also known as
Ging Sze Chin.
XXXXXXXXXX, Osorio-Rodriguez, Wilfrido.
XXXXXXXXXX, Scandrello, Nunzio.
XXXXXXXXXX, Wong, Suzanne.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FEIGHAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN: On page 2, strike out all of line 14 and substitute in lieu thereof the language "A-17-065-000, de Cazares, Maria Petra Gutierrez."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. WONG YUI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 92) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Wong Yui.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN (GIOVANNI) DENARO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 265) for the relief of John (Giovanni) Denaro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 265

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John (Giovanni) Denaro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 23, 1962.

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

DR. KONSTANTINOS NICHOLAOS BABALIAROS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 330) for the relief of Dr. Konstantinos Nicholas Babaliaros.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 330

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Konstantinos Nicholas Babaliaros shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 27, 1962.

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

NICKOLAS GEORGE POLIZOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1110) for the relief of Nickolas George Polizos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 1110

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nickolas George Polizos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 16, 1957.

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

DUG FOO WONG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2019) for the relief of Dug Foo Wong.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

OPPOSING THE GRANTING OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE IN THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called House Resolution 540, opposing the granting of permanent residence in the United States of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 540

Resolved, That the House of Representatives does not approve the granting of permanent residence in the United States to the aliens hereinafter named in which cases the Attorney General has submitted reports to the Congress pursuant to section 244(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended:

XXXXXXXXXXXX, Chin, Hoo, presently known as Howard H. Chin.

XXXXXXXXXXXX, Ping, Lew Yim, now known as Mrs. Woo.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SA CHA BAE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4560) for the relief of Sa Cha Bae.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4560

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sa Cha Bae shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to deduct one number from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

ROGELIO TABHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5106) for the relief of Rogelio Tabhan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 5106

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rogelio Tabhan may be considered to be the son of Mrs. Araceli T. Pixler and a petition filed by her in his behalf may be approved pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rogelio Tabhan may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, and a petition filed in his behalf by Mrs. Araceli T. Pixler may be approved pursuant to section 204 of the Act: Provided, That the natural parents, brothers, or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

KONG WAN NOR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5936) for the relief of Kong Wan Nor.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LIDIA MENDOLA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10156) for the relief of Lidia Mendola.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 10156

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lidia Mendola may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(E) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Giuseppa Mendola, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

On page 1, at the end of line 7, strike out "Act," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Act: *Provided*, That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary, shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded, any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

PANAGIOTIS, GEORGIA, AND CONSTANTINA MALLIARAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6600) for the relief of Panagiotis, Georgia, and Constantina Malliaras.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 6600

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Panagiotis, Georgia, and Constantina Malliaras shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 10, after the words "the proper", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof, the following: "officer to deduct three numbers from the total number of immigrant visas and conditional entries which are made available to natives of the country of the aliens' birth under paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CLAYTON COUNTY JOURNAL AND WILBER HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1703) for the relief of the Clayton County Journal and Wilber Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1703

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Clayton County Journal of Jonesboro, Georgia,

is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$1,506.49, representing additional postage due on copies of such Journal mailed during the period from January 1967, through July 1967, as a result of the assessment of postage at incorrect rates by officials of the Post Office Department.

Sec. 2. Wilbert Harris, of Jonesboro, Georgia, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$1,506.49, representing the amount of a postage deficiency charged his account as postmaster of Jonesboro, Georgia, for failure to collect the correct postage from the Clayton County Journal.

Sec. 3 (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Clayton County Journal and Wilber Harris the sum of any amounts received from them on account of the postage deficiency referred to in the first and second sections of this Act.

(b) No part of any amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

TIMOTHY L. ANCRUM (ALSO KNOWN AS TIMMIE ROGERS)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3590) for the relief of Timothy L. Ancrum (also known as Timmie Rogers).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ELGIE L. TABOR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9591) for the relief of Elgie L. Tabor.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

J. BURDETTE SHAFT AND JOHN S. AND BETTY GINGAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9906) for the relief of J. Burdette Shaft and John S. and Betty Gingas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9906

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That J. Burdette Shaft, postmaster, and John S. and Betty Gingas, copublishers of the Leslie Local-Republican, of Leslie, Michigan, are relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$1,363.42, an amount claimed to be due by the Post Office Department for revenue deficiencies resulting from errors in

postage on second-class material at the post office at Leslie, Michigan, in the period from March 10, 1966, to May 25, 1967.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. Burdette Shaft an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John S. and Betty Gingas an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by them, or withheld from sums otherwise due them, with respect to the indebtedness to the United States specified in the first section of this Act.

(c) No part of the amount appropriated in subsections (a) or (b) of this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

JIMMIE KAZU UYEMURA AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13183) for the relief of Jimmie Kazu Uyemura and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13183

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,511 to be equally divided among the following individuals:

- (1) Jimmie Kazu Uyemura, Stockton, California.
- (2) Jean Tomoye Isozaki, Stockton, California.

The payment of the pro rata share provided for in this Act to each individual in clause (1) or (2) shall be full settlement of all claims of the recipient against the United States arising out of the vesting by the United States (pursuant to vesting order number 17260, dated January 26, 1951, issued under the Trading With the Enemy Act) of the proceeds of life insurance policy numbered 392581 issued by the West Coast Life Insurance Company, San Francisco, California, on the life of the late Tadashige Uyemura. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after "treasury", insert "remaining in the War Claims Fund and".

Page 1, lines 5 through 10, strike "be

equally divided among the following individuals: (1) Jimmie Kazu Uyemura, Stockton, California. (2) Jean Tomoye Isozaki, Stockton, California. The payment of the pro rata share provided for in this Act to each individual named in clause (1) or (2) shall be" and insert "the heirs at law of Tomosuke Uyemura and Chiyo Uyemura, his wife,".

Page 1, line 11, strike "of the recipient".

Page 2, line 8, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the heirs at law of Tomosuke Uyemura and Chiyo Uyemura, his wife."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. JOSEPH E. BEGNOCHE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13218) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph E. Begnoche.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13218

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the national service life insurance upon the life of the late Ernest H. Begnoche, who died on November 28, 1942, shall be held and considered to have been in effect in the amount of \$10,000 at the time of his death. Any payments made by reason of the enactment of this Act shall be made out of the national service life insurance appropriation.

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

REFERENCE OF CLAIM OF JOHN S. ATTINELLO

The Clerk called House Resolution 533, to refer the bill (H.R. 3722) entitled "A bill for the relief of John S. Attinello" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2059 of title 28, United States Code, as amended.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SANBORN LUMBER CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6402) for the relief of the Sanborn Lumber Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6402

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of section 2680 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to receive, consider, and act upon any claims of the Sanborn Lumber Company, Incorporated, of Chapman, Kansas, against the United States

filed within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, for reimbursement of the amount of expenses and other losses and damages incurred in resettlement as a result of its displacement in connection with the acquisition of land (tracts numbered 1358 and 1359) due to the construction of Milford Dam and Reservoir, Kansas, as if such claims had been filed in the time and manner provided in such section.

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 206]

Abbitt	Foreman	Pepper
Albert	Goldwater	Perkins
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	Powell
Berry	Halpern	Rees
Bingham	Harrington	Reuss
Brasco	Hastings	Rhodes
Brock	Hébert	Rosenthal
Brooks	Howard	St. Onge
Brown, Calif.	Karth	Scheuer
Burton, Utah	Kirwan	Schneebell
Cahill	Kluczynski	Smith, N.Y.
Carey	Landgrebe	Stokes
Casey	Lipscomb	Stuckey
Clark	McClure	Teague, Calif.
Clay	Mann	Teague, Tex.
Cunningham	Meeds	Tunney
Dawson	Michel	Whalley
Denney	Murphy, N.Y.	Yatron
Diggs	Pelly	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2546, AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, 1970, AND RESERVE STRENGTH

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with House

amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

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

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RIVERS, PHILBIN, HEBERT, PRICE of Illinois, FISHER, BENNETT, STRATTON, ARENDS, O'KONSKI, BRAY, BOB WILSON, and GUBSER.

RESIGNATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 7, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It has been an honor and a privilege to serve with the many fine men who are members of the District of Columbia Committee on which I have served since becoming a Member of Congress.

In addition, I have found the many problems coming before our Committee very challenging, particularly when viewed as a reflection of the problems of cities all over our country.

However, I wish to resign from the Committee on the District of Columbia effective today.

Sincerely,

SAM STEIGER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

OCTOBER 7, 1969.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It has been a privilege and an honor for me to work with the many members of the Committee on Banking and Currency during the first nine months of the 91st Congress. My association with and participation in the deliberations of this group will always remain a pleasant and rewarding experience.

However, I wish to submit my resignation from the Committee on Banking and Currency, effective today.

Sincerely yours,

J. GLENN BEALL, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 570) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 570

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Armed Services: J. Glenn Beall, Jr., of Maryland.

Committee on District of Columbia: Vernon W. Thomson, of Wisconsin.

Committee on Government Operations: Sam Steiger, of Arizona.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 475 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 475

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. 10878) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, 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 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 Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. O'NEILL) for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need, and at the conclusion of my remarks will yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule tomorrow be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 475 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 10878 to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 10878 authorizes an appropriation for the National Science Founda-

tion for fiscal year 1970 in the amount of \$477,605,000 and provides that, when specified in an appropriation act, amounts appropriated may remain available without fiscal year limitation.

The bill allows the use of counterpart funds up to \$3 million to be authorized for expenses incurred outside the United States, to be spent in foreign countries to support programs in the interest of improving international relations through scientific endeavor.

The bill requires that the Director of the National Science Foundation keep the House and Senate committees informed of all activities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 475 in order that H.R. 10878 may be considered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

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

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, this resolution, House Resolution 475, does provide an open rule with 1 hour of debate for consideration of H.R. 10878, which is an authorization for the National Science Foundation.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize for fiscal 1970 appropriations totaling \$477,605,000 for the National Science Foundation. Additionally, out of foreign currencies held by the Treasury which the Department determines to be in excess of the normal requirements of the Government, the Foundation is authorized to have appropriated \$3 million for use in its operations outside the United States.

There are a number of separate broad National Science Foundation programs which will be funded from the authorization which are spelled out in great detail in the report. They include:

Support of scientific research...	\$249,300,000
Computing activities in education and research.....	22,000,000
Institutional support for science	74,000,000
Science education support.....	117,500,000
International cooperative scientific activities.....	2,000,000
Science information activities.....	13,000,000
Planning and policy studies...	2,805,000
Program development and management	17,000,000

Each of the areas which the National Science Foundation either carries on itself or supports by grants and other assistance is part of the overall program, the goal of which is the general advancement of scientific knowledge in order to insure the continued scientific and technological strength of the United States. With such a broad program goal the Foundation necessarily covers an extremely broad field in its assistance and grant programs—\$191 million is earmarked for the scientific research project support program which supports scientific research in a number of broad scientific areas including physics, chemistry, astronomy, oceanography, biology, engineering, and the social sciences.

Many of these grants go to universities to assist skilled research technicians to pursue individual research projects

which have been approved by the National Science Foundation for their probable future value. In addition, the institutional support for science program and science education program are both oriented toward upgrading and improving university and college scientific research technology and facilities.

With respect to the \$3 million authorized to be paid by the Treasury out of excess foreign currencies, most of this is used for the translation and publication of scientific information and literature which is considered to be of critical interest to the U.S. scientific community.

Several requests by the Foundation were either reduced or deferred by committee action. A \$10 million request to initiate a new interdisciplinary research program was reduced to \$6 million by the committee. A \$3.3 million request to resurface the Arecibo telescope was deferred until next year as was a \$2 million request for construction of a new oceanographic ship. The committee believes both of these expenditures can be deferred at least 1 year.

The total authorization contained is for \$480,605,000, including the \$3 million in excess foreign currencies. This is within the budget figures recommended by the President. The National Science Foundation and the Bureau of the Budget support the bill.

There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, actually the House has already acted on the independent offices appropriation bill which contained funds for the National Science Foundation. A total of \$420 million was appropriated. This included \$418 million for the programs, salaries, and expenses; and \$2 million in foreign currency for translating of foreign documents. Thus we have appropriated about \$60 million less than this bill will authorize. The other body has not acted as yet.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. 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. 10878) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes.

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. 10878, with Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON 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, the Committee on Science and Astronautics, on May 14, 1969, unanimously voted the bill before us today, H.R. 10878, which would authorize appropriations to the National Science Foundation in the amount of \$477,605,000. In addition, this bill authorizes the NSF to spend overseas \$3 million in excess foreign currencies for the translation of important scientific documents into English. Therefore, the total amount which would be provided by this bill for the Foundation's activities in fiscal 1970 is \$480,605,000.

There is also \$10 million already authorized by Public Law 89-688 for the national sea grant program, thus bringing NSF's total authorization for fiscal year 1970 to \$490,605,000. The committee action reflects a reduction of \$9,395 million below that recommended by the Nixon administration, the reductions involving two actual cuts and two deferrals which we would recommend action on in the future years.

Before presenting the substantive authorization picture for the National Science Foundation for fiscal 1970, I wish to make an observation concerning existing conditions that ought to affect our view of the matter.

The administration request for NSF for fiscal 1970 is \$490 million, not including the \$10 million sea grant program which is provided for independently. The House has passed an appropriations bill making available \$420 million, including the sea grant program, which is \$80 million less than requested, or a reduction of 16 percent. Meanwhile, the Senate has passed an authorization bill, which is now at the Speaker's table, authorizing the program as requested by the administration, plus \$150,000 additional for the State-local policy planning program.

What we are supporting in this authorization of appropriations for the National Science Foundation is threefold. It is the sincere attempt, first, to foster the development of new scientific and engineering knowledge in the country; second, to develop within this new knowledge the kind of scientific and technical manpower needed by our modern and science-oriented society; and third, to foster the development and growth of institutions which will provide the education and training for this manpower.

The National Science Foundation, it should be noted, is by no means the largest supporter of scientific research among Federal agencies, but it has a distinctly broader statutory responsibility than any other agency to develop and maintain American science. This is the responsibility that Congress originally envisioned for the Foundation.

Earlier this year, when we held hearings on the NSF authorization, we heard from Dr. Philip Handler, who is President of the National Academy of Sciences and also is serving as Chairman of the National Science Board. His testimony included one quote which I believe to be particularly significant and which I

would like to call to the attention of this body:

In one set of actions the Federal Government did overtly and deliberately recognize the contribution which science had already made to our national life and which it was expected to make in the future—actions which seemingly were intended to assure that that contribution will be of the magnitude and quality commensurate with its recognized potential. I speak of the creation in 1950 of the National Science Foundation and those legislative acts which, since, have strengthened its Charter.

And yet, the National Science Foundation has never received the kind of financial support necessary to effectively fulfill this congressional mandate. Over the past several years appropriations for the National Science Foundation have remained at somewhat the same level. The appropriation level for the Foundation was almost \$480 million in both fiscal years 1966 and 1967. In fiscal 1968 it climbed \$15 million to \$495 million. However, last year in fiscal 1969, appropriations were abruptly cut back to \$400 million. And this leveling off of support does not, of course, even take into account the rapid rate of inflation which has plagued us all in recent years.

If we are to recognize the increasing demands for scientific and technical manpower in this country and extrapolate them into the amounts of moneys we have and the effect of inflation, we will come to recognize that the Foundation has had to do with much less money than it really needs in order to do its job effectively.

Today, we find ourselves also in a new period of adjustment, in which new attitudes toward the support of science and technology are being evidenced. This is something we should contemplate most seriously.

Just this morning, at hearings held before my own Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development on the question of the administration and management of our national science resources, Dr. Emanuel R. Piore, who is vice president of the IBM Corp. and who also serves on the National Science Board, was testifying. He said something which I believe to be particularly significant and relevant to my point. He said:

American science is in a transitional period. The problem, as I see it, is whether we are to continue to be strong in this area or whether we will become a less important factor in the world scientific community. If the latter, ultimately our economy, our standard of living and our ability to deal, for example, with our environmental problems and the health of our people will diminish.

I do believe it is important for us to recognize that there is an adjustment taking place. Questions are being asked, for example, about the way in which the Defense Department and other mission-oriented agencies are supporting scientific research.

The point has often been made about the growing tendency of these many mission-oriented agencies and departments of government to relinquish support for some very important research programs because of the general budget squeeze—

and do so with the strong recommendation that these programs be picked up and funded by the National Science Foundation. Such programs, it is contended, are well worthy of support and are expected to be of great utility to them at some point in the future but, because of the need for more stringent priority, they must be dropped.

A prime example of this occurred on August 11 and 12 in the Senate, which was then dealing with the research budget of the Department of Defense. At that time the Senate identified some 280 behavioral research projects which they felt might better be supported by NSF, about 212 of which represent ongoing obligations of about \$10 million. An amendment to the military procurement bill was added which would force the armed services to drop virtually any research project which did not have an immediate and apparent relationship to a specific military function or operation.

Meanwhile, the Science Foundation has already assumed or is being asked to assume approximately \$19 million worth of important research efforts which the mission-oriented agencies have dropped in the past 4 years.

I bring this up because it is necessary for us, as we reflect on this subject, to understand that this \$19 million which had been for work and programs which have been going on in other agencies was transferred over to the National Science Foundation without any commensurate increase in funds or transfer of funds from those particular agencies. The work was taken on because it was of particular importance to the country.

There may be a philosophical argument over the extent to which these mission-oriented agencies should support academic research—but the fact is, they have. And now they are pulling out. I do not wish to imply that such shifts, per se, are bad. Indeed, the changes in emphasis can be both healthy and constructive, as long as they are handled in a well-coordinated, judicious manner. The abrupt termination of support for ongoing research projects can cause, and is causing, irreparable harm to the research efforts and capabilities of many of the Nation's areas of scientific excellence.

Moreover, while the Executive and the Congress generally recognize the worth of such programs and want them supported by the appropriate science support agency—the National Science Foundation—this can hardly be done when the Foundation is not only not provided with additional funding capability but is denied a very considerable portion of the minimum budget requested.

The lack of any comprehensive national research policy or coordinated long-range planning effort is also of special concern. It is a concern that has been registered by many of the Nation's top scientists and educators at a number of hearings our subcommittee has held recently on the issue of centralization of Federal science activities.

Mr. Chairman, the value of the contributions of science and technology to the Nation's health, security, and general welfare are widely known and ac-

cepted. But while accepting these values, we must not take them for granted. Indeed, this means that we must maintain our commitment or otherwise suffer an erosion of the scientific enterprise which has been developed so laboriously and with such great benefit to the Nation.

The National Science Foundation has played and will continue to play a critically important role in developing and strengthening American science and technology. It has sought to carry out a variety of programs to develop new knowledge, to educate the scientific and technical manpower needed by a modern science-oriented society, and to foster institutions required for both these functions. To accomplish this mission, the Foundation annually awards grants, contracts, and fellowships to colleges and universities, nonprofit scientific organizations, and individual scientists, teachers, and students throughout all 50 States and District of Columbia.

The Foundation plans to use the proposed fiscal year 1970 authorization of \$480,605,000—excluding sea grant funds—as follows: \$239,300,000 for support of scientific research; \$112,500,000 for science education; \$69,000,000 for institutional support of colleges and universities; \$22,000,000 for extending the use of computers in research and education; \$18,000,000 for science information and international science activities; \$17,000,000 for program development and management; and \$2,805,000 for planning and policy studies.

BACKGROUND

This authorization bill for the National Science Foundation is the first such legislation under the terms of Public Law 90-407, which, passed in July 1968, revised the Foundation's organic act of 1950. I should also add that our committee did not propose annual authorization for the Foundation. The House and Senate themselves incorporated this requirement—and we concur in the wisdom of this move.

The Committee on Science and Astronautics reached its unanimous decision to recommend this bill to the House only after very careful consideration of the public record developed by the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development.

This subcommittee in carrying out the wishes of Congress conducted a most thorough and detailed review of the Foundation budget request.

Last fall, as soon as Chairman MILLER assigned the NSF authorization function continued until mid-March of this year to our Science Subcommittee, we began extended planning, spadework, background study, and conferences with Foundation personnel. This staff activity, when we opened hearings on the NSF budget for fiscal 1970.

Those hearings ran for 9 days, from March 17 through April 1. We called over 32 witnesses, including Dr. Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation; Dr. Philip Handler, Chairman of the National Science Board; and then president-elect of the National Academy of Sciences, and all of the Foundation's major program and division directors. In addition, seven outside

witnesses were heard, representing other Federal agencies and laboratories as well as industry.

These hearings were followed by executive sessions of the subcommittee and much staff work. The subcommittee prepared over 130 multipart questions on NSF's program and 1970 budget, to which the Foundation provided detailed and complete responses. The record of these hearings also includes statements from interested persons representing State governments, the scientific community, the universities, and industry. The public record of the proceedings of this authorization runs about 1,400 pages.

I emphasize these details only to demonstrate how seriously the subcommittee has taken its authorization responsibilities.

From our authorization process has come a revised and, I believe, sensible authorization bill—one based on the knowledge and perception that long concentration permits—plus a definitive report which explains what this program is about, where it is strong, where it is weak, and the extent to which it appears worthy of congressional support.

I would also emphasize the great importance that President Nixon and his administration attaches to the program and mission of the National Science Foundation. On April 18, 1969, after completing its own budgetary review, the Nixon administration recommended to the Congress that the Foundation's budget remain at the \$490 million level recommended by the previous administration. This was done not only in recognition of the critical role that the Foundation plays in maintaining our national scientific strength and preeminence, but also with the President's awareness of the unusually difficult financial position the Foundation is in.

COMMITTEE ACTIONS

The \$480,605,000 authorization recommended by the Committee on Science and Astronautics includes two reductions and two deferrals totaling \$9,545,000 and one addition of \$150,000 for a total net reduction of \$9,395,000. These actions are detailed in the committee report and I would refer you to pages 67 to 70 of that report.

Nonetheless, despite this recommended authorization it does not even restore the Foundation's funding to its level of 2 years ago, when its appropriation was \$495 million. However, even with this amount, the NSF will have much less money in fiscal 1970 to support its programs of scientific research and education than it had in 1968. There are at least four reasons for this:

First, the increased complexity of scientific research, the attendant requirements for more sophisticated and expensive instrumentation and facilities, and the escalating costs of scientific and technical education and training bring new pressures to an already limited budget;

Second, the inflationary spiral of the economy places new strains upon the dollar and its purchasing power;

Third, the assumption of new responsibilities by the Foundation for support of scientific research activities formerly

sponsored by other Federal agencies, totaling over \$19 million in fiscal 1970 not only provides an erroneous and inflated picture of NSF's actual growth, but places other burdens on NSF's needed budgetary flexibility; and

Fourth, the rapid and increasing growth of graduate research and education in science and engineering creates new demands that must be met if this Nation is to maintain its scientific and technological edge and cope with its unmet needs and social problems.

Two decades ago, the Congress created the National Science Foundation in its great perception and wisdom. It recognized the essential importance of the development of science and technology to the future of this Nation. It foresaw its potential contribution to the very fabric of our American life. And it recognized the need to maintain the capabilities to meet the challenges of the future.

And still, we have yet to support the Foundation in a manner commensurate with both its potential contribution to society and in an amount requisite to meet the problems that face this Nation. It is, therefore, critical that the Congress resolve itself to support strongly the Foundation in which basic research is done so that science and technology can have its most beneficial effect upon our environment, our society, and the peoples of the world.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The appropriation bill, as I recall, has already been passed; is that correct?

Mr. DADDARIO. The gentleman is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether I am correct in this or not, but points of order were waived on the appropriation bill, were they not?

Mr. DADDARIO. The gentleman will recall, Mr. Chairman, that we had a discussion about that at that time and I showed some concern about the fact that that had been done. Yes, that is so.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. That is the reason why the appropriation was passed before the authorization bill, but how does this compare with the appropriation, that is, the money figure in this bill? Is it the same as the appropriation?

Mr. DADDARIO. It is not. I might say to the gentleman, as I am sure he very well knows, this is not comparable to the figure that was included in the appropriation bill. As I recall it, it was some \$420 million and it included the sea grant program. The net overall sum was \$80 million less than was requested by this administration, or a cut of 16 percent.

Mr. GROSS. I must confess I really did not remember the figure and had not taken the time to look it up. The gentleman says the appropriation bill as approved by the House is some 16 percent less?

Mr. DADDARIO. \$80 million less.

Mr. GROSS. Sixteen percent less in the appropriation. Is it anticipated that the committee will seek a supplemental to make up the difference between the amount authorized in this bill and the amount actually appropriated?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer the gentleman's question as to what will happen. The fact is that, as the gentleman from California stated during the discussion on the record, the appropriation action is not finished. It has not as yet been handled in the Senate, and I have no way of knowing at this time what the Senate action in that regard will in fact be. There has been action in the Senate on the authorization which supported the administration's position and added a figure of \$150,000 for State and local policy planning. That is the situation in which we find ourselves, and I do not know where we will in fact be when the legislative process is terminated.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, the other body may restore the entire \$80 million?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I would hope they would, but I would doubt they would.

Mr. GROSS. You would hope they would?

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes. I certainly would.

Mr. GROSS. Has this committee, the Science and Astronautics Committee, ever investigated the duplication of studies, and expenditures for research throughout the Federal Government?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I would answer that question in the affirmative. However, the gentleman and I might still have some conflict about what in fact he meant by whether or not there has been investigation or whether or not there is duplication. The fact is that in scientific activity there is no question but that there is a great deal of duplication, because that is in the very nature of scientific research. The problem is how do you keep the right number of people at the highest possible levels of the best types involved. I do think the way in which this is managed does in fact develop that kind of capability within the country in the best way possible. However, I did refer earlier, as I quoted from one witness who appeared before us this morning that we are, as we have been for some time, concerned about the way in which our scientific and technical resources are being managed. We are looking into that very seriously and will certainly make some recommendations about that as we have in the past. The committee over a course of time, I believe, looked very carefully into the situation, and I do think we have conducted our oversight responsibilities as responsibly as it is possible to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DADDARIO. I certainly do.

Mr. GROSS. Does this authorization provide for construction, in other words, for brick and mortar, as well as for research and other studies?

Mr. DADDARIO. There is some construction activity, Mr. Chairman. There is some construction going on in certain of our national research centers I might say, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Iowa. For example, there is construction of buildings and research facilities in the amount of \$360,000 at the Cerro-Tololo Inter-American Observatory in Chile.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the Science and Astronautics Committee. His comments, in my view, have been particularly wise and perceptive.

The members of his subcommittee have worked with great diligence to bring this bill to the House and I commend their efforts. The bill to authorize appropriations for the continued work of the National Science Foundation comes at a most critical time. It is a time when pressing national problems and unmet needs are demanding new commitments and new approaches and are challenging our abilities to apply scientific and technological enterprise and expertise to their solution. It is a time in which inflationary pressures and financial pressures threaten the very foundations of our national economy. It is a time of social unrest and cultural upheaval.

It is also a time at which we can ill afford to renege on our commitment strongly to support and maintain the health of our scientific enterprise in research and education. The activities of the National Science Foundation in the fields of scientific research, education, science information, and international scientific activities are of critical importance to the future strength and success of the Nation.

Congressional approval of the NSF authorization bill is mandatory if the Foundation is to meet its responsibilities enacted by the Congress and to demonstrate a renewed commitment to the pursuit of science as an essential element of our present and future national welfare. Therefore, I strongly urge enactment of this bill to provide the Foundation with an adequate level of funding for fiscal year 1970.

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

Mr. Chairman, the National Science Foundation authorization bill, which is recommended to the House by the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, provides for the support of a variety of programs of great importance to our Nation.

A major portion of the funds to be authorized is for the direct support of scientific research.

That we live in an age of science is daily exemplified.

Man has penetrated into the world of subatomic particles with his accelerators and extended his vision far into space with his radiotelescopes.

Even the hostile environment of the Antarctic has been subdued in the search for scientific knowledge.

While we deepen our scientific understanding of the world about us, we are also pushing forward the frontiers of the social sciences which relate the behavior of human beings to each other and to their environment.

Time does not allow me to dwell on the numerous benefits that we enjoy because of the contributions of science.

Instead, I will speak to what must be done to maintain our scientific capabilities.

In the United States today there are laboratories which are not working to their full capacity; there are young people who want and deserve an education in science; and there are scientific opportunities of incalculable value which are dormant.

These consequences of the leveling off in the Federal support of science are not dramatic, but they have long-range results which can only work to the detriment of our national welfare.

Because many Federal agencies support scientific research, the NSF authorization bill will not, by itself, remedy the situation I have described.

The authorization involves less than one-eighth of the total Federal support for basic research, and only about one-sixth of the Federal funds for academic science.

And yet, the support of scientific research made possible through this authorization will have considerable impact because the programs of the NSF extend over the entire range of scientific disciplines and throughout the geographic regions of the country.

It is, therefore, vital that we provide for the maintenance of quality and continuity of American science by supporting NSF's research programs.

This includes support of research projects, science facilities and equipment, and national research centers.

By this action, Congress will strike an effective blow for the scientific structure which has been so carefully built and which has performed so admirably over the past 25 years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER).

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me of the utmost importance that we should today approve in full the recommendations of the committee, for authorization of \$477,605,000 to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1970.

This year, for the first time, the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and development, under the very vigorous and thorough leadership of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO), held very extensive hearings, analyzing and probing the National Science Foundation's budget requests, requiring their justification.

I submit that those hearings clearly and forcefully demonstrated the Nation's need for a somewhat higher level of activity and funding for the NSF. Certainly justification was shown for the authorization levels recommended to us today by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, is it not crystal clear to all of us, that one of the most crucial requirements for this Nation to maintain its vigor, is that we must maintain and enhance our preeminence in the science? And is it not clearly demonstrated by several years of experience now, that the NSF plays a fundamental, vital, imperative role in nurturing the quality and growth of American science?

It is difficult for me to conceive of any investment of national funds we can make here that is more important and

productive of good, than our investment in search of new and useful knowledge, and investment in the training of new and greater scientifically trained manpower—better equipped manpower—as so effectively accomplished by the NSF.

Therefore, I enthusiastically urge the fullest possible funding of the Foundation for fiscal year 1970, within the severe budget constraints that currently beset us.

Of course, I recognize that the authorization level we propose here today is somewhat higher than the amount of NSF funds that we will actually appropriate. That already has been decided, because of the peculiar order in which the House is considering these bills this year.

Nevertheless, I suggest it is extremely important that the House vote today to confirm the authorization of a level that more clearly recognizes the genuine need, the level recommended by the committee.

It is very important that in the final appropriations decisions, as the House and Senate adjust their differences, we must leave as much leeway, as much flexibility as possible. And also that we establish levels of appropriation for the following fiscal year that will be as realistic and possible.

The House should be aware that the Senate has already authorized for NSF some \$9.5 million more than is called for in the bill before us today.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat the fact already pointed to by others, that our committee asks approval of an authorization which is some \$9 million below the budget request presented by the administration. Recognizing the current budget constraints, we did cut or defer several items, in order to reduce the total.

I submit that the authorization provided in H.R. 10878 can be strongly defended by all of us.

In fact, it is significant to note that this authorization proposal had overwhelming, bipartisan support in both our subcommittee and in the full Science and Astronautics Committee.

I assure the House that the minority members of the committee did strongly support this bill.

I join our committee chairman in urging that H.R. 10878 be now approved.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETTIS).

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Chairman, I take this moment to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER) and also to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on Science, Research and Development (Mr. DADDARIO) for his leadership and for the very careful manner in which we have gone into the various aspects of the subcommittee's activities.

And, I would like to assure the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), that we have been most diligent this year in scrutinizing all aspects of the National Science Foundation, whose budget today we authorize.

I had some apprehension myself when I was first associated with this subcommittee with reference to its expenditures. I have spent many, many hours in looking into the various research projects

under the purview of the National Science Foundation, and as a result I have much more confidence in the program. I would like to assure all the Members of the Congress that the National Science Foundation in my thinking is doing an excellent job, and if we are to be paramount as a nation in the field of science we must keep the National Science Foundation strong.

Mr. Chairman, I think the legislation which we have before us today will do precisely that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, the measure before us authorizing appropriations to the National Science Foundation is well worth full support by this House. It would authorize appropriations of \$477,605,000 for support of scientific research, education, institutional support for science, science information activities, international cooperative scientific activities, planning and program development.

Across the Nation, basic research is being done across the entire spectrum of the sciences under these programs. Their success and continued funding now will be our Nation's scientific lead tomorrow.

In this measure, there is support authorized for the areas of mathematics, physics, chemistry, biological sciences, astronomy, atmospheric sciences, oceanography, earth sciences, engineering, social sciences, and interdisciplinary research.

Sophisticated instrumentation is the key to advances in many areas, and continued advances in procurement of such equipment is insured by approval of this measure. The same is true of physics and biological work, as well as astronomy and the entire range of these disciplines. Antarctic research, weather, ocean sediment, and other specialized programs draw their financial lifeblood from Government support.

Computerization, graduate science work, science course content improvement, science teacher development, and translation of foreign scientific journals are also covered. Generally, this measure would insure that American science develops along a broad front from secondary school programs to post doctoral work encouragement and fellowships. It is work which must continue unmolested, especially in light of what we draw from it in terms of peaceful and national defense advances. I urge the passage of this measure without cuts.

I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO) for his dedicated resolve in this work. His efforts have been tireless and unflagging. Our country owes him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time. I want to compliment not only the members of the subcommittee on their excellent work during the hearings on the National Science Foundation authorization, but also the

full committee on its acceptance of the challenges of scientific research and development in this day and generation.

The bill, by coming out this late, follows many weeks the independent offices appropriation bill which has already passed the House. I would hope that during the next session of the Congress, the authorization bill will get to the floor before the appropriation bill. Otherwise it would make the authorization purely a semantic debate if this sort of an event is repeated.

The action of the Appropriations Committee was to recommend to the House \$438 million for the Foundation for fiscal year 1970. The implications of this action can be viewed in terms of both budget authority, which means new money, and obligational authority, which includes new money and carry-over from previous years. Now, the Appropriations Committee approved budget authority for the Foundation of \$400 million in fiscal year 1969, and a budget authority of \$418 million in fiscal year 1970. Therefore, an increase of \$18 million would seem to be apparent. However, because of the National Science Foundation decision not to obligate \$15 million for its institutional development formula grants program in fiscal year 1969, this obligation will carry over into fiscal year 1970, thus reducing the increase of budget authority to \$3 million, which is in effect the actual increase in budget authority.

The obligational authority for the Foundation in fiscal year 1969 was \$435 million. In fiscal 1970, obligational authority will be \$438 million, including \$418 million in new money and \$20 million in carryover funds. However, because of the delay in obligating the \$15 million for formula grants, to fiscal year 1970, the obligational authority in fiscal year 1970 will be reduced to \$423 million. Hence, there is an effective net decrease in obligational authority for the Foundation in fiscal year 1970 in the amount of \$12 million.

We of the Committee on Science and Astronautics have the responsibility to supervise the various programs of the National Science Foundation. This is the first year that there is such an authorization bill to be acted on by this Congress. Although the sums have tripled in the National Science Foundation over the last decade, there has only been an appropriation subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations acting on the money out of the cash box. Total funding has been the major premise for funding the agency rather than the balancing of the tremendous scientific programs, educational programs, and research programs.

It is necessary that the House have legislative committees working with programs involving the agencies of the Federal Government, the State agencies, as well as various scientists and research organizations in order to come up with a balanced set of priorities. The field of research and development is limitless. We in the Federal Government and the Congress who have the responsibility must be able to have the background, the knowledge and, yes, the hard work to make those decisions on priorities.

In my judgment, the bill now before us is a good decision on the priorities. I, therefore, strongly recommend that it be passed.

For fiscal year 1970, the National Science Foundation's budget request is \$500 million. This includes \$10 million for the national sea grant program which is authorized by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and consequently the committee considered authorization totaling \$490 million. The committee reduced this amount by \$9,395 million.

The Foundation's budget was reduced by the Appropriations Committee \$100 million last year, and their request to the Bureau of the Budget this year was reduced \$118 million. In effect then, the Foundation's request this year represents an effort to get back to the funding level of fiscal year 1968. In fact, even without the reductions, their budget request this year would still be \$5 million below the funding level of fiscal year 1968.

Furthermore, the fiscal year 1970 request includes \$19 million in projects taken over by the Foundation from other agencies, primarily the Department of Defense. These agencies are cutting back in their support of basic research in astronomy and nuclear and particle physics as not being directly relevant to their needs.

Heretofore, it has been the accepted policy that mission agencies should support basic research to improve the quality of their work and to provide a proper research base for long-term mission objectives. To say they are now supporting research most relevant to their missions implies a shift in this policy, and a tendency to concentrate support in the more applied areas. Consequently, this action has implications for the long-term support of basic research from a national point of view, and in particular upon the operations of the National Science Foundation.

There should be an understanding that the Foundation must be given the funds to support these projects. It cannot be expected to take on new work while continuing to operate at the funding level it had 2 or 3 years ago.

The Foundation is the only major research and development agency whose budget was not cut by the Nixon administration. This indicates that the President is aware of the difficult financial position the Foundation is in.

Under the research support program, the committee approved one reduction and two deferrals totaling \$9.3 million.

In fiscal year 1970, the Foundation requested \$10 million to initiate a new interdisciplinary research program.

The interdisciplinary research program is designed to bring scientists and engineers of various disciplines together to work in a coordinated way. Traditionally, the universities have been organized along discipline lines, and there has not been a wide exchange of ideas between departments, nor have the departments actively sought to work together on common problems. In recent years, however, some of these barriers have begun to break down, and terms such as biochemistry or bioengineering have come into common usage.

There is a need to further this kind of work in the other disciplines, and to support programs designed to take advantage of the research developments that have taken place over the course of time.

One of the difficulties in the past has been that when some group has wanted to study a multidisciplinary problem such as pollution as a total picture, the mission agencies have tended to support only those portions of the study directly relevant to their mission objectives, and as a result these groups have had to seek piecemeal funding from the different agencies involved.

In considering this program, the committee agreed that the program should proceed slowly and only the most promising proposals should be supported. Furthermore, although the Foundation intended to limit this program exclusively to universities a significant capability for multidisciplinary research exists in a number of our Federal laboratories. These laboratories should have an opportunity to participate in this and similar programs, both for the quality of their own work, and in order that they may serve as a model in helping universities shape their ideas in organizing and carrying out multidisciplinary research. Finally, in reducing this program by \$4 million, the committee was convinced that since the program could not be initiated until the appropriation process has been completed, the Foundation could not effectively use more than \$6 million in fiscal year 1970.

In fiscal year 1970, the Foundation is requesting \$3.3 million to resurface the Arecibo reflector. The committee deferred that project.

Arecibo was built by the Advanced Research Projects Agency in 1963 for ionospheric studies and for radio and radar astronomy. When the Department of Defense decided to curtail its support of astronomy, the National Science Foundation agreed to support the radio astronomy work, and in fiscal year 1969 provided \$900,000 of support for this purpose. In fiscal year 1970, the Foundation proposes to take over responsibility for the Arecibo facility, and its amount of support would increase about \$300,000 to a level of \$1.2 million. The Department of Defense would continue to support ionospheric studies in the amount of about \$600,000, or approximately one-third of the operating costs of the facility.

The work being done at Arecibo is important to radio astronomy, and for this reason authorization of the funds necessary to continue operation of the facility was approved. However, in view of the additional funding requirements and the transfer of management responsibility to take place this year, the resurfacing should not be approved at this time, and that it be deferred until next year.

In his testimony on Science Research and Development, Dr. Philip Handler, the Chairman of the National Science Board, indicated that there are various proposals throughout the country for new facilities or telescopes in radio astronomy which together total about \$100 million. The new director of the Foundation should be given the opportunity

to determine priorities in the whole field of astronomy, and should have the opportunity to examine the Arecibo facility within this context. Furthermore, while \$3.3 million is proposed to resurface the Arecibo dish, to make use of the facility for radar astronomy purposes it would be necessary to purchase new receiving and transmitting equipment costing an estimated \$2.5 million and it is understood that this will be proposed in the near future. Consequently, by deferring the resurfacing at this time, the new Director, Mr. McElroy can examine the total requirements for Arecibo and establish priorities for future equipment needs within the entire fields of radio and radar astronomy.

Finally, this deferment will not impair the on-going work at Arecibo.

In fiscal year 1970, the Foundation proposed to construct an oceanographic research vessel costing \$2 million.

At the present time, the National Science Foundation and the Office of Naval Research support an oceanographic fleet of 31 vessels assigned to 18 different institutions. The amount of support provided by the Foundation for these ships amounts to about \$7 million per year, and the Office of Naval Research contributes about \$4.5 million.

In fiscal year 1970, the Foundation proposed to begin construction on a new vessel costing about \$2 million. This vessel would take about 5 years to construct and would be assigned to an institution like the other ships in the fleet. The committee deferred this project for the following reasons:

First, the Foundation should not begin construction of a new vessel at a time when it is not completely using the existing ships in the fleet. Because of the expenditure limitation in fiscal year 1969, the Foundation set an overall expenditure limitation on each of the universities, and the universities in turn had to decide which projects supported by the Foundation at the universities would have to be reduced to meet the expenditure limitation. As a result of this action, three ships were taken out of service, and the schedules of several others were reduced or markedly altered.

It is more prudent to make the best use of the ships already in service before the Foundation commits itself to the purchase of a new ship. Furthermore, the Foundation, in cooperation with ONR, should review its entire method of ship support with a view toward obtaining more efficient use of the fleet, and report to the committee prior to the beginning of the next authorization process. Of particular interest, the Foundation should look into the possibility of forming user groups for ships as an alternative to assigning ships to particular institutions.

Second, in its report of January 1969, the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources—the Stratton Commission—recommended the creation of a new National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency. The recommendations of the Commission are now being studied by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The Congress should have the opportunity to determine priorities and the direction of the total oceanographic effort and not authorize the

funding of a new ship by the Foundation this year.

For policy and planning studies in fiscal 1970, the Foundation requests \$2.9 million. The committee reduced this amount by \$95,000.

Under the policy and planning studies program, the Foundation proposes to spend \$1.315 million for the National Register of Scientists and Engineers. The national register was begun during World War II for the purpose of locating scientific personnel by field of specialty in a time of national emergency. In 1953, the register activities were transferred to the Foundation, and the Foundation has updated the register biennially and has used the information developed to perform various manpower studies of scientific and engineering personnel. At the last registration in 1968, the register contained the names of approximately 50 percent of the scientists and 10 percent of the engineers in the United States.

In fiscal year 1970, the Foundation again plans to update the register and expand the coverage to include more engineers. We question if the emergency preparedness function of the register is still as urgent as it was during World War II, therefore, we deleted \$245,000 attributable to expanded coverage of the register. Further, the Foundation should perform a study of the requirements for the register as a locator in emergency situations as well as in other than emergency conditions and report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics prior to the start of the next authorization process. If the locator function is no longer necessary, the Foundation should determine if the manpower studies function of the register could be performed on a selective sampling basis at a lower cost to the Federal Government.

Under the policy and planning studies program, the Foundation has a program called State and local intergovernmental science policy planning for which the Foundation is requesting \$150,000 in fiscal year 1970. The committee added an additional \$150,000 to this program.

The State science program is a pilot program to help States and local governments find ways to employ science and technology in solving local problems. Because of the importance of this program, and because of the need to involve more States in this effort, the program should be expanded. At the same time, many States are just beginning to get involved in this area, and the program should remain primarily a pilot program to develop innovative ways through which science and technology can better be employed by State and local governments.

Regarding the bill itself, the committee approved a section requiring the Foundation to keep the committee fully and currently informed, and this appears in the bill as section 5.

This provision is the same as that which the committee previously has adopted with respect to NASA. It clarifies the committee's right to information generally in view of its new oversight responsibilities over the Foundation.

While it is not possible to foresee all the circumstances in which the committee should be kept informed, and this will require the good faith and judgment of the Foundation, other matters would

include, for example, substantial changes in programs as presented to the committee or major accidents and in particular those involving loss of life.

At this point, I want to insert in the RECORD a summary of the National Science Foundation budget which will make clear the committee's action:

BUDGET SUMMARY, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION,
FISCAL YEAR 1970

Program	Budget request	Action	Recommended authorization
Support of scientific research.....	\$248.6	—\$9.3	\$239.3
Computing activities.....	22.0	-----	22.0
Institutional support.....	69.0	-----	69.0
Science education.....	112.5	-----	112.5
Science information.....	113.0	-----	113.0
International cooperative science activities.....	2.0	-----	2.0
Policy and planning studies.....	2.9	— .095	2.805
Program development and management.....	17.0	-----	17.0
Total.....	\$487.0	—9.395	\$477.605

¹ Plus \$2,000,000 excess foreign currencies.

² Plus \$1,000,000 excess foreign currencies.

³ Plus \$3,000,000 excess foreign currencies.

I have three amendments to this legislation which I will introduce when the general debate is finished.

The first amendment is generally to cut the authorization of funds from \$477,605,000 for the fiscal year 1970 to \$474,305,000. This is a \$3,300,000 reduction. It is largely intended to take up the slack resulting from a carryover of funds from last fiscal year and which was not programmed through previous authorizations. There is also deletion of funds for one airplane that I do not believe is needed. This plane is intended to replace a Beech Queen Air, which was unfortunately lost in a Lake Superior accident with its crew in 1968.

I believe there are adequate planes in other Government agencies that the National Science Foundation can utilize for research at the National Center for Atmospheric Research called NCAR, at Boulder, Colo., under lease or flight service arrangements.

I do not think the purchase of a new plane is necessary at this time.

The next amendment is an objection to a Senate provision passed in the authorization bill by the other body within the last 2 weeks. The Senate has approved the authorization of funds for a period of 4 years. These funds, even though the fiscal year in which they were authorized has expired, can be carried over by the agency for 3 additional years before they are canceled.

I believe it should be at most a 2- or 3-year period. In order that the House may then work its will, I have an amendment which will allow the authorization of the funds in this particular bill for this fiscal year, 1970, to be carried over for the fiscal year 1971, and canceling these funds or striking them from the authorization at the end of 2 years.

I believe that since this creates a disagreement between the two bodies we might be able to agree on the same sort of arrangement and authorization that now exists in the acts governing NASA. When NASA authorizations are not used either in the fiscal year for which they were originally authorized or in the two

succeeding fiscal years, they are automatically canceled.

As a matter of fact, it was my amendment this year that did cancel \$322,000,000 of NASA authorization funds which had been held over for longer than this 3-year period. The House adopted that amendment.

My last amendment generally is directed to institutions of higher learning with respect to students who are either refusing to obey lawful regulations and orders of the institution or are convicted of crimes such as trying to destroy the institution and causing riots. I believe such an amendment is necessary.

Part of my amendment on student unrest and disorder is already in the NSF appropriation bill which passed this House on June 24. However, it does not contain the full language that is part of the NASA authorization bill. I believe we should have some form of language that covers institutions of higher learning in every one of the authorization bills as well as in the appropriation bills.

Therefore, I have taken the present language that has been adopted by this House in the NASA authorization bill and have tailored it to fit into this particular legislation.

I thank my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, and recommend that the bill do pass.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to my colleagues that one of the important provisions of H.R. 10878 which authorizes appropriations for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1970, is to provide \$5 million for support of the international biological program.

The international biological program represents the first large-scale ecological research activity on biological productivity and the biological basis of human welfare. The broad objective of the IBP is to provide insight and foresight about the changing relations between man and his environment. The focus of the program is upon establishing an ecological base for the management of our environment and for the prevention of the deterioration which is threatening our entire planet.

It was over a decade ago that faint voices of scientific concern were being raised about the pending deterioration of our planetary environment. Today these voices are loud and clear. Environmental quality has become a central issue of national and international concern.

First, it has also become amply clear that, despite these growing concerns and developing commitment to meet this challenge, the scientific data upon which to base valid judgments and effective actions are simply not available. Moreover, the manpower supply of highly skilled ecologists and environmental managers is still nowhere commensurate with the demands and size of the problems we are facing.

The IBP represents an organized and integrated approach to these two problems. It will contribute importantly to the store of knowledge about organic production and human adaptability. It will aid also in the training of new manpower resources for the problems we face today and will face tomorrow.

Second, I would like to point out that

Joint Resolution 589, introduced by the gentlemen from California and Connecticut, is presently pending and will be coming up for floor action in the near future. This joint resolution expresses the support of the Congress, and urges the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the IBP. I would certainly hope that this resolution will be adopted by the House during this session.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 10878, the authorization for the National Science Foundation. This bill would authorize the expenditure of \$477.6 million.

As a Member of Congress who has the privilege of representing a large academic community, I know, at first hand, the value of the National Science Foundation. For example, the University of California at Berkeley, which is located in my district, received almost \$11 million for the last fiscal year and the beginning of fiscal year 1970, according to the latest NSF figures. The grants are given for a variety of purposes but all directly contribute to the upgrading of the quality of education and the pursuit of knowledge.

In supporting this authorization, I am not unmindful that the House has appropriated \$420 million and the other Chamber has appropriated \$502 million. In supporting this \$477.6 million authorization bill, I am still of the opinion that this is an inadequate figure, but given the pressing demands on our budget, I feel that this figure represents the minimum that is needed.

Mr. Chairman, the range of the National Science Foundation grants illustrates their necessity. At the University of California at Berkeley there are grants for pure research. For example there are grants to investigate properties of laser beams, metamathematics, theoretical solid state physics, and so forth. There is also a study to determine the ability of various structural systems to withstand earthquakes. The results of this study may have significance for many of us who live in an area that is not unfamiliar with the effects of earthquakes. Still another study sponsored through a grant from the National Science Foundation is the utilization of mathematics to assist in solving our transportation problems. As can be seen from these examples, the National Science Foundation research has pure and applied scientific value.

Mr. Chairman, I must point out that the National Science Foundation does not just limit itself to supporting programs in pure and applied research. At the University of California at Berkeley there were a number of grants to improve the quality of our secondary school systems. This was undertaken in two ways: By providing grants to improve the content of various curricula and by a series of institutes for teachers and supervisors. Still other grants were utilized to restructure undergraduate and graduate curricula and to assist in graduate student training.

Mr. Chairman, I think that these examples, drawn from an area that I have

familiarity with, show the necessity for authorizing funds for the National Science Foundation. I want to compliment the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO) for his handling of this bill. Mr. DADDARIO furnished the Members with an informative report. I have worked with him on numerous occasions in this area, and I have found him to be most helpful and sympathetic to the needs of scientific research. I went with Mr. DADDARIO's subcommittee and my colleague from California (Mr. MILLER) to investigate the NSF projects at Berkeley and U.C.L.A. This investigation reinforced my conviction of the vital nature of the NSF research effort. In supporting this authorization, I am not unmindful of the many worthwhile projects that will be limited or eliminated. I wish that the current fiscal situation permitted a more extensive program, but unfortunately, this is not the case.

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. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10878

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, to enable it to carry out its powers and duties under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and under title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$477,605,000.

SEC. 2. Appropriations made pursuant to authority provided in section 1 shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure, for such period or periods as may be specified in Acts making such appropriations.

SEC. 3. Appropriations made pursuant to this Act may be used, but not to exceed \$2,500, for official reception and representation expenses upon the approval or authority of the Director, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

SEC. 4. In addition to such sums as are authorized by section 1 hereof, not to exceed \$3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States to be paid for in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any provision of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, or any other provision of law, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall keep the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate fully and currently informed with respect to all of the activities of the National Science Foundation.

SEC. 6. This Act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Authorization Act, 1970."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 1, line 9, strike "\$477,605,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$474,305,000"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely involves \$3.3 million. It would cut funds on projects for which there has been no authorized programing by the Foundation. It will even leave a \$2 million leeway if they use \$15 million of the \$20 million carryover authorization of funds from 1969 for institutional formula grants. There is also a cut of \$300,000 in the purchase of an airplane, which I believe is unnecessary, because the NSF already is using three planes at the Boulder installation. The fourth plane, in the interest of economy, can be obtained on loan, or by request and payment through budgetary exchange from other Government agencies. We have plenty of planes of this type within the Government. I therefore think the new plane, the fourth one, should not be bought.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 2, add new section 5: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorization of any appropriation to the National Science Foundation shall expire (unless an earlier expiration is specifically provided) at the close of the first fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the authorization was enacted, to the extent that such appropriation has not theretofore actually been made."

Renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the reason for this amendment is that in the bill passed by the Senate on September 18, authorizing funds for the National Science Foundation, called the amendments of 1969, there is a section 3 which reads:

Section 14 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1956, as amended by Public Law 90-407, 82 Stat. 360, is amended by adding to the end thereof the following new paragraph:

1. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the authorization of any appropriation of the Foundation shall expire unless an earlier expiration is specifically provided at the close of the third fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the authorization was enacted, to the extent that such appropriation has not theretofore actually been made.

That means that for a 4-year period, authorizations which are made by the Congress for the National Science Foundation remain in power and force.

In my judgment the legislative committees of the Congress should follow

these appropriations of such large amounts—approximating almost one-half billion dollars a year—much more closely than that. In order to have a uniform method, I have put in an amendment to have the authorization last for a 2-year period.

Since the Senate has made the authorization for 4 years, obviously a disagreement between the two Houses will exist. My hope is we will agree to adopt uniformly the same process governing authorization as now exists in NASA, an allied agency. That means, at the end of the second fiscal year after an authorization is passed, there is an automatic termination of those authorizations. This does two things: First, it keeps the Agency current; and second, it keeps the Agency on its toes.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the purpose of the gentleman's amendment, it is laudable in that it stops this 4-year business, but why 2 years?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The answer to it is this: These are authorizations on programs that are continuing programs. For example, when we have education programs, such as graduate fellowship programs leading to a doctoral degree, they run for 3 years. So really, if we are going to have funding for a program, we have to have authorization for the term of the program. But we do not appropriate money except on a yearly basis.

Mr. GROSS. I can think of one program that seems to be perpetual around here on a 1-year basis, and that is the foreign handout bill. I would hope this would be the year when that would be washed out entirely, and we would dissipate and obliterate the idea that we have to give our billions away overseas every year. But I just do not understand and still do not understand why this Foundation, to the exclusion of many others, should be put upon a 2-year basis. I am for the gentleman's amendment, but I do think it goes far enough.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman should be complimented, because he has always tried to restrict the U.S. foreign aid programs, first in amount, and second, to an annual basis.

I am very glad to state that I have not felt the programs of U.S. foreign aid should be abandoned. But I have voted to reduce them and have also joined with the gentleman from Iowa in trying to work out annual authorizations for that program.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question. Is this the same amendment the gentleman from Pennsylvania added to the NASA authorization bill, except for that there was a 1-year provision rather than 2 years?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The NASA authorization bill provides for termination at the end of the second fiscal

year after the current fiscal year for which the authorization is made. This is 1 year shorter than that, obviously in order to try to make an arrangement with the other body and reduce their provision from 4 to 3 years, which is now the law for NASA.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this for clarification. The amendment, as I understand it, adds a new section 5 on page 2. I presume other sections would be renumbered accordingly. Does that mean the present section 5 would become new section 6? The purpose of my question is to insure this is not in substitution of that present section 5.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Connecticut has a very good point. Those sections should be renumbered as section 6, and section 7, and so on, renumbering accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 2, after line 23, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. —. If any institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending or employed by such institution—

"(a) that such individual has, after the date of the enactment of this act, willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to the disruption of the administration of such institution; or

"(b) that such individual has been convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or convicted of any group activity resulting in material damage to property, or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned;

then the institution shall deny any further payments to or for the benefit of such individual which (but for this section) would be due or payable to such individual and no part of any funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be available for the payment of any amount (as salary, as a loan or grant, or otherwise) to such individual."

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the point of this amendment is to put in this bill for the National Science Foundation the same amendment which passed this House in the National Aeronautics and Space Agency bill, H.R. 11271.

The difference between this amendment on student unrest and violence in institutions and the similar provision in the appropriation bill in that section (b) had been left out by the Appropriations Committee. I will read section (b):

b. that such individual has been convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction of inciting, pro-

moting, or carrying on a riot, or convicted of any group activity resulting in material damage to property, or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned;

One part of the section was left out by the Appropriations Committee. It states:

Which (but for this section) would be due or payable to such individual and no part of any funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be available for the payment of any amount (as salary, as a loan or grant, or otherwise) to such individual.

That last portion I read makes it very specific. There can be no payments as salary, loan, grant of any kind, or otherwise. It ties down the provisions very specifically.

The other portion that is left out means that when an individual has been convicted of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or convicted of any group activity resulting in material damage to the institution or injury to the persons of the institutions, and these laws are designed to protect the institution, the property and the persons concerned, that person shall not receive money under National Science Foundation grants, loans, salaries, or otherwise.

This amendment ties it down just as the House decided, after some little debate on the NASA authorization bill, which just passed the House a few weeks ago.

This means that we use the same form. We do not change it. Once the House has made up its mind and has authorized for scientific institutions a provision that is to apply to students' behavior, the House should readopt the same language for similar legislation. So this is my amendment, which merely takes a language from the bottom of page 8 over to page 9, line 10, of H.R. 11271. It passed the House by a tremendous majority, and is known as the National Aeronautics and Space Agency authorization bill.

Now, in concluding my statement, there are many people with other ideas. I simply put this on the basis of the House having acted this year on this particular point. Now, when this scientific institution, the National Science Foundation, comes up for authorization, the House should likewise apply the same rule and adopt the same language. It would be intolerable to have funds given out under NASA one way, and to have the National Science Foundation give funds out in another way. Both are under the purview and jurisdiction of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House, of which I am the ranking minority member.

I am glad to yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

To recapitulate, it is my understanding according to the explanation given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this language of the amendment you have just offered is identical to that which was in the NASA bill.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is correct. And you have the NASA bill and can take a look at it.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Second, am I correct that this applies only to an individual who is either covered by (a) or (b) of this section?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It applies to individuals in seriatim. It can be individuals one at a time. It is intended for the individual and his own actions, not to ban or blacklist a whole group.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania asked and was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I am glad to do so.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. It does not apply, then, to an institution?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. No. It does not apply either to an institution, a university, a college, or any type of school, foundation, or laboratory. It applies to the individual, regardless of how many may be involved in a riot or disorder.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will yield once more, am I correct, also, in having quickly read the amendments passed by the House earlier, that the determination for the action to refuse to grant money in the form of a loan, grant, or salary is made by the institution of higher education?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. That is specifically the case. The amendment specifically says "if any institution of higher education determines after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to the individual attending or employed by such institution." So it is specifically as you stated it.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is apparently fortunate that this bill did not come out of the Committee on Education and Labor, or else it would be brought up under a suspension of the rules so that we could not put this kind of an amendment on it. I congratulate the gentleman for his amendment and say I am delighted that this bill did not come out of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. His compliments are very few but well received.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the full 5 minutes but simply want to say it is unfortunate, as I have said in the past in debate on this floor in Committee of the Whole, that action has not been taken on a single amendment to the Higher Education Act which might be applicable to all Federal programs as they relate to cutting off aid to an individual student convicted of substantively disrupting a university campus. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for having offered an amendment that is identical to that in the NASA bill so that at the very least the institutions of higher education

which work with NASA and the National Science Foundation will be operating on the same basis and will not become more confused by a proliferation of so-called student unrest amendments. I have said before it seems to me we have a legitimate reason, in operating the Federal Government, to cut off aid to individual students. This amendment, while I regret the necessity of having it even considered, does not go so far as some have suggested in cutting off aid to an institution.

I want to indicate my concern, however, over the provisions of the amendment, particularly the fact that no termination date is provided for the cutoff so that a student again would be eligible for assistance. Section 504 of the Higher Education Act, as the Committee knows, provides for 2 years.

In addition, Secretary Finch of HEW has correctly pointed out the difficulty with the "court of competent jurisdiction" language which makes for unequal treatment of students of the same age in Wisconsin and California, for example.

I would much prefer that this language not be included in this authorization but, because this amendment is identical with the NASA amendment, it seems to me appropriate for this body to consider it at this time.

When that NASA bill was before the House an effort to delete this kind of provision was rejected overwhelmingly. With so few Members on the floor at this moment, I expect the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) will be adopted. I am saddened by that prospect, Mr. Chairman, and again reiterate my hope that one set of standards will be adopted that apply to all Federal programs so as to stop this procedure of adopting separate amendments to each and every bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have followed this authorization "after the fact," with great interest. In fact, I want to compliment the committee, because I remember when it garnered power unto itself in order to make a line-item review of the authorization of all these different research areas, under the National Science Foundation.

I am one of those who have studied the reorganization of the Congress, served on the House-Senate joint commission, and one who thinks that all committees have a supervisory, surveillance, and review function over the executive branches of the Government, whether they be individual agencies or Cabinet or departmental branches. I believe we should analyze and authorize on an each-year—or at the minimum on each congressional—basis; by line item, their authorizations and then have the subsequent action of the operating committee to appropriate funds therefor.

Therefore, I compliment the committee and the subcommittee on this historical first authorization of the appropriations for the National Science Foundation.

I suppose, basically because I am a scientist, I am much concerned about the fact that we are controlling directly or indirectly more and more of the elements of parallel or vertical research that goes on by Government agencies. It is a known fact that those who produce technical breakthroughs based on research, development, testing and engineering do equally as well in the 18-percent private sector as they do in the 82-percent Government-controlled sector. Perhaps this is because we in Congress fear "sacred cows" and strangle the scientific agencies with directed research funds. This should concern us as a matter of national interest, in my opinion.

By the same token, I am sure one must be concerned by the possibility of duplication and overlapping. As the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, our good friend (Mr. DADDARIO) said, the necessity of research must at times be duplicative in its concept and in its development. This is not always bad. Some of the greatest discoveries of mankind have been predicated on redoing basic, applied, technical, or developmental research. There is no question about that in any scientific mind. But I am a little bit concerned about the duplicative effect of the National Science Foundation working directly under the chief of the executive branch, as well as it may be overseen by a distinguished committee such as this, lest it become as the Department of Defense has, a many-headed monster overseeing and duplicating programs and additive programs to those which are constitutionally allocated to the functioning branches of the Capital.

Mr. Chairman, here we have a bill for practically one-half billion dollars of authorization where if we study the applied research and the technical research, we find there are some very questionable areas. I can think of a few right off the cuff.

There are many of these research and development funds authorized wherein they are duplicated in the various defense agencies, whether they be the Army, Navy, Air Force, or others.

Indeed, there are some of these items that have been set forth here by this committee in its first authorization report, and on which it therefore has no comparison with prior authorizations, that are duplicative in an extent somewhat even with the NASA authorizations themselves.

Certainly a specific example could be dredged up in some of the scientific research areas authorized here vis-a-vis the Department of HEW, which I believe, outside of the Department of Defense, is our biggest authorizing bill for research and development, and particularly involving the National Institutes of Health.

A simple reading of the committee's report will give some danger of duplication over and above the essential duplication of research if one reads it carefully.

Then, as an added example there is the example of the authorization here for the appropriation for oceanography. Now, we get at oceanography in many different ways in this Congress. Those of use who study it and look at it from a scientific point of view know that, for

example, our Navy is authorized to invest—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, the Navy is authorized to invest and fund 76 percent of all oceanographic studies. There is a separate Institute on Oceanography, it is chaired by the Navy. Then we have the Oceanographic Institutes. I believe there is one in San Diego, and I think there is one additional one which we use as a laboratory, and which we fund in authorized appropriations for consultation to the Oceanographic Institute, and the intergovernmental oceanographic agencies.

To go on down the list here is perhaps useless. I think I have made my point, and I simply throw out a warning that in the blessed name of science and research, and in spite of the importance and need of garnering unto ourselves line item review of essential projects—and I compliment the committee for doing that—that we constantly be alert lest we do invade the jurisdiction of other committees, but even more so that we double expenses from the taxpayers' pocket in research that redounds without producing benefit.

I believe that one cannot go further this time, although one can continue going through item by item as, indeed, I have in the report, and marked pluses or minuses on every one of the authorizations that are set out here, I think it serves no purpose except to alert and put on notice those who have garnered unto themselves that they must at all expenses avoid duplication, additive work, unnecessary research that overlaps, and, above all, read history to see if the needed knowledge is available before the research is authorized.

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

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman on making an excellent point. Our Committee on Science and Astronautics has tried to prevent overlap, particularly in the Department of Defense, and the National Institutes of Health, and some progress has been made by the new Secretary of the Air Force. We have been so much opposed toward putting a program under the DOD and the Air Force for a manned orbiting laboratory, and then a program of very similar nature under NASA for a manned orbiting workshop. That manned orbiting laboratory program has now been canceled. I believe we should go forward, as the gentleman said, and make sure on these line-by-line items that we will provide adequate research but no duplication.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I would only add one sentence, and that is that the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is true if, it is within the bounds of military security, which cannot be here discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, 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. 10878) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 475, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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 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. 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 384, nays 5, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—384

Abernethy	Brown, Ohio	Culver
Adair	Broyhill, N.C.	Daddario
Adams	Broyhill, Va.	Daniel, Va.
Addabbo	Buchanan	Daniels, N.J.
Alexander	Burke, Fla.	Davis, Ga.
Anderson,	Burke, Mass.	de la Garza
Calif.	Burleson, Tex.	Delaney
Anderson, Ill.	Burlison, Mo.	Dellenback
Andrews, Ala.	Burton, Calif.	Dennis
Andrews,	Bush	Dent
N. Dak.	Button	Derwinski
Annunzio	Byrne, Pa.	Dickinson
Arends	Byrnes, Wis.	Diggs
Ashbrook	Cabell	Dingell
Ashley	Caffery	Donohue
Aspinall	Camp	Dorn
Ayres	Carter	Dowdy
Baring	Casey	Downing
Barrett	Cederberg	Dulski
Beall, Md.	Celler	Duncan
Belcher	Chamberlain	Dwyer
Bell, Calif.	Chappell	Eckhardt
Bennett	Clancy	Edmondson
Betts	Clark	Edwards, Ala.
Bevill	Clausen,	Edwards, Calif.
Biaggi	Don H.	Edwards, La.
Blester	Clawson, Del.	Ellberg
Blackburn	Clay	Erlenborn
Blanton	Cleveland	Esch
Blatnik	Cohelan	Eshleman
Boggs	Collier	Evans, Colo.
Boland	Collins	Evins, Tenn.
Bolling	Colmer	Fallon
Bow	Conable	Farbstein
Brademas	Conte	Fascell
Bray	Conyers	Feighan
Brinkley	Corbett	Findley
Brock	Corman	Fish
Broomfield	Coughlin	Fisher
Brozman	Cowger	Flood
Brown, Mich.	Cramer	Flowers

Foley	McCloskey	Rodino
Ford, Gerald R.	McCuulloch	Rogers, Colo.
Ford,	McDade	Rogers, Fla.
William D.	McDonald,	Rooney, N.Y.
Fountain	Mich.	Rooney, Pa.
Fraser	McEwen	Rostenkowski
Frelinghuysen	McFall	Roth
Frey	McKneally	Roudebush
Friedel	McMillan	Roybal
Fulton, Pa.	Macdonald,	Ruppe
Fulton, Tenn.	Mass.	Ruth
Fuqua	MacGregor	Ryan
Galifianakis	Madden	St Germain
Gallagher	Mahon	Sandman
Garmatz	Mailliard	Satterfield
Gaydos	Marsh	Schadeberg
Gettys	Martin	Scherle
Glaimo	Mathias	Scheuer
Gibbons	Matsunaga	Schwengel
Gilbert	May	Scott
Gonzalez	Mayne	Sebellus
Goodling	Meeds	Shipley
Gray	Melcher	Shriver
Green, Oreg.	Meskill	Sikes
Green, Pa.	Michel	Sisk
Griffin	Mikva	Skubitz
Griffiths	Miller, Calif.	Slack
Grover	Miller, Ohio	Smith, Calif.
Gubser	Mills	Smith, Iowa
Gude	Minish	Smith, N.Y.
Hagan	Mink	Snyder
Haley	Minshall	Springer
Hamilton	Mize	Stafford
Hammer-	Mizell	Staggers
schmidt	Molohan	Stanton
Hanley	Monagan	Steed
Hanna	Montgomery	Steiger, Ariz.
Hansen, Idaho	Moorhead	Steiger, Wis.
Hansen, Wash.	Morgan	Stokes
Harsha	Morse	Stratton
Harvey	Morton	Stubblefield
Hathaway	Mosher	Sullivan
Hawkins	Moss	Symington
Hays	Murphy, Ill.	Taft
Hechler, W. Va.	Murphy, N.Y.	Talcott
Heckler, Mass.	Myers	Taylor
Helstoski	Natcher	Teague, Calif.
Henderson	Nedzi	Teague, Tex.
Hicks	Nelsen	Thompson, Ga.
Hogan	Nichols	Thompson, N.J.
Hollfield	Nix	Thomson, Wis.
Horton	Obey	Tieman
Hosmer	O'Hara	Udall
Hull	Olsen	Ullman
Hungate	O'Neal, Ga.	Utt
Hunt	O'Neill, Mass.	Van Deerlin
Hutchinson	Ottlinger	Vander Jagt
Ichord	Passman	Vanik
Jacobs	Patman	Vigorito
Jarman	Patten	Waggonner
Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Waldie
Johnson, Pa.	Perkins	Wampler
Jonas	Pettis	Watkins
Jones, Ala.	Philbin	Watson
Jones, N.C.	Pickle	Watts
Jones, Tenn.	Pike	Welcker
Karh	Pirnie	Whalen
Kastenmeier	Poage	White
Kazen	Podell	Whitehurst
Keith	Poff	Whitten
King	Pollock	Widnall
Kleppe	Preyer, N.C.	Wiggins
Kluczynski	Price, Ill.	Williams
Koch	Price, Tex.	Wilson, Bob
Kuykendall	Pryor, Ark.	Wilson,
Kyl	Pucinski	Charles H.
Kyros	Purcell	Winn
Landrum	Quillen	Wolfe
Langen	Railsback	Wright
Latta	Randall	Wyatt
Leggett	Rarick	Wyder
Lennon	Reid, Ill.	Wyllie
Lloyd	Reid, N.Y.	Wyman
Long, La.	Reiff	Yates
Long, Md.	Reuss	Young
Lowenstein	Riegle	Zablocki
Lujan	Rivers	Zion
Lukens	Roberts	Zwach
McCarthy	Robison	
McClory		

NAYS—5

Devine
GrossHall
O'Konski
NOT VOTING—42

Abbott	Chisholm	Howard
Albert	Cunningham	Kee
Anderson,	Davis, Wis.	Kirwan
Tenn.	Dawson	Landgrebe
Berry	Denney	Lipscomb
Bingham	Flynt	McClure
Brasco	Foreman	Mann
Brooks	Goldwater	Pelly
Brown, Calif.	Halpern	Powell
Burton, Utah	Harrington	Rees
Cahill	Hastings	Rhodes
Carey	Hébert	Rosenthal

St. Onge
Schneebell
StephensStuckey
Tunney
Whalley

Yatron

So the bill was passed.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Rhodes.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Schneebell.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Corey with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Abbott with Mr. Landgrebe.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Rees with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Harrington with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Stephens.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 1857, to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation pursuant to Public Law 81-507, as amended, a Senate bill similar to that just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1857

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, to enable it to carry out its powers and duties under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and under title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$487,150,000.

Sec. 2. Appropriations made pursuant to authority provided in section 1 shall remain available for obligations, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure, for such period or periods as may be specified in Acts making such appropriations.

Sec. 3. Section 14 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended by Public Law 90-407 (82 Stat. 360), is amended by adding to the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorization of any appropriation to the Foundation shall expire (unless an earlier expiration is specifically provided) at the close of the third fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the authorization was enacted, to the extent that such appropriation has not theretofore actually been made."

Sec. 4. Appropriations made pursuant to this Act may be used, but not to exceed \$2,500, for official reception and representation expenses upon the approval or authority of the Director, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

Sec. 5. In addition to such sums as are

authorized by section 1 hereof, not to exceed \$3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States to be paid for in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

Sec. 6. Notwithstanding any provision of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, or any other provision of law, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall keep the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate fully and currently informed with respect to all of the activities of the National Science Foundation.

Sec. 7. This Act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Act Amendments of 1969."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DADDARIO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DADDARIO: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1857 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 10878, as passed, as follows:

"That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, to enable it to carry out its powers and duties under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and under title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$474,305,000.

"Sec. 2. Appropriations made pursuant to authority provided in section 1 shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure, for such period or periods as may be specified in Acts making such appropriations.

"Sec. 3. Appropriations made pursuant to this Act may be used, but not to exceed \$2,500, for official reception and representation expenses upon the approval or authority of the Director, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

"Sec. 4. In addition to such sums as are authorized by section 1 hereof, not to exceed \$3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States to be paid for in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

"Sec. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorization of any appropriation to the National Science Foundation shall expire (unless an earlier expiration is specifically provided) at the close of the first fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the authorization was enacted, to the extent that such appropriation has not theretofore actually been made.

"Sec. 6. Notwithstanding any provision of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, or any other provision of law, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall keep the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate fully and currently informed with respect to all of the activities of the National Science Foundation.

"Sec. 7. If any institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending or employed by such institution—

"(a) that such individual has, after the date of the enactment of this act, willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to the disruption of the administration of such institution; or

"(b) that such individual has been con-

victed in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction of inciting, promoting, or carrying on a riot, or convicted of any group activity resulting in material damage to property, or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned;

then the institution shall deny any further payments to or for the benefit of such individual which (but for this section) would be due or payable to such individual and no part of any funds appropriated pursuant to this Act shall be available for the payment of any amount (as salary, as a loan or grant, or otherwise) to such individual.

"Sec. 8. This Act may be cited as the 'National Science Foundation Authorization Act, 1970.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 10878) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 571) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 571

"Resolved, That Charlotte T. Reid, of Illinois, be and she is hereby elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Standards of Official Conduct."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SUBCHAPTER III OF CHAPTER 83, TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE—CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9825) to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: That this Act may be cited as the "Civil Service Retirement Amendments of 1969".

TITLE I—CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FINANCING

Sec. 101. Section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (15);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (16) and inserting a semicolon in lieu thereof; and

(3) by adding immediately below paragraph (16) the following new paragraphs:

"(17) 'normal cost' means the entry-age normal cost computed by the Civil Service Commission in accordance with generally accepted actuarial practice and expressed as a level percentage of aggregate basic pay;

"(18) 'Fund balance' means the sum of—

"(A) the investments of the Fund calculated at par value; and

"(B) the cash balance of the Fund on the books of the Treasury; and

"(19) 'unfunded liability' means the estimated excess of the present value of all benefits payable from the Fund to employees and Members and former employees and Members, subject to this subchapter, and to their survivors, over the sum of—

"(A) the present value of deductions to be withheld from the future basic pay of employees and Members currently subject to this subchapter and of future agency contributions to be made in their behalf; plus

"(B) the present value of Government payments to the Fund under section 8348(f) of this title; plus

"(C) the Fund balance as of the date the unfunded liability is determined."

Sec. 102. (a) Section 8334 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) (1) The employing agency shall deduct and withhold 7 percent of the basic pay of an employee, 7½ percent of the basic pay of a Congressional employee, and 8 percent of the basic pay of a Member. An equal amount shall be contributed from the appropriation or fund used to pay the employee or, in the case of an elected official, from an appropriation or fund available for payment of other salaries of the same office or establishment. When an employee in the legislative branch is paid by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Clerk may pay from the contingent fund of the House the contribution that otherwise would be contributed from the appropriation or fund used to pay the employee.

"(2) The amounts so deducted and withheld, together with the amounts so contributed, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Fund under such procedures as the Comptroller General of the United States may prescribe. Deposits made by an employee or Member also shall be credited to the Fund;" and

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

"(c) Each employee or Member credited with civilian service after July 31, 1920, for which retirement deductions or deposits have not been made, may deposit with interest an amount equal to the following percentages of his basic pay received for that service:

"Percentage of basic pay:

Employee:	Service period
2½-----	August 1, 1920, to June 30, 1926.
3½-----	July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1942.
5-----	July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1948.
6-----	July 1, 1948, to October 31, 1956.
6½-----	November 1, 1956, to December 31, 1969.
7-----	After December 31, 1969.

Member or employee for congressional employee service:

2½-----	August 1, 1920, to June 30, 1926.
3½-----	July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1942.
5-----	July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1948.
6-----	July 1, 1948, to October 31, 1956.
6½-----	November 1, 1956, to December 31, 1969.
7½-----	After December 31, 1969.

Member for Member service:

2½-----	August 1, 1920, to June 30, 1926.
3½-----	July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1942.
5-----	July 1, 1942, to August 1, 1946.
6-----	August 2, 1946, to October 31, 1956.
7½-----	November 1, 1956, to December 31, 1969.
8-----	After December 31, 1969.

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the deposit with respect to a period of service referred to in section 8332 (b) (6) of this title performed before January 1, 1969, shall be an amount equal to 55 percent of a deposit computed in accordance with such provisions."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) (1) of this section shall become effective at the beginning of the first applicable pay period beginning after December 31, 1969.

Sec. 103. (a) Section 8348 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) There is a Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund. The Fund—

"(1) is appropriated for the payment of—

"(A) benefits as provided by this subchapter; and

"(B) administrative expenses incurred by the Civil Service Commission in placing in effect each annuity adjustment granted under section 8340 of this title; and

"(2) is made available, subject to such annual limitation as the Congress may prescribe, for any expenses incurred by the Commission in connection with the administration of this chapter and other retirement and annuity statutes;" and

(2) by striking out subsections (f) and (g) and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(f) Any statute which authorizes—

"(1) new or liberalized benefits payable from the Fund, including annuity increases other than under section 8340 of this title;

"(2) extension of the coverage of this subchapter to new groups of employees; or

"(3) increases in pay on which benefits are computed;

is deemed to authorize appropriations to the Fund to finance the unfunded liability created by that statute, in 30 equal annual installments with interest computed at the rate used in the then most recent valuation of the Civil Service Retirement System and with the first payment thereof due as of the end of the fiscal year in which each new or liberalized benefit, extension of coverage, or increase in pay is effective.

"(g) At the end of each fiscal year, the Commission shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the amount equivalent to (1) interest on the unfunded liability computed for that year at the interest rate used in the then most recent valuation of the System, and (2) that portion of disbursement for annuities for that year which the Commission estimates is attributable to credit allowed for military service. Before closing the accounts for each fiscal year, the Secretary shall credit to the Fund, as a Government contribution, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the following percentages of such amounts: 10 percent for 1971; 20 percent for 1972; 30 percent for 1973; 40 percent for 1974; 50 percent for 1975; 60 percent for 1976; 70 percent for 1977; 80 percent for 1978; 90 percent for 1979; and 100 percent for 1980 and for each fiscal year thereafter. The Commis-

sion shall report to the President and to the Congress the sums credited to the Fund under this subsection."

(b)(1) The provisions of subsection (g) of section 8348 of title 5, United States Code, as contained in the amendment made by subsection (a)(2) of this section, shall become effective at the beginning of the fiscal year which ends on June 30, 1971.

(2) Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not be held or considered to continue in effect after the enactment of this Act the provisions of section 8348(g) of title 5, United States Code, as in effect immediately prior to such enactment.

Sec. 104. Section 1308(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "on a normal cost plus interest basis".

Sec. 105. The proviso under the heading "Civil Service Commission" and under the subheading "Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1962 (75 Stat. 345; Public Law 87-141), is repealed.

TITLE II—CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Sec. 201. (a) Paragraph (4)(A) of section 8331 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(A) over any 3 consecutive years of creditable service or, in the case of an annuity under subsection (d) or (e)(1) of section 8341 of this title based on service of less than 3 years, over the total service; or"

(b) Subsection (c) of section 8333 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) A Member or his survivor is eligible for an annuity under this subchapter only if the amounts named by section 8334 of title 5 have been deducted or deposited with respect to his last five years of civilian service, or, in the case of a survivor annuity under section 8341(d) or (e)(1) of this chapter, with respect to his total service."

Sec. 202. Subsection (g) of section 8334 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the word "or" at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or"; and

(3) by adding the following new paragraph immediately below paragraph (4):

"(5) days of unused sick leave credited under section 8339(m) of this title."

Sec. 203. Section 8339 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out of subsection (b) the words "so much of his service as a Congressional employee and his military service as does not exceed a total of 15 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "his service as a Congressional employee, his military service not exceeding 5 years";

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

"(2) his Congressional employee service;";

(3) by striking out the last full sentence of subsection (f);

(4) by striking out "(excluding any increase because of retirement under section 8337 of this title)" in subsection (1); and

(5) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) In computing any annuity under subsections (a)-(d) of this section, the total service of an employee who retires on an immediate annuity or dies leaving a survivor or survivors entitled to annuity includes, without regard to the limitations imposed by subsection (e) of this section, the days of unused sick leave to his credit under a formal leave system, except that these days will not be counted in determining average pay or annuity eligibility under this subchapter."

Sec. 204. (a) Subsection (b) of section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, is amend-

ed by inserting "1 percent plus" immediately after the word "by".

(b) Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(2) For the purpose of computing the annuity of a child under section 8341(e) of this title that commences on or after the first day of the first month that begins on or after the date of enactment of the Civil Service Retirement Amendments of 1969, the items \$900, \$1,080, \$2,700, and \$3,240 appearing in section 8341(e) of this title shall be increased by the total percent increases allowed and in force under this section on or after such day and, in case of a deceased annuitant, the items 60 percent and 75 percent appearing in section 8341(e) of this title shall be increased by the total percent allowed and in force to the annuitant under this section on or after such day."

Sec. 205. The provisions of subsection (b)(1), (d)(3), and (g) of section 8341 of title 5, United States Code, also shall apply in the case of any widow or widower—

(1) of an employee who died, retired, or was otherwise finally separated before July 18, 1966;

(2) who shall have remarried on or after such date; and

(3) who, immediately before such remarriage, was receiving annuity from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund;

except that no annuity shall be paid by reason of this section for any period prior to the enactment of this section. No annuity shall be terminated solely by reason of the enactment of this section. Notwithstanding the prohibition contained in the first sentence of this section on the payment of annuity for any period prior to the enactment of this section, in any case in which the Civil Service Commission determines that—

(1) the remarriage of any widow or widower described in such sentence was entered into by the widow or widower in good faith and in reliance on erroneous information provided by Government authority prior to that remarriage that the then existing survivor annuity of the widow or widower would not be terminated because of the remarriage; and

(2) such annuity was terminated by law because of that remarriage;

then payment of annuity may be made by reason of this section in such case, beginning as of the effective date of the termination because of the remarriage.

Sec. 206. (a) The first sentence of subsection (d) of section 8341 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"If an employee or Member dies after completing at least 18 months of civilian service, the widow or dependent widower of the employee or Member is entitled to an annuity equal to 55 percent of an annuity computed under section 8339 (a)-(e) and (h) of this title as may apply with respect to the employee or Member, except that in the computation of the annuity under such section, the annuity of the employee or Member shall be at least the smaller of (1) 40 percent of his average pay, or (2) the sum obtained under such section after increasing his service of the type last performed by the period elapsing between the date of death and the date he would have become 60 years of age."

(b) Subsection (e)(1) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(e)(1) If an employee or Member dies after completing at least 18 months of civilian service, or an employee or Member dies after retiring under this subchapter, and is survived by a spouse, each surviving child is entitled to an annuity equal to the smallest of—

"(A) 60 percent of the average pay of the employee or Member divided by the number of children;

"(B) \$900; or

"(C) \$2,700 divided by the number of children; subject to section 8340 of this title. If the employee or Member is not survived by a spouse, each surviving child is entitled to an annuity equal to the smallest of—

"(1) 75 percent of the average pay of the employee or Member divided by the number of children;

"(2) \$1,080; or

"(3) \$3,240 divided by the number of children; subject to section 8340 of this title."

Sec. 207. (a) The amendments made by sections 201, 202, 203, and 206(a) of this Act shall not apply in the cases of persons retired or otherwise separated prior to the date of enactment of this Act, and the rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if such sections had not been enacted.

(b) The amendments made by section 204(a) of this Act to section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply only to annuity increases which become effective under such section 8340 after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c)(1) The amendment made by section 206(b) of this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) The annuity of each surviving child who, immediately prior to the effective date of such amendment is receiving an annuity under section 8341(e) of title 5, United States Code, or under a comparable provision of any prior law, or who hereafter becomes entitled to receive annuity under the Act of May 29, 1930, as amended from and after February 28, 1948, shall be recomputed effective on such date, or computed from commencing date if later, in accordance with such amendment. No increase allowed and in force prior to such date shall be included in the computation or recomputation of any such annuity. This paragraph shall not operate to reduce any annuity.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Senate amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS)?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do so in order that we may have an explanation of the action of the other body with respect to this legislation and to ask a few questions of the gentleman from New Jersey.

Particularly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what additional benefits the other body put into this bill and whether the costs of the additional benefits are covered?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I shall be happy to explain.

The Senate amended the House bill, H.R. 9825, by striking all language following the enacting clause and inserting the language of S. 2754, as amended.

The Senate amendment retains all of the provisions of the House-passed bill, except minor technical and perfecting changes. Exclusive of the liberalized survivor provisions and additional funding mechanism added by the Senate amend-

ment, the only substantive change in the House-passed version is with respect to the rate of contribution applicable to Members of Congress. The House version continues the Members' contribution rate at the present 7.5 percent whereas the Senate version raises it to 8 percent—no attempt being made in the Senate to retain the rate of 7.5 percent.

The Senate amendment made changes in other respects, as to costs of crediting military service, surviving spouses' benefits, and surviving children's benefits.

With respect to costs, the total contributions will amount to 14 percent, and under the Senate-passed amendments the normal costs will come to 13.98 percent, leaving a surplus of 0.02 percent.

Under the present cost operating system, normal costs come to 13.86 percent and, by virtue of the change made by the State, the normal cost will be reduced by 0.22 percent so that the new normal cost of present benefits comes to 13.64 percent.

However, the House provisions would add thirteen one-hundredths of 1 percent and, by virtue of the liberalized benefits added by the Senate, which amount to twenty-one one-hundredths of 1 percent, we arrive at a total new normal cost of 13.98 percent of payroll, which is 0.01 percent under the House-passed bill.

The Senate amendment to title I provides that the cost of crediting military service be financed by annual transfers from the Treasury, out of money not otherwise appropriated, to the retirement fund in the same manner as it is proposed to finance the interest on the existing unfunded liability. Ten percent of such costs would begin to be paid starting in 1971, increasing by an additional 10 percent each year until, in 1980 and thereafter, the total costs would be funded by direct transfer. These payments would begin at about \$10 million, rise proportionately over the next 20 years, and peak at approximately \$300 million. Thereafter, these costs will gradually decline to a relatively negligible amount since military service performed after 1956 will, generally, be creditable under the social security system. By so funding, the normal cost of the benefit structure of the civil service retirement system will be reduced by 0.22 percent of payroll, reducing present normal cost from 13.86 percent to 13.64 percent. It will also result in reducing the system's unfunded liability by \$4.7 billion.

Under existing law an employee who retires on disability—after completing at least 5 years of service—is guaranteed a minimum benefit of the smaller of (A) 40 percent of the average salary or (B) the rate obtained under the general formula after increasing the actual service by the time remaining between the date of disability retirement and the attainment of age 60, if either (A) or (B) produces a greater rate than is earned by virtue of his actual service. However, the law stipulates that such guaranteed rate is payable only to the disabled employee, and is not applicable in determining his spouse's survivor rate. Her benefit is 55 percent of only his earned rate.

The Senate amendment removes the latter restriction, and extends to the surviving spouse an annuity based upon the higher guaranteed minimum benefit, where applicable.

Under existing law the spouse and children of an employee have survivor protection only in the event of his death after completing at least 5 years' of service. The Senate amendment would provide such protection upon the employee's death occurring after a total of 18 months of service—similar to the minimum coverage requirement of the social security system.

The amendment extends to the surviving children of such short-term decedents the same dollar benefits provided to children of over-5-years employees. However, its greatest effect is with respect to the spouse's benefit. It grants to the eligible spouse the same computation formula extended to the spouse of a disability retiree; that is, her rate would be computed on the basis of 55 percent of a guaranteed minimum disability benefit, if it exceeds the basic earned annuity. In other words, the basic rate would be determined as though the employee had retired on disability as of the date of his death in active service.

Present law grants basic survivor annuity benefits to eligible children of the smallest of: First, \$50 per month per child, second, \$150 per month divided by the number of children, or third, 40 percent of the employee's average salary. Orphaned children's basic rates are, respectively: First, \$60 per month per child, second, \$180 per month divided by the number of children, or third, 50 percent of the average salary, whichever is smallest. These basic rates are subject to all automatic cost-of-living adjustments occurring since 1965. Generally, the current maximum monthly rates are \$61 and \$183 for children with one parent, and \$72 and \$216 for orphans.

The Senate amendment proposes a fresh start principle by increasing the respective children's basic amounts of \$50, \$150, and 40 percent to \$75, \$225, and 60 percent, and orphan's basic amounts of \$60, \$180, and 50 percent, respectively, to \$90, \$270, and 75 percent. In application the present actual average rates of \$61 and \$183 would be increased to \$75 and \$225; the present actual average rates of \$72 and \$216 would be increased to \$90 and \$270; and these new basic rates would be further increased by the percentage of all future cost-of-living increases.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation and say to Members of the House that I am still opposed to some provisions of this bill, but if I read the signs correctly—and I believe I do—there is no point in going to conference with it.

I accept the fate of having been defeated on this issue when the measure was originally before the House. I said then, as I now reiterate, that this legislation had the original worthy purpose of bringing order out of chaos in the funding of the Government employees retirement fund, but was then converted into a Christmas tree with goodies for almost everyone.

Let me repeat my belief that it would be futile to attempt to overturn in a conference the action of the House and Senate. However, I still strongly oppose enactment of this legislation in its present form.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. The gentleman from New Jersey has made an explanation, but like my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, I recognize the facts of life and feel that there is no further point in debating this bill except merely to clarify some things for the Members. Does the gentleman have any idea as to what cost will now be attributed to the high 3-year-service feature, calculated as to the impact on immediate retirement of many people in the service? Does the gentleman have any figures to show the possibilities in that area?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I understand a number of people will be retiring shortly after enactment of the bill, if that be the will of the President. I have received many, many inquiries from Members as to the status of this bill, both after the House passed it and while action was pending thereon in the Senate, and since last week when the Senate passed this bill, I believe there will be a considerable number who will retire. This bill will save, perhaps, the administration some embarrassment of firing people to cut back defense spending. Because by people retiring, it will also open the doors for many young people to come into the Government service, and for younger employees to move up the ladder.

Mr. DERWINSKI. It is not my purpose to go into unnecessary speculation about the acts of this administration unless we in Congress exercise some leadership in this bureaucracy in doing away with many of the programs we have started. But like the gentleman from Iowa, I feel that the Senate version is an improvement on the bill passed in the House. I think the gentleman from New Jersey is correct in recommending that we accept the Senate version.

Mr. Speaker, now that the Senate has worked its will on the civil service retirement bill, H.R. 9825, and it is obviously moving toward enactment, I would be delinquent if I did not make some observations which I feel are pertinent at this point.

I first want to commend our distinguished colleagues in the other body for improving in two instances a bill which I did not favor as it passed the House. One improvement is the increase from 7½ percent to 8 percent of the retirement deduction rate for Members of Congress. Fairness dictates that if we insist that all other Federal employees pay an additional one-half percent into the retirement fund that Members of Congress should do the same.

I also admire the Senate action in amending the bill so that costs attributable to the crediting of military service be financed annually by the same method

as the financing of interest on the unfunded liability of the retirement fund. It was, after all, the idea of Congress to permit credit for military service and so the cost should not be charged to the fund as a whole, as it has in the past, but should be covered by annual payments by the Government.

I must, however, restate my strong disagreement with the provision remaining in the bill which permits retirement service credit for the calendar value of unused sick leave. This is a departure from the basic concept that has governed the use of sick leave since its inception in the Federal system. The basis for sick leave under our system is to insure against the loss of income during periods of illness. All employees have the same right to draw upon sick leave if necessary, but nothing is owed the employee who enjoys good health and does not have to draw upon his reserve. This sick leave provision, as it becomes law, will discriminate against the employee who happened to be burdened with illness.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that under the bill about to be accepted, if it is, that our contribution as Members of Congress to the retirement fund will be increased from 7½ percent to 8 percent?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Your understanding is correct. Our contribution will be increased from 7½ percent to 8 percent, with the Government contributing a similar sum into the retirement fund.

Mr. MICHEL. Further reserving the right to object, I should like to make the observation that some of the newspapers at home carry front-page accounts about how we are raising our salary again, raising our annuities. I have been opposed, frankly, to liberalizing that 5-year high base to 3 years. Personally, I do not like to see the increase from 7½ percent to 8 percent. I am grateful for what I may get someday and I do not think it ought to be increased. The thought occurs to me that our late senior Senator, who died a few weeks ago, was a Member of this body and a Member of the other body since 1932, except for 2 years. Over that vast expanse of years he contributed to this retirement fund. In that particular kind of case, the Senator contributed into the fund for 37 years and died without realizing an annuity. Now his widow qualifies, as I understand the system, for a 55-percent survivorship of what the Senator earned, but if she is in the twilight of her years, she may never realize in benefits anywhere near the amount her husband had contributed to the fund. There is provision, I believe, for the balance of premiums paid in to go to one's estate, but that is it.

Certainly, it is not any real bonanza,

when one considers the amount of the contributions over some 32 years.

Have there been any studies made of the number of senior Members of this body and the other body who die after contributing over a period of 20 or 30 or 40 years to this program and never fully realize what they paid for in their 7½ or now 8 percent of salary deductions?

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Illinois. There is no real bonanza for the Members of Congress.

Our subcommittee did not go into the particular subject matter the gentleman has discussed, but I understand another subcommittee did go into this matter in considering the retirement benefits for the civil employees of the Foreign Service. I am not familiar with what that study showed, but I fully agree with the gentleman, that there are no "bundles for Congress" in this bill, regardless of what the news media says.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to hear the gentleman's response to that question.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I chaired the subcommittee that went into this matter. As I said before, during the debate on this bill earlier, this fund for Members of Congress, if it were separated out and stood alone, would show it has accumulated a bonanza for the Government, in spite of the fact that when it was passed everybody was blanketed in without any prior contributions or without having to go back and pay for prior years of service, and in spite of the fact that for about half the time or more of the time, the Government did not put its share of contributions in.

I do not recall the figure off the top of my head at this moment, but I think it was approximately \$12 million or \$16 million more which was paid in than has ever been paid out—and that in spite of the fact the Government did not make its contribution and in spite of the fact the people who were here in 1946, when it was passed, and who had been here for 20 or 30 or 40 years were blanketed in. So there has not been really any steal from the taxpayers at all.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have been a cosponsor of this legislation which will resolve the financial crisis facing the retirement fund today. At the same time we are fulfilling an obligation long overdue our civil servants by committing the Government to maintaining the integrity of the civil service retirement fund and insuring that there will always be enough money in the fund to permit payment of all benefits—in full and on time—to all past, present, and future Federal employees.

I urge the Members of this body to give our Government workers one more vote of confidence by unanimously ac-

cepting the Senate amendments to H.R. 9225, permitting prompt transmittal of this measure to the President for his signature into law, a moment long awaited by civil service employees of the Fifth District of Maryland.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on H.R. 9825.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REFORM OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

OCTOBER 1, 1969.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
The Capitol.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with regret that I respectfully submit my resignation as a member of the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I do not plan to run for reelection to Congress and I think it appropriate that I be replaced at this time by another Member of the House of Representatives.

I enjoyed my service on the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws with its distinguished Chairman, The Honorable Edmund G. Brown.

Sincerely,

DON EDWARDS,
Member of Congress.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REFORM OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 89-801, the Chair appoints as a member of the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MIKVA, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House session on Monday, October 6, because of a death in our family in Buffalo, N.Y.

Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea" on rollcalls Nos. 203, 204, and 205. On rollcall 202, I would have voted "nay."

ANTI-INFLATION CAMPAIGN

(Mr. O'HARA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, I read into the RECORD a newspaper article describing how the Advertising Council, an offshoot of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, was hoping to launch an anti-inflation campaign to "condition the collective mind so that when something is done, they will know it to be in their best interests." The quote is from an official of the Advertising Council.

Well, this administration has been doing its best to fight inflation. And yesterday, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor announced that unemployment had risen to its highest level in 2 years. The increase—equal to one-half of 1 percent of the entire labor force—was the biggest monthly increase since the last time the Republicans were in office.

We are told by the Washington Post:

Some administration economists, most notably Assistant Treasury Secretary Murray L. Weidenbaum, viewed the increase in joblessness as evidence the Government's anti-inflation program is beginning to take hold.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the people of this country have yet had their collective mind conditioned by the advertising council to the point where they are going to accept the administration's view that a little unemployment is good for you.

Prices continue to rise. The President opposes tax relief for the middle-income taxpayer, but supports more tax relief for those who already have most of the loopholes. The Federal Reserve Board continues with its policies of increasing the prices the banks can charge us to use our money.

Taken as a whole, Mr. Speaker, one can only agree with the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. The administration's anti-inflation fight has indeed begun to "take hold."

It has begun to reduce full employment so that business can keep labor in line through fear of unemployment. It has begun to generate public pressure against domestic programs which might improve the position of those most in need. And it has done so without holding down prices and profits for the natural supporters of the Republican Party.

Mr. Speaker, I have a modest proposal. If increased unemployment is going to be sold to us as an anti-inflation measure, may I suggest that the unemployment start with the guy who thought up that argument?

RAILS, RULES, AND RUIN AT FORT ROBINSON

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the problem of inadequate rail service for passengers was the subject of a special order last month and over 90 Members have joined with me in sponsoring a bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to require adequate standards of service on the Nation's passenger trains. This is a proposed solution to part of the whole problem of

passenger train discontinuances, inadequate service, and the inability or unwillingness of the American railroad system to maintain passenger service.

One of the first Members to join with me on this bill was Representative GLENN C. CUNNINGHAM of Nebraska, and his experiences on the road to Fort Robinson on the Burlington Railroad should make interesting reading for all Members. I have obtained permission to include at the close of my remarks articles from the Wall Street Journal and the Washington Star which outlined what happened to Representative CUNNINGHAM when he tried to ride the train between Omaha, Nebr., and Billings, Mont.

Representative CUNNINGHAM was on his first vacation in 13 years. The train was stopped at Hemingford, Nebr., a community of 904 persons, 19 miles northeast of Alliance, the nearest bus connection. This was part of a prearranged plan by the railroad to discontinue this train before a further appeal could be taken by the passengers who were objecting to the stoppage of service.

I will leave it to Congressman CUNNINGHAM to explain his problems in greater detail when this bill comes before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which he is a member. Congressman CUNNINGHAM has long been a strong supporter of the railroads of this country and I am certain that his remarks on this bill will have great weight with Members of the House.

The material referred to follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 21, 1969]

THE TRAIN DOESN'T STOP HERE ANY MORE

It isn't especially pleasant to be stranded in Fort Robinson, Nebraska (pop.: 904), even if you happen to be a Congressman from Nebraska. And the upshot may not be entirely pleasant for the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad which, unwittingly, marooned Rep. Glenn Cunningham in the isolated hamlet.

The Burlington, you see, had been trying for years to discontinue a pair of trains that shuttle between Billings, Mont., and Omaha, Neb. According to the railroad the trains attracted so few passengers that they were costing the Burlington the not inconsiderable sum of \$1 million a year.

Well, a Federal court finally authorized discontinuation of the service and, almost faster than you could say Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, the trains stopped. Passengers who happened to be aboard at the time were loaded onto buses to complete their journeys. And Mr. Cunningham, waiting at Fort Robinson with return ticket in hand, got the word that the train to Omaha would not stop there any more.

It's possible to sympathize with the railroad. Interstate Commerce Commission and court procedures, which govern not only the extent of passenger and freight service but also what the lines can charge for it, are so protracted that a railroad can go bankrupt before it gets remedial action.

If anything is to be done about this messy situation, however, cooperation will be necessary among the railroads, Congress and other branches of Government. Lately there has been a growing realization in Washington of the sorry state of mass transportation and a feeling that—no matter whose fault it is—the Federal Government is going to have to help find a solution.

As a matter of fact a House Commerce subcommittee has been looking into ICC pro-

cedures for several months. One member of the Commerce Committee, as the Burlington by now must be painfully aware, is Rep. Glenn Cunningham.

HE IS ICC MONITOR, TOO: LAWMAKER STRANDED AS TRAIN ENDS RUN

(By Stephen M. Aug.)

A move by the Burlington Railroad to take a train off the tracks before opposing lawyers could get to court to block it may have backfired. Without knowing it the railroad stranded—among others—a U.S. congressman in the middle of nowhere.

And the train was ordered right back on by the Supreme Court.

Among those stranded was Rep. Glenn C. Cunningham, R-Nebr., a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Coincidentally, the committee is the one which acts as watchdog over the Interstate Commerce Commission, whose ruling set in motion the events that permitted the Burlington to end train service.

Cunningham said it was his first vacation in 13 years—and he and his son, Glenn, Jr., 26, had gone fishing at Fort Robinson State Park near the Wyoming Border.

Reached at the fishing camp, Cunningham said "when I came in for lunch was the first time I knew they'd stopped the train. There's no buses, and unless somebody drives you down to Alliance, then you can take an airplane—but they have a lot of old-fashioned planes and I'm not going to ride on those darn things."

"I bought a round trip ticket and I want the satisfaction of coming up here and going back on the train," he said. Cunningham tried complaining to the ICC which had authorized to end the service last January.

The railroad, the full name of which is the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, has been trying to discontinue for two years a pair of little known trains between Omaha, Neb., and Billings, Mont.—a sparsely settled area of the Midwest.

So when railroad lawyers learned a federal court in Cheyenne, Wyo., had authorized the end of the service they acted swiftly—stopped the train at a small western Nebraska community and unloaded 34 startled passengers, 200 sacks of mail and dozens of paychecks for railroad workers in Wyoming.

MAIL STRANDED, TOO

The passengers were loaded aboard buses for the rest of their trip—456 miles northwest to Billings—the mail was turned over to the Post Office at Alliance, Neb., and the paychecks were given to a railroad official to distribute.

A train that was to have headed east never left Billings, and railroad agents helped passengers aboard buses and planes.

As a result of the abrupt end of No. 41—and its eastbound counterpart, No. 42—dozens of prospective passengers, many holding return tickets, were left waiting at Burlington stations throughout Wyoming, Nebraska and Montana.

Cunningham said, he would seek some form of congressional action—but he wasn't certain what. "They're not going to get by with it," he said, adding, "this is such a shock to me I haven't figured out my maneuvers yet—but I'm going to do something."

A Commerce subcommittee has been looking into the Interstate Commerce Commission at least since last February.

The Burlington sought unsuccessfully last year to end the Omaha-Billings service—a daily round trip on which it says it loses \$1 million a year because few passengers use the service.

Cunningham dispute this. "When we came out here that train was full. The pullman section from Omaha to Alliance was only about three-quarters full, but when we got off at Alliance and changed to a coach, that coach was jammed," he said.

In first rejecting the Burlington's plea, the ICC criticized the railroad for providing shoddy service on the line. But last January it decided the train could go.

INDIANS ON LIMB, TOO

Several cities in the three states, the Crow Indian Tribe, a citizens group and two labor unions appealed to federal court in Cheyenne. The court ruled late Wednesday and mailed its opinion to the parties.

A. M. Rung, director of Burlington's public relations, said the railroad's lawyers "had issued instructions to the operating department that when the order was received to halt the train at the nearest station."

He explained it was felt that if the train was discontinued immediately after the first federal court authorization, it could not be ordered back into service.

At 8:19 a.m. No. 41 pulled into Hemingford, Neb., a community of 904 persons 19 miles northeast of Alliance. Dale Ettie, president of the Citizens Voting League for the Retention of Passenger Train Service, said "the passengers were told that the train would not go on."

RAPID MOVES

So fast did the Burlington move that a lawyer for the opposition had no time to obtain a restraining order to stop the action. Gordon P. MacDougall of Washington, who is handling the case here, wired the Burlington he intended to appeal, and 15 minutes later filed his suit with the Supreme Court.

Justice Hugo E. Black handed down an order requiring the railroad to continue operating the train for 10 days or until Justice Byron R. White—who handles matters in the 10th circuit—has a chance to rule in the matter. White was out of town.

But that was nearly four hours later, and by then the train service had been halted.

Later in the day, a spokesman for the Burlington reported that train service would be resumed, and added that the railroad had "acted in good faith."

TRAIN A LOSER

Rung earlier said of the discontinuance, "Of course, we'd prefer not to do these things, but you've got to be realistic. If we hadn't terminated the train, it could have dragged on another year. It's losing a million dollars a year and it's averaging 12 passengers a mile. We can't operate our business that way." It was the first time Burlington had acted to end service so swiftly, Rung said.

There was some reaction from Capitol Hill. Sen. Cliff Hansen said through an aide that the sudden discontinuance "would appear to reflect poor judgment on the part of someone, to say the least."

Robert T. Cabbage, Burlington general counsel, said the railroad would restore the service "out of deference to the court, even though it seems it's going to be tremendously expensive."

Cabbage said he had had no idea an appeal would be made. "We were following a pattern we understood was appropriate. It seemed the reasonable thing because of our own financial problems."

Said Cunningham: "My goodness, if you're going to stop a train at least give the people 10 days or two weeks to adjust."

FUNDS FOR CURRENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS ON A CONTINUING BASIS

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

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution which will make available funds for current education programs on a continuing basis in accordance with action taken by the

House on the Labor-HEW appropriations bill:

The HEW-Labor appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970, which was passed by the House some 2 months ago, is stalled in the Senate. From all reports, it looks as though it may be months before any action is taken by the other body.

We are well into the academic year. Education programs were started this year in full anticipation of the Federal funds provided in House-passed H.R. 13111. Further delay in releasing these funds, approved by this body, will only precipitate another crisis in an already critical situation.

During considerations of H.R. 13111, we put ourselves on the line as to whether or not we really favored an adequate education budget. We had to make the decision as to whether or not we really wanted better schools, better colleges, better research facilities or were we going to be satisfied with decaying school systems, overcrowded colleges, and underfunded research. We made the decision at that time by adding over \$900 million to the HEW appropriation.

Education programs are now funded on a continuing resolution only to the level prescribed in the administration's revised budget estimates of April or the 1969 appropriation level, whichever is lower. This means that there are no Federal funds available for operating library programs in elementary and secondary schools and higher education programs; there are no funds for the matching grant equipment programs of title III, NDEA, and title VI of the Higher Education Act; there are no funds for the guidance, counseling, and testing provisions of title V, NDEA; there are no funds for the impact aid legislation, section (b) of Public Law 874. Grants to local educational agencies under title I, ESEA, the program for disadvantaged students, are now forced to operate below the budget estimates for fiscal year 1970. Cutbacks in vocational education must be made at this time because the 1969 funding level does not permit implementation of the 1968 set-asides simultaneously with the continuation of ongoing programs. Several higher education programs are similarly retarded as a result of funding cutbacks.

This resolution will merely fund education programs at the level this body already overwhelmingly agreed to. The present continuing resolution expires on October 31. This resolution is designed to supplement the existing resolution and allow our schools to operate at the funding level that we felt necessary when we voted on H.R. 13111 last July 31, and will be in effect only until the Senate completes final passage and the fiscal 1970 authorization is finally signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution before us today has the bipartisan cosponsorship of 182 Members. This broad base of support in itself is an expression of the importance of this joint resolution.

TREATMENT OF OUR PRISONERS OF WAR

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to address the House

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I was honored to take part on September 17 in the discussion here in the House on the heartbreaking treatment of our POW's and those missing in action. I was pleased to see that the Armed Forces Journal in their issue of September 27 called attention to the attempt of the House to focus attention on this situation. The RECORD would not be complete without this report added to the colloquy and I include it in the RECORD today:

CONGRESS FOCUSES ON POW PROBLEM

The most celebrated personage on Capitol Hill, Wednesday, 17 September, was someone who was not physically present, the American Serviceman held by the North Vietnamese as a prisoner of war.

On that day, the Nixon Administration and the Democratic-controlled Congress joined in a bipartisan effort to galvanize American public opinion to remember its nearly 1400 so-called "forgotten men" who are POW's, and to bring world-wide pressure to bear on North Vietnam to live up to its own ratification of the Geneva Convention provisions which prescribe civilized treatment of prisoners of war.

A concurrent resolution to this effect was introduced in both houses of Congress, and Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird reiterated an earlier promise that the POW issue must be resolved prior to total U.S. pullout from Southeast Asia.

Although the POW issue has not been entirely dormant in Congress, only this year, apparently, have increasing numbers of House and Senate members spoken out against the barbaric and inhumane treatment being given American Servicemen languishing in North Vietnamese prisons.

The major manifestation of this feeling took place when the House, in a special order of business, devoted a major portion of its proceedings to hear member after member (some 150 in all) denounce the North Vietnamese violations.

Representative William L. Dickinson (R-Ala.), a member of the Armed Services Committee (along with over 200 co-sponsors), introduced the resolution condemning the North Vietnamese for their uncivilized conduct and calling upon the President, the Department of State, DoD, other concerned agencies, the UN, and the peoples of the world to appeal to North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front to comply with requirements of the Geneva Convention.

North Vietnam and the Viet Cong are asked in the resolution to take the following immediate actions:

- Identify the prisoners whom they hold.
- Release the seriously sick and injured.
- Permit impartial inspections of all POW facilities.

- Permit the free exchange of mail.
- Present in the House galleries during the long discussion of the POW resolution were approximately 350 wives and relatives of Servicemen listed by DoD as either prisoners of war (POW) or missing in action (MIA).

The obvious emotional impact on the legislators below was perhaps best measured by the fact that the House ban on gallery applause was repeatedly allowed to be breached as the wives clapped after each Representative's speech.

Representative Dickinson, however, while also noting the presence in the gallery of two of the three American POWs released by North Vietnam in July (Navy Lt Robert Frishman and Seaman Douglas Hegdahl) did not formally recognize them—in keeping with another parliamentary prohibition.

Later in the day the wives were honored at a reception attended by, among others,

the Army and Air Force Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Naval Operations, and General Lewis W. Walt, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Despite the fact that Congress is now doing everything within its constitutional power to deal with the problem, all participants were careful not to raise false hopes. As Representative Dickinson pointed out: "There is little the Congress can do directly to recover our forgotten men."

Dickinson said he was personally going to send copies of the day's Congressional Record to the chief U.S. negotiator in Paris, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, requesting that they be made available to Hanoi representatives.

"They can see for themselves what the Congress of the U.S. thinks of their claims of 'humane' treatment of Americans they hold captive," he commented. Congress also may—just to keep the heat of publicity on Hanoi—take other symbolic steps, two of which were suggested by other members of the Armed Services panel.

Representative William Whitehurst (R-Va.) said he has suggested to the President that a national day of prayer be declared on behalf of the POWs.

And Representative Bob Wilson (R-Calif.) urged his colleagues to support his request to the House Chaplain and Washington area ministers to sponsor a "pray-in" on the Capitol steps.

Wilson also requested the clergymen who lead the House in its opening daily prayer to consider a voluntary reference to American POWs.

The POW wives also got assurances of action from Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird, who told a group of them that the U.S. will not abandon the men being held in North Vietnam, and that there will be no withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Southeast Asia until the prisoner of war matter is settled.

Laird assured the wives their husbands will not be "forgotten men."

DoD now has a team assigned to attempting to secure the release of the POWs and to continually reviewing information received regarding prisoner treatment. The team is headed by Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs) Warren Nutter and Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs) Richard Capen.

DoD officials have personally met with nearly 1,400 wives, parents, and family members to assure flow of the high priority assigned the matter.

The latest Department Vietnam casualty statistics lists a total of 412 currently captured, and 929 as currently missing, for a total of 1341 missing and captured.

Some men have been in Communist prison camps for more than five years—longer than any U.S. Servicemen were held captive during WWII. Over 200 have been POWs longer than 3½ years.

Only nine (including Frishman and Hegdahl) have been released by the Communists, and all from the same prison camp.

The testimony of the two Navy men, according to Dickinson, "refutes in a graphic way the propaganda disseminated by North Vietnam that prisoners are treated humanely."

The claims of North Vietnam that the prisoners are "war criminals" and that it therefore is not bound by the Geneva Convention Treaty it ratified in 1957, according to Dickinson, is "a propaganda claim that will not stand close inspection."

The 21st International Conference of the Red Cross he pointed out—the highest governing body of that organization—has adopted a unanimous resolution completely rejecting North Vietnam's contentions and calling on all parties to abide by the obligations set forth in the convention.

The resolution clearly states that the Ge-

neva Convention applies to each armed conflict between two or more parties without regard to how the conflict may be characterized.

"I suggest that the failure of North Vietnam and the Viet Cong to comply with the Geneva Convention," Dickinson declared, casts serious doubts on the validity of any agreement that might be reached at the Paris peace talks.

"Either the North Vietnamese will honor their formal commitments and keep their word, or else they are without honor and their word is no good."

THE PROPOSED MORATORIUM ON CRITICISM OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam was a primary issue in the electing of a new President in 1968.

Who could best lead this Nation out of Vietnam? This was a principal question upon which the results of the election were to turn.

During the 1968 presidential campaign, candidate Richard M. Nixon told the American people that he had a plan for erasing the war. While he did not detail or in general spell out his plan, he did indicate that it would bring the United States peace with honor.

It has been almost 9 months since President Nixon took office. While there has been some progress in the settlement of the war, no definite end is in sight or hinted.

The people of the Nation are growing more and more concerned that President Nixon's plan has not proceeded as hoped nor been as effective as desired.

Through these intervening months since Mr. Nixon's swearing-in, the Nation has adopted a wait-and-see attitude. While the wait has been long and there have been occasional encouraging signs, little progress is to be seen. As a result, the latent national discontent is growing more active.

President Nixon has indicated his concern that expression of opposition to the war in Vietnam indicates to the leaders in Hanoi a lack of resolve on our part to support present policies designed to end the fighting.

The President said on September 30: I think we're on the right course in Vietnam.

He also asserted:

The war will end much sooner if we can have . . . a united front (in America) behind very reasonable proposals. If we have that united front, the enemy will then begin to talk.

In the wake of those statements the Senate minority leader, Mr. SCOTT, called for a 60-day moratorium on criticism of the war policies and peace efforts of the administration.

The implication here is, it seems to me, that such action would have a positive impact on Americans at Paris to move negotiations off dead center and toward a meaningful settlement of the war.

Mr. Speaker, after a great deal of thought I, for one, am willing to give the President the 60-day moratorium.

My initial reaction to the suggestion was negative. But on reflection it seems to me that 60 days is a reasonable time to ask if the administration feels it will help convince Hanoi that the time has come to negotiate an early end to the war.

Also, I feel very strongly that all criticism at all times should be bipartisan. Criticism of the war must not be used as a political club by any political party against this or any administration.

We have endured this war and suffered its consequences too long to turn down or consider a reasonable request. If the administration's spokesmen feel a 60-day moratorium will actually move us toward peace then this request is reasonable. I am willing to take the risk. At the same time I certainly reserve the right of every Member of Congress and every citizen to decide the issue according to the dictates of his own conscience.

SCLC PAYMENTS FOR RESURRECTION CITY

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I was quite concerned, and even dismayed, last night when I heard over the news that the Federal Government had accepted a partial payment of only some \$10,000 from the Southern Christian Leadership Conference as repayment for the mass destruction caused by the Poor People's March last year. This partial payment is only one-seventh of the amount of the bill presented to the SCLC and compares with over \$325,000 in direct costs to the U.S. Government to repair the Mall and return it to its original state.

I am very thankful we passed a bill earlier this year to prohibit such unlawful activities as the camp-in on the Mall in the future. If it were not for that piece of legislation, I am afraid the Justice Department has set a very dangerous precedent of saying to protesters, "You have the right to destroy Government property and the Government will even pay for the destruction you cause." Of course, I am not convinced that the past administration even had the legal right to permit a camp-in on the Mall in the first place.

I would also point out that the over \$325,000 in direct costs to the Government does not include over \$1 million for additional police protection to protect the citizens of the Nation's Capital, nor millions of dollars in business lost by Washington merchants.

In making this settlement, the Justice Department stated that it was "in the best interest of the United States." I contend that it is not in the best interest of our Government to waive money legally owed the U.S. Treasury. I feel sure that if it had been you or I, or any individual taxpayer, owing this much money in back taxes, we would have been "hounded" to death by the Justice Department and would have a lien on every piece of property we owned.

Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the Justice Department has set a double

standard for collecting just debts due the Federal Government.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard that the Department of Transportation, sometime by the end of the year, hopes to come forward with a comprehensive plan to coordinate more closely the separate aspects of our national transportation system. We urgently need a national transportation plan and policy.

I strongly endorse moves along this line, and hope we do see some firm recommendations on this, as well as prompt congressional consideration.

Historically, most all of the governmental regulatory agencies dealing with freight and transportation grew up in a time when our transportation needs were much simpler than they are today. When the Interstate Commerce Commission was established, there was no such thing as motorized freight or busing, and the kind of service offered by the railroads was on a simple point-to-point basis. Similar background surrounded the creation of the other regulatory agencies, including the Federal Maritime Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Today, however, we do not, as a practical matter, see our transportation network merely as a series of separate pieces, each with their different rules or guidelines. Instead, we see freight systems in which containerized shipments may be handed from one carrier to another, from one mode to another. We see passenger transportation systems dependent on highway and high-speed rail transportation, and on the burgeoning aviation system.

In the field of commuter transportation, we still see cities struggling to develop their own program, frequently in areas divided by several jurisdictions. And recently, we have seen Government assistance in the form of urban mass transit grants, and the newly proposed program set out in the Public Transportation Assistance Act providing a tremendously expanded program for bus and rail transit.

At the same time, our commuter systems are generally based on highway networks which are expanding rapidly, but on the basis of projected needs which rarely account for alternative modes, or of how user patterns might shift if stronger emphasis were laid on other approaches.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we are seeking a tremendous growth in our transportation needs and capabilities, but, in my view, we are not providing adequate rational consideration to how we might improve our system through simplification and through technical and administrative developments.

I am convinced that a large part of the problem lies in the fact that our transportation programs are spread among so many government departments and agencies. As I mentioned

earlier, the agencies include the ICC, CAB, and FMC, but the responsibility for coordinating these responsibilities is placed in DOT. At the same time, DOT administers all of the programs designed to promote commuter transit systems, and does all the planning and priority decisionmaking in connection with our highway system.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that these problems are generally caused by the fact that our system has simply grown piecemeal for the past 150 years, and that it would be impossible to change this pattern overnight. The creation of the Department of Transportation, in fact, was an important step in the direction of reform, but I still feel that more needs to be done.

In one important area dealing with freight shipments, I have sponsored legislation to facilitate and simplify the administrative problems which have developed. The Equipment Interchange Act, H.R. 8968, would provide a way to expedite containerized shipments which utilize more than one mode of transportation. The bill would permit carriers of different classes—rail, motor, water, and air—to obtain authority for agreements with a carrier or group of carriers in another class on the interchange of cargo containers, highway trailers, and related intermodal equipment. This would include establishment of procedures to determine per diem rates on such interchange equipment and the controlling regulations.

To assure that the agreements would not be subject to antitrust violation, the Equipment Interchange Act would grant immunity when such agreements were approved by a joint board composed of one member each from the ICC, FMC, and CAB.

I believe this approach would give us an important step in simplifying our administrative proceedings on those transactions which cut across the areas of more than one regulatory agency, and I would hope that we might see consideration given to something along these lines.

At the same time, I understand that the DOT, just within the next several days, is prepared to send Congress its own version of an expanded bill known in past Congresses as the Trade Simplification Act. According to earlier versions of this bill, it deals not only with the interchange of equipment, but also with the publication of joint rates, the issuance of single through bills of lading, and liability matters.

THE PACE OF THE NIXON RECESSION INCREASES

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for several months I have been predicting a recession followed by a depression if the Federal Reserve tight-money, high-interest-rate policy continues and if the Nixon administration continues along its path of trying to curb inflation by running excessive budget surpluses, along with a severe tight-money, high-interest-rate policy.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that the objectives being sought by the administration—to plunge our economy into a severe recession—is well underway. Unemployment has increased to 4 percent—the highest rate of unemployment since the Republicans were last in power in 1960.

I am flabbergasted by some of the statements attributed to members of the Nixon administration. Apparently they have no compassion whatsoever for the man who has been thrown out of a job as a result of the administration's economic policies. One administration official, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Murray Weidenbaum, expressed great pleasure at these economic indicators.

I guess there are some within the administration who, it would seem, believe that we are to shout with joy when people get thrown out of a job.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to make a partisan issue out of the plight of those who have been removed from productive employment. I know the President has a good memory and he should be the first to recall that the last time the monthly jobless rate rose as sharply as it did between August and September of this year was during the 1960 campaign. Mr. Speaker, the administration in power seems to want to assure that old biblical adage that "the poor shall always be with ye."

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party has always sought to create an economic situation whereby everyone in our society seeking employment could secure employment. This, to me, is one of the fundamental differences between the Democratic and Republican Parties.

I have no fear of the outcome of either the congressional elections of next year or the next presidential election. With policies of the Nixon administration, such as that which led to a 4-percent unemployment rate and which I predict will go higher, the Democratic Party has no problems. It is lamentable, indeed, however that as a result of his policy, millions of breadwinners will be thrown out of work and millions of families will suffer the plight of no paycheck to take care of their basic needs and desires.

IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I was recently asked to write an article for the Young Republican newspaper at American University. Feeling as I do that President Nixon deserves firm support from all of us in his attempt to bring the Vietnam war to an honorable end and not be stampeded into surrender, I take the liberty of inserting my article in the RECORD in order that my colleagues may fully understand my position and my determination to support President Nixon:

IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

(By William G. Whitehurst, Member of Congress)

I became a strong supporter of Richard Nixon in June, 1968, at the Candidates' Conference at the Marriott Motor Hotel. Prior to

that time, I leaned toward one of the other Republican candidates, but after hearing Nixon speak to us on his proposed foreign policy for the United States, I became convinced that he, of all the candidates, had the best grasp of foreign affairs and I determined to support him.

Nothing has happened since that time to change my opinion. Indeed, what the President has said and done since his inauguration has reinforced my conviction. The President spoke in general terms of a world partnership of America and her allies instead of the paternal relationship which has existed since the end of World War II. He was emphatic in stressing the need for Asian allies to assume the burden for their defense against internal enemies, offering our assistance in the supply of necessary arms and ultimate defense against massive aggression from without. It is the kind of policy that should have been initiated over a decade ago, with the additional move of encouraging Japan to take a more active political role in the Far East.

This policy is currently hamstrung by the Vietnam morass, which the President inherited from his predecessor. The large American commitment in Vietnam represents more than the presence of a sizable military force engaged in a static defense of South Vietnam. It underscores the ability of the United States to place its armed forces in strength anywhere in the world, and just as important, its willingness to do so. Our presence in Vietnam is proof of the credibility of America as an ally and it is this credibility which is the cement of an alliance.

The critics, both Democrats and Republicans, who demand an end to the war, either immediately, or by December, 1970, destroy or would at least diminish the President's chance to decrease our participation in the war while at the same time maintaining that credibility. For if we are stampeded by the dissenters at home into a precipitate withdrawal, no free world political leader in Asia would count upon us as a source of strength. The SEATO alliance would be meaningless and more important, the hope to build the kind of partnership that the President envisions will be dashed. We will suffer an isolationism imposed from without in Asia for it is difficult to see what credence will be placed in our word by our Asian friends.

I do not ask that the war be escalated or that the current level of troop strength be indefinitely maintained. I do believe, however, that the President should be allowed more time to carry through disengagement in an orderly way, keeping the pressure on Hanoi to negotiate on a mutual basis. The impatience of his critics is reflected in deadlines, which in themselves are hard to defend. If they would have us out of Vietnam at any price, why not let it be done in 90 days? This would at least spare the lives of those who will be killed between now and the end of next year.

We have a responsibility to support President Nixon in this most difficult of all our national problems. He has announced his path and he has taken the first few steps along it. But if we join the chorus of those who bleat "Withdraw, Withdraw," we will surely help pin the label upon our leader as the first American President to lose a war and worse, we will abort the birth of a new Asian policy which holds so much promise for the future.

A RISKY NEW AMERICAN SPORT: "THE BREAKING OF THE PRESIDENT"

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, today's edition of the Washington Post contains a most thoughtful and perceptive column by its national political correspondent, David S. Broder. He writes of the problem of Presidential leadership and the war in Vietnam.

Mr. Broder, as many of us know, is presently a fellow at the Institute for Political Studies at Harvard University. His column, written from Cambridge, Mass., brings a new and refreshing perspective to the debate on the Vietnam war.

Mr. Broder presents a most intelligent interpretation of recent events bearing on the Vietnam war, and real insight into the motives of those who have been most vocal in their criticism of the conduct of the war, as well as President Nixon's efforts toward a scaling-down of the fighting.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER).

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) in bringing to the attention of Members of this House this very good article. I hope Members of both bodies will take note of the importance at stake in this "Breaking of the President."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most interesting—and the most disturbing—aspect of this article, Mr. Speaker, is a chilling description of what the future holds if those who have embarked on what Mr. Broder so aptly calls "The Breaking of the President" are successful.

Mr. Speaker, the column by Mr. Broder should be required reading for every Member of Congress. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this should be required reading for every American.

The article follows:

A RISKY NEW AMERICAN SPORT: "THE BREAKING OF THE PRESIDENT"

(By David S. Broder)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—If there are any smart literary agents around these days, one of them will copyright the title "The Breaking of the President" for the next big series of nonfiction best-sellers. It is becoming more obvious with every passing day that the men and the movement that broke Lyndon B. Johnson's authority in 1968 are out to break Richard M. Nixon in 1969.

The likelihood is great that they will succeed again, for breaking a President is, like most feats, easier to accomplish the second time around. Once learned, the techniques can readily be applied as often as desired—even when the circumstances seem less than propitious. No matter that this President is pulling troops out of Vietnam, while the last one was sending them in; no matter that in 1969 the casualties and violence are declining, while in 1968 they were on the rise. Men have learned to break a President, and, like any discovery that imparts power to its possessors, the mere availability of this knowledge guarantees that it will be used.

The essentials of the technique are now so well understood that they can be applied with little waste motion.

First, the breakers arrogate to themselves a position of moral superiority. For that reason, a war that is unpopular, expensive and very probably unwise is labeled as immoral, indecent and intolerable. Critics of the President who are indelicate enough to betray partisan motives are denounced. (That for you, Fred Harris.) Members of the President's own party who, for reasons perhaps unrelated to their own flagging political careers, catapult themselves into the front ranks of the opposition are greeted as heroes. (Hooray for Charley Goodell.)

The students who would fight in the war are readily mobilized against it. Their teachers, as is their custom, hasten to adopt the students' views. (News item: The Harvard department of biochemistry and molecular biology last week called for immediate withdrawal from Vietnam.)

Next, a New England election (the New Hampshire primary is best but the Massachusetts Sixth Congressional District election will do as well) surprisingly shows that peace is popular at the polls. The President's party sees defeat staring it in the face unless it repudiates him, and the Harris poll promptly comes along to confirm his waning grip on public trust. The Chief Executive, clearly panicky, resorts to false bravado and says he will never be moved by these protests and demonstrations, thus confirming the belief that he is too stubborn to repent and must be broken.

And then, dear friends, Sen. Fulbright and the Foreign Relations Committee move in to finish off the job.

All this is no fiction; it worked before and it is working again. Vietnam is proving to be what Henry Kissinger once said he suspected it might be—one of those tragic, cursed messes that destroys any President who touches it.

That being the case, any President interested in saving his own skin would be well-advised to resign his responsibility for Vietnam and publicly transfer the assignment of ending the war to Congress or the Vietnam Moratorium Committee or anyone else who would like to volunteer for the job.

But he cannot. And that is the point the protesters seem to overlook. Assume that they and the President are both right when they assert the time has come to end this war. Assume that the protesters know better than the President how to do so—despite the conspicuous absence of specific alternatives to the President's policies in their current manifestos.

There is still a vital distinction, granting all this, to be made between the constitutionally protected expression of dissent, aimed at changing national policy, and mass movements aimed at breaking the President by destroying his capacity to lead the nation or to represent it at the bargaining table.

The point is quite simple. Given the impatience in this country to be out of that miserable war, there is no great trick in using the Vietnam issue to break another President. But when you have broken the President, you have broken the one man who can negotiate the peace.

Hanoi will not sit down for secret talks with the Foreign Relations Committee. Nor can the Vietnam Moratorium's sponsors order home a single GI or talk turkey to Gen. Thieu about reshaping his government. Only the President can do that.

There is also the matter of time. It is one thing to break a President at the end of his term, as was done last year. It is quite another thing to break him at the beginning, as is being attempted now.

The orators who remind us that Mr. Nixon has been in office for nine months should remind themselves that he will remain there for 39 more months—unless, of course, they are willing to put their convictions to the test by moving to impeach him.

Is that not, really, the proper course? Rather than destroying his capacity to lead while leaving him in office, rather than leaving the nation with a broken President at its head for three years, would not their cause and the country be better served by resort to the constitutional method for removing a president?

And what a wonderful chapter it would make for Volume 2 of "The Breaking of the President" series.

THE BREAKING OF THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and including the article on the "Breaking of the President" which was in the Washington Post this morning.

I think it is time that the American people become aware of those who—I regret to say some in high positions—are making a career out of attempting to destroy their own country.

A TIME FOR AMERICANS TO UNITE

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) and commend him for his forthright statement. This is certainly a time in the history of our country for all Americans to unite behind our Chief Executive who is making a great effort to fulfill his responsibilities under the Constitution in the formulation and execution of our foreign policy.

President Nixon has shown courageous and intelligent leadership in trying to bring the tragic war in Vietnam to a close which will be consistent with the great traditions and national honor of this country. He should be given an opportunity to use his great knowledge and experience in the field of foreign affairs to achieve an early resolution of the conflict. He should be supported by the Congress when he refuses to hit the panic button and sue for peace at any price, a false peace which would betray our national interest and in the long run jeopardize our security.

I believe the people of this country will rally behind the President as he refuses to be stampeded by those who apparently will not be content with anything less than the total humiliation of our fighting troops in the field and the total repudiation of the sacrifices of brave Americans living and dead who have answered the call of duty in far-off Vietnam. They have not been defeated by the enemy and our policy should not be dictated by those who wish they had. Our fighting men and their Commander in Chief are entitled to a great deal more support and consideration than they are receiving from some quarters today.

NEW KIND OF PROTEST IS NECESSARY ON WAR

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have here a column all those in this Nation who support North Vietnam should read carefully.

It is written by Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond, not known for their sensationalism.

Those who view the North Vietnamese with affection should read how that affection is returned. It just might change their minds.

This column is from the Philadelphia Inquirer of October 3, 1969, and it reads as follows:

NEW KIND OF PROTEST IS NECESSARY ON WAR (By Roscoe and Geoffrey Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—There ought to be another protest after students and professors devote Oct. 15 to contending that President Nixon is not getting the U.S. out of Vietnam fast enough to suit them.

We need a different kind of protest.

We propose that Congress and the country join in a massive protest to Hanoi against its continuing cruel, criminal and inhumane treatment of American prisoners of war.

We propose that the House and Senate pass a joint resolution at the earliest date demanding that North Vietnam cease violating the Geneva Convention against the maltreatment of enemy prisoners to which Hanoi is solemnly bound. One such resolution with 200 cosponsors has already been introduced in the House.

We propose that special means be taken—by letters to the President and Congress, by circulated petitions for signature, by newspaper advertisements and other means—to show to North Vietnam and the Vietcong that American public opinion is both united and revolted by their needless and heartless attitude toward the men who have fallen into their hands.

Hanoi has shown itself very sensitive to the state of opinion in the U.S. It hopes to win a one-sided peace by playing on the disunity and impatience of the American people.

It would be useful to let Hanoi see something of the unity and the impatience of the American people over the long-standing, proven mistreatment of U.S. men in North Vietnamese prison camps.

It would be useful to let the whole world know more about these conditions.

It might do more. It might help break the deadlock over serious political negotiations to begin serious prisoner-of-war negotiations as it did in the long deadlocked Korean negotiations at Panmunjom.

There are 1332 U.S. servicemen listed as prisoners or missing in action and many missing in action may be in prison camps. More than 200 U.S. servicemen have been held more than three and one-half years—longer than any U.S. serviceman was held prisoner in World War II.

Here are the minimum obligations of the Geneva Convention, which North Vietnam signed in 1957—and Hanoi's nonperformance:

Identify prisoners whom they hold. Hanoi has refused to do so.

Release the sick and injured. Hanoi has refused to do so; its medical care has often been deliberately inadequate.

Permit impartial inspections of prisoner of war facilities. Hanoi has refused to do so.

Permit free exchange of mail. Hanoi has refused to do so.

Here is typical testimony of those who were released and returned to the U.S. (nine in five years): One told of "rebreaking bones in solitary confinement, of sitting on a hot stool in a hot room with no sleep. . . . In two days your feet swell up and then it creeps up your legs until they are numb. How long can you last before giving some kind of statement? Some have gone 150 hours. Others passed out from heat exhaustion in 48."

Another told of a fellow prisoner "tied up with ropes to such a degree that he still has large scars on his arms from rope burns which became infected. He was deprived of sleep, beaten, had his fingernails removed and put in solitary for 38 days."

Many hundreds of American wives, children and parents today live in needless and tragic uncertainty because Hanoi barbarously flouts its pledged word in the Geneva Convention. Some distraught U.S. Army wives are going into debt to fly to Paris to visit the Vietcong headquarters on the uncertain promise that they may be told whether their husbands are dead or alive. What cruelty! What a travesty!

Since Hanoi is concerned about American opinion on ending the war, it ought to be given an authoritative word through a unanimously passed Congressional resolution about the American state of mind on ending their brutal prisoner-of-war crimes.

It could help end the war. It could help bring the peace.

HORSE PROTECTION ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of my colleagues are aware of the brutal method of "soring," which results in the quick development of a Tennessee walking horse. Specifically, "soring" is the practice of using mechanical and chemical means to make a horse's feet tender so it will lift them high in the show ring.

Today, almost half of this country's 60,000 walkers are tortured into performing spectacularly. In order to help put an end to the widespread barbaric treatment of these horses, I am today introducing the Horse Protection Act of 1969. This legislation would prohibit the movement in commerce, for the purpose of showing or exhibition, any horse which is believed to be sored.

The Tennessee Walking Horses Trainers Association pleads that no legislation be enacted and that they be given "additional time in which to continue efforts to improve conditions." Had this association acted years ago to end this torture, then their request might be granted. But such was not the case, and as Mrs. Paul Twyne, president of the American Horse Protection Association, testified before a Senate committee:

The magnitude of this problem is far beyond the control of the horse shows associations, the local humane societies and the legitimate, honest trainers, breeders and owners who are sincerely interested in the future of the Tennessee Walking Horse.

It is my firm belief that unless we can insure that all trainers will stop the inhumane practice of "soring," it is highly unlikely that anyone will initiate the action and go into the ring against other trainers whose horses have been "sored for the big lick."

Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee walking horse is advertised as the world's best pleasure horse. These horses should be treated as the champions that they are. I urge my colleagues to lend their active support to the Horse Protection Act of 1969.

EFFECT OF IMPORTS ON GLASS AND OTHER INDUSTRIES

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to again call for drastic action in regard to the trade policy followed by the United States. The American St. Gobain glass plant in Arnold, Pa., has just closed its doors because of the senseless and uneconomic trade policy which is slowly but surely eroding job opportunities in every major industry in our country. Even the farm and service professions have not been spared. The time for talking is past. For 12 years I have warned the Congress, the White House, and the people of the coming day of reckoning. That day is here for millions of U.S. workers, and most recently for the 750 families found wanting in Arnold.

To add insult to injury, the Tariff Commission is holding hearings—at which I plan to appear—on a further reduction in U.S. tariffs on flat glass. The audacity, the boldness, the greed of the importer lobby and fraternity in this country, coupled with the brazenness and profiteering of foreign exporters calls for the only kind of action left to the American worker, farmer, merchants, and above all taxpayers. Either we mount a protective buy-American program for competitive goods, or we bow to the foreign products. This, indeed, is drastic action; but when reason does not prevail, then revolutionary tactics are demanded.

This may lead to an open boycott of all foreign-made products whether produced by foreign-owned or U.S.-owned industries abroad. I doubt that one single American family can shop for 1 month without buying a foreign-made product.

Our own manufacturers are lowering quality while their foreign counterparts are doing the opposite. With international cartels setting the pace, prices are doubled and even tripled on foreign products in the U.S. marketplace.

The glass workers can be the spearhead of this drive by calling upon all workers to "buy American." The difference in price, if any, is more than offset by the extra taxes the employed people of our country would have to pay in the form of welfare for those who are out of work. Call it "buy American," call it boycott, call it protectionism, call it by any name; this is the only means left to prevent the United States from continuing to be used as a dumping ground for foreign imports. The only sound trade policy in today's technological world is one of buying what you need and selling what customers require. This Nation

cannot survive in a free trade world, regardless of the pro forma arguments of the doctrinaire free trader.

The next move upward in the minimum wage and maximum hour law may well spell the death of the consumer goods industries as far as growth and job opportunities for future Americans is concerned. I will not sponsor a new bill unless protective criteria such as those contained in H.R. 478, 90th Congress, and H.R. 1044 of this Congress, are included therein. The provisions of H.R. 1044 would tie import impact to our mandated minimum wage which is higher than any other nation's minimum wage. This may not be enough, but it will help.

We have mistaken trade relations for foreign relations and have let the State Department create a Frankenstein in the world trade economy. We buy goods we produce in surplus. We sell goods subsidized by our Government. We put U.S. producers in business in foreign countries. We buy back the U.S. goods formerly produced in the United States to further pollute our U.S. marketplace without regard to their foreign origin. The disparagement between U.S. and foreign labor costs, based on our lowest wage level, is such as to bar competitive equality in any marketplace except when that market is in short supply.

The 750 workers permanently removed from their lifetime jobs in Arnold will cost our economy no less than 2,700 full-time wage and salary workers.

When an event takes place after being predicted beforehand, it behooves all of us to give heed to the future dangers. The trade policies of our Nation are based upon false and mistaken assumptions. We assume we can have a high-cost economy and prosper in a free trade world without regard to cost differentials and marketplace opportunities. We cannot. The Arnold plant's closing proves this, and dramatically calls attention to an acknowledged fact: we have the highest unemployment in the past 9 years.

It is now up to the people, the consumers of America. We buy American or we go broke. We cannot count on our Government since too many Government leaders are tied to foreign trade directly or indirectly. We just named Carl Gilbert of the Gillette Razor Co. as chief negotiator for U.S. trade. This same Gillette Co. is one of the largest and farthest-reaching international operators. This same company pays its workers in one foreign country—in a plant I visited—less than 80 cents a day. Is this the kind of a trade expert we need to save American jobs?

The gravest danger facing this country is not Vietnam, and is not student unrest, but the stupidity of the people in control of our Government who do not see that the economics of this country cannot go anywhere but downward unless we change our outmoded and mistaken trade policies.

My Pennsylvania Dutch people would describe our present generation of leaders as "folks who got too soon old and too late smart."

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE LAIRD URGES UNIFIED ACTION FOR PEACE

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

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Melvin R. Laird, delivered a timely and significant address today at the national convention of the AFL-CIO at Atlantic City.

The theme of Secretary Laird's speech was the current program to Vietnamize the war in South Vietnam.

Secretary Laird emphasizes that the military forces in South Vietnam are being improved to take over a greater part of the fighting in that beleaguered land. He also emphasized the strengthening of the Vietnam economy and the emphasis on improved internal security.

Mr. Speaker, the significance of Secretary Laird's speech is quite obvious. President Nixon has launched a new peace offensive which has already resulted in the reduction of American manpower in South Vietnam and the lowest number of casualties in more than 2 years. The President deserves and should have the unified support of the people of our Nation in behalf of his program to bring the war in Vietnam to an early and honorable close.

Mr. Speaker, I was appalled to hear a group of television broadcasting commentators express surprise that the President had asked for national unity in his pursuit of peace in Vietnam.

Certainly, this request is quite obvious, as Secretary Laird declared:

To carry out his policy, the President needs the support of a united people. The young Americans in Vietnam need that support. Hanoi's strategy is clear: the leaders in Hanoi expect to achieve victory by waiting for us to abandon the conflict as a result of anti-war protest in this country.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the choice is clear. We can help the President in his great mission for restoring peace in Vietnam or we can undercut his efforts. As for me, I want to be counted as lining up solidly with the President and in full support of his new approach to restoring peace in Vietnam.

I commend the Secretary of Defense on his illuminating and inspiring address to the members of the AFL-CIO gathered in Atlantic City, N.J. I hope that all Americans will take heart in his words and that the valiant efforts of President Nixon will receive the overwhelming support of loyal Americans throughout the land.

TO PROVIDE THAT THE FISCAL YEAR OF THE UNITED STATES SHALL COINCIDE WITH THE CALENDAR YEAR

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GONZALEZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year. I believe this legislation would help the Congress in dealing more efficiently with problems connected with the appropriation process.

We have been in session for over 9 months now and only one appropriation bill for fiscal 1970 has been enacted into law—the one providing funds for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Executive Office. We are nearly a third of the year into the fiscal year and 12 other appropriation bills have yet to be sent to the President for signature. Still somewhere in the pipeline are the appropriation bills for the legislative branch; Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary; Department of Defense; Department of the Interior; Department of Agriculture; Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare; Department of Housing and Urban Development and Independent Offices; Department of Transportation; military construction; Public Works and Atomic Energy; District of Columbia; and foreign assistance.

This situation is by no means unique. The following list shows, for the last three Congresses, as well as for the current session, how many regular appropriation bills had not become law before the beginning of the fiscal year to which they pertained:

1963	10 of 12
1964	12 of 12
1965	10 of 12
1966	10 of 12
1967	13 of 14
1968	13 of 14
1969	13 of 13

Obviously the situation is going from bad to worse and there seems little likelihood that it will improve unless we change the fiscal year so that it will coincide with the calendar year.

I am not at this time going to argue the merits and demerits of the many programs that are included in the appropriation bills that we pass annually nor am I going to argue whether they ought to have more money or less. Suffice it to say that it is mandatory that the appropriation bill be passed as early as possible if the programs are going to function properly.

Having served in this body since 1957 and having been closely associated with its operations since 1949, I have watched Federal outlays increase from less than \$41,000,000,000 annually to more than \$195,000,000,000 annually.

During these two decades, sessions of Congress have become longer and longer. The 1952 session adjourned sine die on July 7 and that of 1953 on August 3. In 1954, the House of Representatives adjourned sine die on August 20. In subsequent years, both Houses adjourned for good on August 2, 1955; July 27, 1956; August 30, 1957; and August 24, 1958. Since then final adjournments have been in September, October, and December, one session ending on the next to the last day of the year.

Some of these sessions were unduly prolonged because of delays in enacting appropriation bills. When such measures are being considered just before Christmas, I sometimes wonder whether we in the Congress are working for Uncle Sam or for Santa Claus.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend in my remarks here this afternoon to lay the blame for this situation on anyone's doorstep, for it comes about because of a number of things.

First and foremost, we on the Appropriations Committee cannot appropriate for that which has not been authorized, and in this respect we are seriously handicapped on many occasions by the slowness of the legislative committees to move, when an ongoing program's expiration date is nigh at hand. In other words, if a program is to be extended pretty much intact we ought to know about it early enough to appropriate wisely for it, and lacking authorization we have to assume that it is a program about to be terminated.

Now our chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), has on any number of occasions urged the subcommittees conducting their hearings here on the House side to move along expeditiously, and we have. I should also say that it is a downright deplorable situation when we find the other body at this stage—nearly a third of the way through the current fiscal year—having not even begun its hearings on the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill. We spent nearly 4 months of hearings on this bill before our HEW subcommittee, and while it is a well-known fact that the other body never takes as long a time, nor does as thorough a job as we do, they cannot possibly have a bill on the floor before December, and then when one considers that a conference has to be called and the differences ironed out, we could find ourselves into the new calendar year, 1970, and into the last half of the current fiscal year before getting some of these appropriations bills actually enacted into law.

It is just ridiculous to be operating this way. If we ever thought of doing the same in private enterprise or in our own businesses, we would be out of business before long. It is an egregious situation.

In defense of the other body, they are charged with the constitutional responsibility of ratifying treaties and confirming Presidential appointees, and that does take a considerable amount of time with which we in the House do not have to concern ourselves, but it seems to me that we have to find a better way of doing business.

That is why I am proposing here today, Mr. Speaker, that we at least try an alternative by making the fiscal year coincide with the calendar year.

It would appear on the surface that the use of the calendar year in preference to the present fiscal year would require a mere housekeeping change affecting only those of us in the legislative and executive branches who are directly concerned with appropriations.

To the contrary millions of Americans as individuals, groups, organizations and yes, above all, the 50 States would be far better off if they knew where they were sufficiently in advance to get the most return for each Federal dollar appropriated.

Under the existing setup, when it is almost impossible to send all the appropriation measures to the White House before July 1, many people throughout the land live in uncertainty for months. Officials of educational institutions at all levels do not know how much money will be available for construction of buildings, for popular ongoing programs, for scholarships, or for salaries. Hospital administrators are in the dark, not knowing what Federal funds will be forthcoming for hospital construction or for research. Badly needed housing cannot be built unless those responsible for construction know how much money they can expect. These are but a few examples.

With the switch from the existing fiscal year to the calendar year, we would have more time for hearings, more time for calm deliberation, more time for debate on the floor, and more time for oversight. We would not need to utilize all of the added 6 months.

Some bills could be sent to the Chief Executive soon after July 1, while work on the others could be completed on various dates long before December 31. Congress would not have to remain in session throughout the year just because of the change to the calendar year, but if it did continue sitting after all the appropriation measures had been passed in final form, the extra time could be used for purposes of review. Whether we retain the present fiscal year or shift to the calendar year arrangement, we will from time to time have to consider supplemental requests. The important thing, as I see it, is to give the various instrumentalities of government, including State and local as well as Federal, time to budget their funds properly, spend their money wisely, and make their dollars go further.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I have dropped into the hopper today ought to have strong support from both sides of the aisle and all shades of thinking in both parties. Last and by no means least—it ought to have enthusiastic support from the people who provide the money to appropriate, namely, the taxpayers.

H.R. 14225

A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year

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

SECTION 1. Effective with the second calendar year which begins after the date of enactment of this Act, the fiscal year of all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States shall be the calendar year.

SEC. 2. The director of the Bureau of the Budget is authorized to make provision by regulation, order, or otherwise for the orderly transition by all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States

affected by section 1 of this Act from the use of the fiscal year in effect on the date of enactment of this Act to the use of the fiscal year prescribed by section 1 of this Act.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman has brought up this question and is introducing this bill. I understand the Committee on Rules is considering somewhat the same legislation which the gentleman from Illinois is introducing.

I wonder if the gentleman has anything in his bill which would require authorizations to be made promptly? Even though we go to the fiscal year plan, and have the entire year to consider appropriation bills, are we not still in the position of not having authorizations come October or November and still find ourselves in the same position we are in today if we were not able to get the authorizations bills through?

Mr. MICHEL. The point that the gentleman from Ohio makes is a very good one. The bill which I have introduced is very general in scope. But realizing that there are some of these other approaches and versions that have been introduced in bill form, I have not in my bill specifically earmarked or set a target date on which we must have authorizations before considering appropriation bills.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I can recall in the 82d Congress when the Appropriations Committee had all of its bills out by the end of May, all except the so-called foreign aid bill and that came out I think a month or two later—this was before we were held down by authorizations—and here we had one today, this late in the season, and I understand one of the other great committees of this House has not yet finished the markup on another bill that is going to require authorization before we can bring the appropriation bill to the floor of the House for consideration and passage.

It would seem to me that we have got to find some way to get the authorizations passed promptly.

I think the gentleman will agree with me that practically every subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has concluded its hearings and we are now waiting for the final word that we will have authorizations for the consideration of the appropriation bills.

We could have had our bills on the floor here earlier.

The gentleman touched upon another question that is most serious, and that is in the other body.

We have now—I think this is correct—six bills over there now upon which no action has been taken. I know of one subcommittee that sent a bill over there in July and no final action has been taken upon it as yet. So, that is not going to be quite as easy to solve as it looks on the surface.

There is one other matter that is of concern with reference to going from the fiscal year to the calendar year. I may say to the gentleman that on this floor not long ago I urged this study to be made because I think there may be some merit to changing to the calendar year, but every 4 years you would really have a problem, for if you appropriate for the 4th year, the incoming President, whomever he might be, will be working for a full year on an appropriation passed by his predecessor. Of course, we all know they can send down amendments to the budget, but that is not very satisfactory.

Mr. MICHEL. In the current fiscal year we have been witness to how long it takes an administration to really get cranked up on its own and have its own imprint upon legislation, upon spending and the budget. I do not see how changing to a calendar year would in any way inhibit a new administration in making changes, for they would simply have a longer period in which to send up budget amendments.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there is one other observation I would like to make and one which concerns me, and that is the practice of continuing resolutions. We have to have them because of the situation which the gentleman has discussed. But, in many cases we are now carrying on under continuing resolutions and there are various departments which are hampered by not having their bills through and by not knowing what they are going to have. But, in many of those bills that are held up because they are not through conference, it would seem to me that where the House and the Senate are in agreement and where they are not subject to conference, we should amend our next continuing resolution in order to permit departments to go ahead with the expenditure of the amounts that have been agreed upon if they are not in conference.

It seems to me to be an injustice to the executive branch of the Government to have to be carrying on under a continuing resolution where nobody knows and nobody can plan on what is going to go on.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will follow through so that we can have a study upon this matter. But we must find some way, because the executive branch is suffering and we are suffering from the stigma attached by not getting the bills through.

But I again want to point out on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations that we could have had our work finished if we had had the cooperation of the other body, and of the legislative committees, we could have been out of here.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I will yield to the gentleman from California in just a moment, but before I do that I would like to make, if I might, one other observation, since the gentleman from Ohio

(Mr. Bow) mentioned the continuing resolutions.

Earlier today on the floor of this House there were several statements made with respect to that, and to amending the continuing resolution when it comes up again—a subject matter on which there is going to be a lot of discussion when it does come to the floor of the House.

If we continue to go the route of continuing resolutions, we are going to have all kinds of requests for exemptions by this and that pressure group in the future and that is bad. It practically destroys the orderly appropriating process. I think it is a bad way to do business, and that a change is needed. The handwriting is on the wall and I believe we ought to move to correct this bad situation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I know the resolution that the gentleman is talking about, but that is not what I am saying. I am saying where the bill has passed the Senate, and passed the House, where they are not in disagreement and there are items that would not have to be in conference which we know are going to be approved, then I think we ought to permit them to go ahead.

Mr. MICHEL. I am heartily in agreement with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio with regard to that kind of resolution.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman on introducing this bill. I have been advocating the change from the fiscal year to the calendar year for a long time, and I have had discussions with many Members of my side of the aisle, and I feel that many of them will support this principle if and when it comes to fruition. I have done a number of things in connection with this, in fact, I have had some trial copies of a bill drawn by the legislative reference department, and by my staff, and I think that the gentleman is absolutely on sound ground.

The burden of work that faces both the authorizing committees and the Committee on Appropriations is so much greater than it was 27 years ago when I first came to the Congress when we could get the authorizations for the appropriations out in a few months, or a relatively few months. And I know that we have to have a change in the system.

Of course, there are a lot of problems involved on this, as the gentleman knows. For instance, we have the transitional period which I assume would be an 18-month transitional period, because we would have to take into consideration the additional 6 months in the calendar year change if we actually went to a calendar year. So there is that problem which I am sure will be brought out during the hearings. I hope to be allowed to testify on this bill because I think it is realistic. I think that we have been living in a fool's world when we expect the authorizing committees and the Committee

on Appropriations to do their work in 6 months. We just cannot do that any more, and I think we might as well recognize this and bend to the inevitable to give ourselves the necessary time.

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

AIRLINES CAN STOP POLLUTING THE AIR—IF THEY WILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us here and Americans throughout the Nation have a keen interest in solving the problem of air pollution. In many areas we have been baffled in finding a solution which will guarantee clean air.

However, it has come to my attention that industry has developed the technology to prevent air pollution from airplanes. As you know, when jets take off and land, a stream of smoke follows in their wake, causing an unsightly plume which leaves tiny particles of carbon hanging in the air.

This is the result of unburned fuel. We have known this for a long time, but until recently there was no way to prevent it.

Pratt and Whitney has, however, developed a combustor which will render all future jets smokeless. What is more important, they have a process whereby their existing engines can be retrofitted with the same result—no smoke and no pollution.

Because of this breakthrough, a Government-industry meeting was held September 4. Mr. William H. Megonnell, Assistant Commissioner for Standards and Compliance of the National Air Pollution Control Administration conducted the meeting after inviting 43 airlines. The majority of airlines were represented by Mr. Clifton F. vonKann, vice president for operations and engineering of the Air Transport Association.

The crux of the meeting was that the Air Pollution Control Administration said the smokeless cans were soon to be available and urged their use. Note was made of the increase in cost to the airlines and estimates for this additional cost were put at between \$13.5 and \$15 million for retrofitting approximately 3,000 engines.

Pratt & Whitney said that it could tool up and by next spring could, if there was a need, turn out 200 of these smokeless cans per month for retrofit.

Mr. vonKann said that he figured the cost to be about \$30 million and added that the industry felt it was doing a proper job. The airlines position then appeared to be that they would wait until new engines were needed before they acted.

Mr. Speaker, if the airlines voluntarily accept their responsibility to do their part in cleaning the air, the majority of engines now polluting our skies could be corrected by 1972. But the airlines want to wait until their existing engines completely wear out before starting a clean air campaign. This would mean that it would be the mid-1970's before we

started to see smoke pollution from airlines disappear. I do not think that is soon enough.

There are three ways retrofitting could be accomplished. First, it could start as soon as possible, depending on the availability of the new cans; second, refit them as they come in for overhaul, or third, wait until they wear out and have new smokeless engines installed.

I favor the first—immediate action.

The point was made during the hearings that there is no law on the books requiring the airlines to adopt cleaner burning engines. I would hope that the airlines would reconsider their position and voluntarily start retrofitting their engines.

For I feel the Congress and the American people will press for legislation if it is necessary to make sure that we are doing all we can to halt air pollution from airplanes.

As a general rule, we accept that airplane smoke accounts for 1 percent of all air pollution by weight. But in the population corridors where planes land and take off, that percentage is higher.

The important thing, however, is that if we do have a solution for eliminating even 1 percent of the air pollution problem, we would be negligent if we did not take action to do so.

There are 78 million pounds of pollutants dropped from planes every year. Here in Washington, D.C., 1,200 pounds per day, or about 602,000 pounds per year, are dumped from airplanes. In New York, they figure about a ton and a half per day. And in Los Angeles, almost 1 ton of pollutants per day is dumped from airplanes.

This could be eliminated. Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join with me in urging the airlines of this Nation to meet their responsibility and move as quickly as possible to have their existing engines fitted with these devices to prevent air pollution.

I, for one, can say that if they do not, there will be legislation coming. For we in the Congress also have a responsibility to see that the air we breathe is clean. And I think the Congress will meet that responsibility.

STATE DEMOS GEARING UP FOR 1970 RACES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. W. N. Patman, wife of the distinguished State senator, Bill Patman, and the daughter-in-law of our beloved and respected dean of the Texas delegation, and chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, WRIGHT PATMAN, and in addition, the daughter of an illustrious State senator, Fred Mauritz, now deceased, has been named Texas National Committeewoman for the Democratic Party. It is indeed a fitting honor for this outstanding lady. Mrs. Patman comes to serve the party in Texas at a most decisive and critical time. She has been inured in the Texas tradition of unselfish public service.

I know that Chairman PATMAN is proud of her appointment and I share that pride.

Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of calling the attention of my colleagues to news items relating to Mrs. Patman's selection:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Sept. 30, 1969]

STATE DEMOS GEARING UP FOR '70 RACES (By Felton West)

AUSTIN.—Amid warnings not to take past success at the polls for granted, the State Democratic Executive Committee started gearing up for the 1970 elections and chose a new national Democratic committeewoman for Texas at a meeting here today.

Mrs. Carrin Patman, wife of state Sen. William N. Patman of Ganado, was unanimously selected as national committeewoman, succeeding Mrs. Lloyd M. Bentson Jr. of Houston, who resigned about four months ago.

"We must convince Texas Democrats that they no longer can take success for granted," state Democratic Chairman Elmer Baum of Austin said.

Baum said he was "confident of future victories" but warned that the national Republican administration will name GOP "nose-counters" for the 1970 census and otherwise use patronage jobs in an effort to help the state GOP attain its announced goal of winning 35 seats in the Texas House of Representatives.

Gov. Preston Smith said, "Democrats should not be lulled by past victories into a false feeling of security." But he predicted the GOP will fail to win its goal of 35 legislative seats.

Baum announced he will soon establish a "future directions committee" as an advisory group for the SDEC "to seek new solutions to old problems, to chart new approaches to a brighter future." He suggested that, among other projects, it devote attention to bringing "senior citizens more deeply into Democratic Party activities," to giving county Democratic chairmen "opportunities for more service to the state organization," and to devising "a definite plan . . . to aid our Democratic nominees in their races against Republican opponents next fall."

Mrs. Patman is a vibrant 37-year-old longtime Democratic Party worker who served on the SDEC in 1966-67. She is the daughter of Fred Mauritz, a Ganado rancher and businessman who served in the Legislature from 1935 until his death in 1947. Her father-in-law is longtime congressman Wright Patman of Texarkana. She is a niece of prominent Houston Attorney Percy Foreman.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Oct. 1, 1969]

MRS. WILLIAM N. PATMAN CHOSEN COMMITTEEWOMAN

AUSTIN.—Mrs. William N. Patman, chosen to be national Democratic committeewoman from Texas, is an energetic South Texan with both a record and heritage in politics.

The former Carrin Mauritz of Ganado, she is the wife of a state senator and daughter-in-law of Wright Patman of Texarkana, senior U.S. congressman from Texas.

If the National Democratic Committee, as expected, follows the recommendation of the State Democratic Executive Committee, Mrs. Patman will succeed Mrs. Lloyd M. Bentson Jr. of Houston, who resigned.

The new committeewoman is considered a liberal-moderate in politics. She is 37, wealthy, a veteran political campaigner for her husband and other Democratic candidates. A former State Democratic Executive Committee member, Mrs. Mauritz is helping to launch a new magazine for the party in Texas. She also is incoming president of the Texas Senate Ladies Club.

Sen. Charles Herring of Austin, SDEC member who urged Mrs. Patman's selection, described her as "ideally suited" to the post.

Gov. Preston Smith complimented the choice: "She has a unique political heritage . . . an abundance of ability and enormous capacity for hard work . . . I have always felt there is no substitute for hard work . . ."

Addressing an SDEC luncheon two hours after her selection, Mrs. Patman remarked "This is the first time any Patman election has ever been unanimous." She predicted "an exciting time" in Democratic politics in Texas.

The new committeewoman-designate also praised Gov. Smith as showing exceptional respect for the authority of his office and in practicing an "open door" policy as governor.

National Democratic Committeeman Robert Strauss of Dallas did not attend the meeting here but sent regrets. Both he and Mrs. Bentsen, the former national committeewoman, were choices of the administration of former Gov. John Connally.

SDEC adopted a resolution by William H. Clark III of Dallas commending Mrs. Bentsen's three years on the national committee including "the tumult at Chicago" (1968 national convention).

DRAFT CUTS, TOKEN PULLOUTS, AND OTHER FANTASIES AND ACTS OF MAGIC

(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, as the war in Vietnam drags its gory way along, ever-growing numbers of Americans demand a constantly increasing pace of extrication on the part of our country from that civil war. In the process, they are also calling for reform of our draft system, which has not been proven to be a fair selection of young men for service.

As demands have grown from all corners of the land, the Nixon administration searched desperately for some well-gnawed bone to throw to critics who at last are breaking their silence in ever-increasing numbers. The result is one of the more cynical acts of political legerdemain of recent years. In terms of tangible performance it is a disaster. As far as fantasy is concerned, it is a masterpiece. Several years ago, it would have worked. Today, it turns into an edged boomerang, which strikes its perpetrators all the harder because of national emotions they have toyed with.

With trumpets, drums, and thumping nonsequiturs, the administration recently announced a reduction of draft calls for the remainder of the year, simultaneously issuing a call for draft reform. The validity of these draft reductions is called into serious question after a study and comparison of statistics. Contemplating the situation from an angle which does compare figures, the draft call reductions lose all significance and stand revealed as mere statistical sleight-of-hand.

The average monthly draft call last year was 24,667 as opposed to 29,040 this year. Four thousand more men monthly are being drafted this year. How apt then for the President to make the empty gesture of reducing draft calls for 2 months.

He has been drafting young Americans this year faster than President Johnson

did last year. Draft calls under President Nixon have shot up more than 70 percent over last year since his June announcement of commencement of troop withdrawals from Vietnam. In October 1968, as an example, the call was for 13,800 as against 29,000 this October. From June to October of 1968, draft calls were for 79,300 men. For the same period in 1969, President Nixon drafted 135,700. In 10 months of 1969, Nixon is going to draft as many men as President Johnson did in 12 months of 1968. Figures are 290,400 for Nixon in 10 months against 296,000 for Johnson in 12 months.

So the draft call reduction stands revealed as a deliberate delusion offered to the public in order to blunt the cutting edge of dissent, which our leaders fear so much. Further, this is the second time such a cynical ploy has been used to fool the public. Earlier, the President announced troop cuts which were not cuts at all, knowing full well there had been a sharp increase in troop strength just before he made the announcement. The method used was the same as the draft cuts. Announce what is known to be a meaningless cutback with great fanfare and hoopla. The goal is the same in both cases. Stave off public criticism in order to continue to feed the guns.

The President announced a troop cut of 35,000 men by December 15, following the original 25,000-man reduction. Total withdrawals for 1969 then are 60,000. At this breathtaking rate we shall be out in a mere 8 years. At present casualty rates, even taking into account the lesser rate of recent hostilities, such a time schedule would cost America 600,000 more dead and wounded. For further evidence, let us examine casualty analysis figures emanating from the Armed Forces Journal.

American forces in Vietnam have suffered about 30 percent more combat deaths in the first 6 months of the Nixon administration than in the last 6 months of the Johnson regime. Under Nixon, combat deaths have jumped from 4,894 to 6,358. Wounded rose from 31,557 to 45,363. Even during the most recent "lull," American killed and wounded have been averaging about 1,500 weekly. This averages out to 75,000 annually, higher than the average for the last 3 years.

Here, then, is the stark reality of a callous effort by the administration to delude the public into thinking there is withdrawal and a winding down of our Vietnam participation, while such is not the case at all. An empty gesture is foisted upon the public as a grand and meaningful effort. The scarecrow dances and we are asked to believe it is a person performing. It is one of the crueler hoaxes of recent times, and the second of its kind. No one is fooled. Everyone is angered. Magic shows are supposed to be reserved for theaters and professional magicians, not for presidents and millions of people seeking policies and actions reflecting their wishes and demands. On October 15, a national day of protest, the American people will give President Nixon a demonstration of how much they want our Vietnam involvement to end. I endorse that protest and

shall participate in it. It is my belief that millions upon millions of Americans will on that day show their disgust and contempt for the Vietnam policy now being followed. I believe the President has deluded himself into believing he could actually get away with these charades. It is my fervent hope that these protests will break through the wall of insularity around him, inducing a tangible, truthful process of withdrawal and extrication. If not, then demonstrations, peaceful and well within the law, will continue—and continue—and continue. If I may borrow a tragic phrase—they will escalate indefinitely.

APPLES AND BREADLINES, ANYBODY?

(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, the tree of economic disaster planted and assiduously cultivated by President Nixon is bearing its first full harvest of bitter fruit. Unemployment in September made its biggest leap since the final months of the Eisenhower administration 9 years ago. It rose to its highest rate in 2 years, according to official statistics released by the Labor Department.

Overall unemployment rose from 3.5 percent in August to 4 percent in September, largest increase since late 1960. We note that unemployment usually drops in this period as students return to school. Instead, unemployment rose 365,000, with two-fifths of the increase among workers in the 20- to 24-year-old group. Three hundred sixty-five thousand Americans lost their jobs in 30 days. In August, 150,000 lost their jobs. Five hundred fifteen thousand Americans, therefore, have joined the swelling ranks of the unemployed in the last 60 days of the Nixon administration. Quite an accomplishment, is not it? Not too many governments of this Nation can boast that their economic policies have wrought so much devastation in such a short period. And the worst is yet to come.

Our national jobless rate increased from 3.3 percent in the first quarter of this year to 3.6 percent in the second quarter. Then it jumped to 3.7 percent in the third quarter and now it skyrockets to 4 percent. Inexorably, prosperity is being annihilated under the merciless hand of the Government, which has destroyed prosperity painfully created over the past 9 years.

In September, the jobless rate for white workers rose from 3.2 to 3.6 percent, while nonwhite rates went from 6.5 to 6.8 percent. Unemployment among blue collar workers went from 3.8 to 4.4 percent. These are utterly damning statistics. Has inflation been stopped, or even halted? Not an iota. Have prices gone down or even held level? Not a fraction. Have taxes been adjusted or reform been approved? Not a cent's worth. Has consumer buying power been annihilated? In great measure. Have interest rates been lowered? Not a point.

Heartlessly, dispassionately, uncom-

prehendingly, this administration pulverizes the working people of this country into powder under its fist. They talk peace and make war. They prattle of balanced budgets and cut essential programs. They bellow of prosperity and create an economic desert. They whine about jobs and create unemployment. They howl about work and the unemployment lines lengthen. Has there ever been such a gap between promise and performance? Never. We have the reincarnation of the Republican Party of the 1920's and 1930's in control. They are crippling the economy, and the worst has not yet arrived.

They will look at the unemployment lines and say, "Prosperity is just around the corner," or "Full employment will come as soon as minor adjustments are made." Watch and see. These are the exact words of Herbert Hoover. They will be the words of Richard Nixon. They are the bankrupt economic slogans of the Republican Party which, in its slavery to yesterday's ideas and contempt for the average working person, will allow repetition of the worst economic disasters of our past. Let them excuse these phenomena as they will. The figures are there, and like the raven perched beside them, they will not leave or be exorcised.

Look at the market. Look at the interest rates. Look at the inventories. Look at the declining sales. Look at the slowing consumption rates. We have reaped the first harvest of sorrow, and its fruits are bitter, indeed. Bare tables, empty pockets, barren futures, and blasted hopes are the blessings President Nixon has brought us. Let the country take note of this accumulating horror, for the storm's full force yet awaits us.

AIRLINE FARES TO SMALL CITIES

(Mr. STEED asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I have long contended that the Federal Government should do more to promote the development and growth of our Nation's smaller cities and rural areas. To foster such development I have introduced legislation designed to stimulate business to locate in these smaller communities. Similarly, I have supported our airline subsidy program; favored legislation to give the local service airlines permanent operating status; and until recently, approved the CAB's policy of substituting local service carriers for trunklines.

I felt this latter policy, specifically, was another way of improving our national airline system more efficient and economical. I say until recently, because lately I have become increasingly disturbed over several developments flowing from this policy which are adversely affecting our smaller cities, in particular, the lack of through fares to most of these so-called off-line points.

Consider for a moment as examples our situation in Lawton and Duncan and a number of other smaller Oklahoma cities. At present, our lowest fare to

many eastern and southeastern cities is greater than those from Amarillo and Lubbock, which lie several hundred miles beyond in west Texas.

More important, when the Board announced the airline fare increases last February, it said that the maximum increase would be \$3 on short-haul service. And yet, when I examined these increases, I found the actual increases from Lawton to many distant points was at least \$4, which would be a third more.

I am offered all sorts of explanation for these higher fares. I am told for example that this situation arises because two or more airlines must provide the service using different types of equipment or classes of service or other technical reasons. Then of course there is always the old cliché, the cost of service is greater.

I am naturally extremely grateful that in some selected cases there is now something called a "joint fare" for certain limited types of service between Lawton and a few major cities such as New York and Washington. Where these fares are available the burden of my constituents is lessened, and my district is more competitive with other surrounding communities enjoying one carrier service.

Unfortunately, however, these fares are available only in a limited number of cases, and there appears to be no rhyme or reason as to their application. Consequently I have found, as I am sure many of my colleagues have discovered, that I have been somewhat at a loss in advising my constituents on how to go about securing such favorable treatment since until recently I did not know what standard, if any, the airlines or the Board used in determining which points would receive this form of preferential treatment.

The problem has been succinctly outlined by Mohawk Airlines. Last May they applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board for permission to hold joint discussions with the other airlines concerning the establishment of joint fares. At that time they said, and I quote:

At the present time, there is no uniform system within the industry for establishing or maintaining domestic joint fares in markets that are not served by a single carrier. Joint fares are established by ad hoc agreements between individual carriers. These agreements are generally of limited scope and effectiveness. The limited character of existing joint fares, and the requirement that fares be quoted in connection with a specific routing, has resulted in a tariff system that is unduly complicated and totally unintelligible to the traveling public. The present system penalizes the carrier by requiring an enormous amount of time and expense in computing and accounting for interline transactions. The process of training personnel to operate this system involves additional costs that might otherwise be unnecessary. The present system penalizes the traveling public by subjecting it to a rigid routing system and a variable price system, depending upon whether or not a joint fare is in effect. Mohawk believes that this system can be improved and simplified. It further believes that such action is required by the public interest and in the interest of promoting adequate, efficient and economical air transportation industry.

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I first brought this matter to the attention of

the CAB last March. I am therefore delighted to report to you today that last May the Board did establish for the first time, at least to my knowledge, a minimum national standard for the establishment of such fares, to wit: one or more passengers a day.

In addition, the Board subsequently focused additional attention on this very important issue by approving last month Mohawk's application for joint airline discussions. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we have at last begun taking the first few halting steps on the long walk to the promised land of more equitable treatment for the citizens of our rural areas.

I feel, however, I must raise at least one objection. So far all of the plans advanced by either the airlines or the CAB propose to limit the applicability of those fares to those markets generating one or more passengers per day. But why should the availability of such fares be limited to some arbitrary traffic figure?

Why should they not be available to everyone?

Why this discrimination?

The telephone companies are not permitted to make such a distinction, and they literally serve thousands of markets. The Federal Communications Commission has established through rates for telephone calls and other services from Lawton to every point in the United States, even though three companies may be involved in completing the service—the Bell System, General, and independent—and the service may be used less than once a year.

I have been told part of the problem lies in the way the rates are published. If this is the case, then we have a technological bottleneck and need to come up with some new system for quoting or publishing rates. The price list should be designed around the needs of the public, and the public interest. In this day when man can go to and from the moon at his will almost, the public should not have to conform to some historical technique for quoting fares.

This is not a question of whether or not some rate is or is not lawful. There is no published rate. Instead, the issue is that a service is being offered the public by the airlines as a group pursuant their public franchise of convenience and necessity, and there is no fare being published for that service. Consequently, I hope that the airlines and the CAB will address themselves to this broader matter when they sit down to have their discussion about joint fares.

It the Nation is going to have different airlines for each kind of service, long and medium haul and local, then we apparently are going to have to come up with a different pricing system. If the technicians cannot devise one, then maybe we will have to reconsider changing that policy in one way or another.

The airlines are here to serve the needs of all the people, not the people to meet the needs of the airlines. Just because some people live in sparse, non-competitive markets does not mean they should be discriminated against. They should not be charged "what the traffic will

bear" because their market is not as dense and lucrative as the New York- Los Angeles market. These are the people who need the protection of the Board the most, and I hope the Board will be responsive to their need.

Mr. Speaker, as I previously noted, I have had a number of communications with the Board on this subject. I would like to insert these into the RECORD at this time for the benefit of our colleagues and the public in general.

MARCH 14, 1969.

HON. JOHN R. CROOKER,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been my contention that the federal government should promote the growth of our smaller cities and rural areas. To foster such development I have introduced legislation proposing a 7% tax credit for business locating in these smaller communities, supported the airline subsidy program and backed legislation to give the local service airlines permanent operating status.

Similarly, I have supported the Board's policy of substituting local service carriers for trunklines as another way of improving service to these communities, while simultaneously making our national airline system more efficient and economical. Nevertheless, I have recently become interested in several developments flowing from this policy, particularly the lack of through fares to most of these so-called off-line points.

Consider our situation in Lawton, Duncan and a number of other small Oklahoma cities. Presently our lowest fare from many eastern and southeastern cities is greater than that to Amarillo or Lubbock which lie several hundred miles beyond in west Texas. Moreover, whereas the Board announced that the maximum increase it recently permitted would be \$3 on short-haul services, I now find that the actual increase from Lawton to many distant points was at least \$4, a third more.

I am told this situation arises because two or more airlines must provide the service using different types of equipment and classes of service; that the cost of the service is greater.

On the other hand, I am of course grateful that in some selected cases there are "joint fares" for certain limited types of service between Lawton and a few points such as New York and Washington. These fares do make us at least more competitive with other Texas points such as Wichita Falls. However, I must admit that in advising my constituents how to go about securing such through rates, I do not know what standards, other than simply the judgment of the carriers, the Board uses in determining which points or markets will receive this type of preferential treatment.

As a matter of fact, while I do not profess to be an expert in this area, the facts seem to indicate to me that undue preference is being given technical tariff matters to the prejudice of the statutory requirements of section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. The effect of rates upon the movement of traffic and the need in the public interest for airline service at the lowest cost in the sense of the lowest fares, are two Congressional mandates which must not be overlooked by the Board. It makes little sense to try and stimulate the development of the smaller communities with a 7% tax credit if transportation rates are not going to foster the promotion of these communities too.

I would appreciate your views on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

TOM STEED,
Member of Congress.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1969.

HON. TOM STEED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEED: This is in reply to your letter of March 14, 1969 concerning the question of through joint air fares to our smaller communities.

In seeking to promote a sound and efficient air transport system to serve the nation as a whole, the Board is very much aware of the transportation needs of the smaller communities. In this regard, the Board has been engaged during the past several years in a rather extensive route strengthening program whereby the local carriers' route systems have been extended directly into a number of metropolitan areas. We believe these new authorizations will significantly improve the service provided by the local carriers to the smaller communities which they have long served, while at the same time reducing these carriers' dependence upon Federal subsidy. By the same token, this program makes available additional through service on the local carriers and has increased the availability of through joint fares on connecting local and trunkline services.

With respect to the general question of joint fares, over the years the Board has continuously encouraged the carriers to publish joint fares between all pairs of points where a feasible connecting service is provided. This policy was reassessed and reaffirmed by the staff in its over-all review of the domestic passenger fare structure issued in January 1968.

There are, however, certain limitations to the Board's ability to achieve substantially broadened availability of joint fares. The Board is empowered by statute to require a joint fare only upon a finding of public convenience and necessity after formal hearing, and the Board construes the Act to further require a finding that the existing fares are unlawful. As you are aware, the cost of serving the smaller communities is somewhat higher than average due primarily to the relatively short stage lengths involved. This fact makes it more difficult to reach a finding of unlawfulness, although this difficulty may be lessened to some extent by the route authorizations mentioned above.

For this reason, and because formal proceedings are lengthy undertakings, the Board has sought to achieve more widespread publication of joint fares through informal contact with the carriers, and the number published has been steadily on the increase. On the other hand, we do not believe that establishment of joint fares between all points receiving air service is necessarily indicated by the public interest. This would involve publication of a tremendous number of fares, many of which might or might not bear any significant relationship to established traffic flows.

We appreciate receiving your comments on this matter. You may be sure that the Board will continue to work toward improved air service to our smaller communities by means of all avenues available.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. CROOKER, JR.
Chairman.

JUNE 23, 1969.

HON. JOHN R. CROOKER,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in regards to my letter of March 14, 1969, and your reply of April 1, 1969, regarding joint fares.

If I understand your letter correctly, your position is that there are a number of limitations to broadening the availability of joint fares to my constituents. Specifically because (1) it would necessitate the holding of a formal proceeding; (2) it would be difficult to

find the present fares unlawful; and (3) it would raise technical problems regarding publication of these rates.

Considering these arguments in this sequence, I am well aware from my own committee hearings—Appropriations and Small Business—that formal proceedings are lengthy undertakings, so I can appreciate the Board's desire to achieve more widespread publication of joint fares through informal contact with the carriers. But that does not mean I approve or condone this policy. If I read my colleagues' complaint in the Matter of Trans World, United and Braniff Tariffs correctly, the Board has never held an overall investigation of this matter. My committees hold public hearings on matters within the ambit of their authority, and so therefore I don't think it is too much to ask any agency to which we, the Congress, have delegated one of our legislative powers to do likewise.

Second, you state that the Board would have to make a finding that the existing fares are unlawful. However, may I respectfully point out that that we are discussing through long-haul services involving no stop-over for which at present there is no published single factor fare. Consequently, I fail to see how the Board could ever find that a fare which does not in fact exist is unlawful. That is not the issue. The issue is there is no published rate for the service. What is unlawful is the fact that there is a through service being proffered by the air carriers, as manifested by the interline ticket, and there is no published fare for that service.

Third, you contend establishment of joint fares between all points receiving air service would involve publication of a tremendous number of fares, many of which or might not bear any significant relationship to established traffic flow. This observation leads to the speculation that the present method of publishing fares is a technological bottleneck. Perhaps you should consider some other technique such as the zone system used by the Post Office Department and U-haul trailer companies; or an area or group system as impliedly suggested by Dr. Ronald E. Miller in his book, Domestic Airline Efficiency, the M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass. (1963) at page 133.

Oklahoma City fares, for example, might also apply to Lawton, Duncan, Enid, Ponca City and Stillwater, while the charge for travel within the group could be the same for all trips whether it was from Lawton to Duncan or Oklahoma City or Enid. A city located such as Lawton could conceivably be assigned to more than one area, like both Oklahoma City and Dallas. This could produce minor variations in some cases. I would suspect that fares from Oklahoma City and Dallas to Kansas City would be different, so that use of the Dallas gateway would be slightly more expensive. On the other hand, fares to New York and San Francisco could be the same from either city, so both routings would be available at the same fare. Over-all, such a fare structure would probably reduce rather than increase the number of published fares.

With regards to your comment about a fare having a significant relationship to established traffic flow, this might be an appropriate test for specific commodity rates or special promotional fares, but not general fares. The F.C.C. has established through rates for telephone calls and other services from Lawton to every point in the United States even though 3 or more companies may be involved (Bell, General, independent), and the service may be used only once a year or less frequently. We are discussing general rates and general discounts for which a specific traffic flow is not the appropriate test of reasonableness.

I would appreciate receiving your comments and answers concerning the foregoing.

Sincerely yours,

TOM STEED,
Member of Congress.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND INTEREST RATES MOVING UP

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, after a morning of trying to determine from administration officials a reasonable explanation of their policies toward increasing interest rates, I was treated at lunch yesterday to further frustration from an announcement by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The unemployment rate, during the past month, has taken its sharpest rise in 9 years. Increasing by a half of a percent, the annual rate has risen from 3.5 to 4 percent. This represents the steepest increase since October of 1960.

Imagine the impact of this news after discussing interest rates all morning with Federal Reserve Chairman Martin. That my digestion during lunch yesterday was anything but good needs no further testimony. That the American public is getting tired of swallowing these indigestible statistics should be obvious.

A discouraging list of statistics were discussed at yesterday morning's meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee. Rising interest rates, although billed as the tool to control inflation, have in fact wasted billions of dollars.

The National Commission on Mortgage Interest Rates demonstrated that for each 1-percent rise in the interest rate the public pays \$15 billion. Considering that in less than a year interest rates have climbed $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 percent, actual cost to the public is somewhere between \$37½ to \$45 billion.

The rise in the interest rate has been in response to the inflationary situation within the economy. Anyone familiar with current conditions realizes that the high interest rates have done virtually nothing to cool the economy but have severely depressed a segment of the economy that could least afford, socially and financially, depression.

Today the homebuilding and home finance sector of our economy is rapidly drying up. And the cost to the American public to accomplish this rather deft feat of virtually destroying an industry while inflation continues to rise amounted to almost \$45 billion.

This figure does not take into consideration the special impact interest rates have had on the cost of homebuilding. For each 1-percent rise in the cost of interest the cost for building a home increases by 7 percent. During this last year rates have risen by 3 percent with a corresponding rise of 21 percent in the cost of building a home.

The point of these discouraging statistics is that we are being told that it is necessary to raise interest rates in order to control inflation. Yet we've seen nothing yet to demonstrate that this is in fact the case. To the contrary—higher interest rates are generating billions in inflation without demonstrating any value.

And now we see the unemployment rate begin to move up rapidly. With disturbing frequency we are being told by

administration economists that we must accept a small increase in unemployment in order to control inflation.

Well, the small increase in interest rates turned out to be almost 3 percent and cost almost \$45 billion. The net result of the high-interest policy in terms of controlling inflation has been zero.

The small increase in unemployment has already turned out to be the highest percentage increase in 9 years. And if the high-interest-rate experience is any indication the unemployment rate has not peaked. In fact, I expect we may anticipate the rate exceeding 5 percent if the trend now established continues.

Yet we see no corresponding decrease in the rate of inflation; if, indeed, a case can be made at all for controlling inflation by sacrificing jobs and homes. I doubt seriously if a case can be made, and yet these are the segments of our economic society suffering from ill-conceived and ineffective policies.

I suggest that if the present policy continues without substantial change in direction and impact we will continue to witness rising interest rates, particularly in home finance, reduced housing starts, and increased unemployment.

Perhaps the next rate this body will have to concern itself with will be the inflammatory rate. With housing becoming critical and jobs disappearing, the heat within America's blighted urban ghettos, and faceless suburbs, will rise. This rate will be the most damaging and difficult one to deal with.

CLEAN WATER

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the House this week will consider the fiscal year 1970 public works appropriations bill.

The Committee on Appropriations has recommended a total of \$600 million, an increase of \$386 million in the budget estimate, for construction grants for waste treatment works under the Clean Water Restoration Act.

While I commend the committee for its action in this regard, I sincerely do not feel that the House can do anything less than provide the full amount authorized for fiscal year 1970—that is, \$1 billion—and still meet its obligations to the people of the United States.

The need to achieve more effective water pollution control is of overriding importance. To do anything less than what was authorized in 1966 will mean a further degradation of our already endangered environment.

The people have made it clear in bonding elections, public opinion polls, and in their mail to Members of this House that they want to spend more money to control and abate water pollution.

The country has the capacity—engineering capacity, the construction capacity, and the financial capacity—to put into place adequate waste treatment facilities.

By voting full funding of \$1 billion for

waste treatment facilities, the House will be stating that clean water is, in fact, a matter of the highest national priority.

Such action by the House will be acclaimed throughout the Nation as evidence of the vitality of the House. It will be an act of legislative leadership of which we all can be proud.

So that my colleagues may be aware of the nationwide support which the drive for full funding has achieved, I wish at this point to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the texts of some of the letters, telegrams, articles, and so forth, which have been sent to me by the Governors of the several States, national organizations, and interested citizens or which have appeared in various of our press media:

DALLAS, TEX.,
October 7, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Washington, D.C.:

House will consider H.R. 14159 Wednesday recommending \$600,000,000 grant funds for wastewater treatment facilities under terms Clean Water Restoration Act 1966. Water Pollution Control Federation urges your support in increasing this to \$1,000,000,000 authorized. Flight on water pollution requires construction of local facilities. Delays compound problem making solution more costly for all Americans. Congress established national clean water goal in 1966. States adopted sound water quality standards and plans of implementation based on authorized Federal assistance. Failure to provide this assistance nullifies efforts of local and State governments.

PAUL D. HANEY,
President, Water Pollution Control Federation.

JEFFERSON CITY, Mo.,
October 6, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

\$23,626,000 is needed in Federal grants for pollution abatement works in Missouri this fiscal year. This is based on 55% of the total cost of \$50,928,000. The State has a 25% grant program which is fully financed for the current authorization.

JACK K. SMITH,
Executive Secretary, Missouri Water Pollution Board.

DALLAS, TEX.,
October 6, 1969.

Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies solidly endorses your support or the full one billion dollar appropriation for construction grants under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The association consists of the managers of those sewerage agencies which serve the following metropolitan areas: Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dallas, Denver, Detroit, Houston, Kansas City, Mo., Los Angeles, Middlesex Co. of New Jersey, Milwaukee, New York City, Norfolk Orange Co. Cal., Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, San Diego, San Francisco, Seattle, St. Louis, Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Wash., D.C., Maryland suburbs.

The total population served by the above agencies is nearly 43 million people or 22% of the total national population. Information collected by our group has convinced us that the full one billion dollar appropriation can be utilized this fiscal year. A large percentage of the appropriation can be used by our member agencies who have suffered

under previous discriminatory features of the above Federal act.

The association in a meeting today in Dallas authorized me, as chairman, to convey our support of your goal to secure the one billion dollar appropriation for clean waters.

CHARLES V. GIBBS,
Executive Director, Municipality of
Metropolitan Seattle, Seattle, Wash.

OCTOBER 4, 1969.

Attn: JOHN DINGELL (Mich.),
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Re: Clean water, \$1 billion appropriation.

We support the position of the clean water group. The industry can handle construction and equipment requirements of that magnitude.

CHICAGO PUMP FMC CORP.

St. Louis, Mo.,
October 4, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: We at the Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District urgently request your support for the one billion dollar appropriation for fiscal 1970 to aid in the construction of water pollution abatement facilities.

The Metropolitan Sewer District has already qualified under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for \$3,500,000.00 in reimbursable funds and we are ready to start construction on pollution abatement project in 1970 which requires an additional \$3,334,150 in Federal grants; therefore we urgently need Federal funds for fiscal 1970 in the total amount of \$6,834,150.00.

Respectfully requested.

CHARLES D. KAISER, JR.,
General Counsel.

CONSULTING ENGINEERS COUNCIL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
October 6, 1969.

The Honorable JOHN DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Room 2210
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Our Council, representing more than 2,200 U.S. engineers in private practice, has just completed a nationwide sampling of member firms which confirms beyond question that American consulting engineers can, if called upon, design in excess of \$3 billion in waste treatment plant construction next year. This is a conservative estimate based upon a survey of 114 firms in 26 states. Our study covered firms ranging in size from over 500 employees to less than 50 employees.

Checking no more than ten firms in any one of twenty different states revealed an existing capacity (by just the contacted engineering firms) to handle design of \$2.005 billion in waste treatment construction in the next twelve months. Projecting that figure to cover all private firms in those states would indicate sufficient capability to design in excess of \$3 billion in sanitary facilities in that same period. Projecting these figures to the other states produces a figure approaching \$5 billion. From this we are led to believe there is no question that there exists a capability of well over \$3 billion in construction potential which could come off U.S. consulting engineer drawing boards in fiscal 1970, or the year following.

One firm alone—Black & Veatch Consulting Engineers of Kansas City—reported that it billed \$182 million worth of waste treatment construction in the past twelve months and could easily handle \$175 million in the next twelve months with no additional personnel. In fact, if no new work were to come in for the next seven months, Black & Veatch would be in serious trouble. A similar state-

ment was made by Ken R. White Engineers of Denver, Colorado. Mr. White's firm normally handles eight to ten projects a year. Currently K.R.W. engineers are completing plans and specifications for one treatment plant and are looking for work in this field.

In Boston, Massachusetts, the firm of Camp, Dresser & McKee is currently handling 95 jobs totaling approximately \$187 million of construction. This is approximately 25% below the firm's demonstrated capacity and the officers conservatively estimate they could handle another \$40 million worth of projects with no change in personnel.

The 80-man firm of Nelson, Haley, Patterson and Quarth, of Denver, advises us that it has ten projects nearing completion with no new ones under contract. The sanitary engineering workload of the firm is extremely low. A similar situation exists with Hayes, Seay, Mattern and Mattern, of Roanoke, Virginia, which is currently handling only five projects, mostly for communities whose requests for FWPCA funds were postponed and they were forced to proceed without Federal aid. The Roanoke firm is looking for treatment plant work and could handle another \$8, or \$9 million with no increase in staff.

Twenty-nine firms from six states provided a breakdown of workload by number of projects in three classifications. These firms reported a total of 193 treatment plants designed last year. Of these, 53 are still in process awaiting Federal aid prior to completion. The firms were unanimous in claiming ability to undertake more projects dependent upon their size and location. Conservatively it was estimated that they could, if necessary, accept up to 419 projects in the coming year.

Virtually all respondents, large firms and small firms, indicated that the present demand for sanitary engineering services is decreasing. This was blamed on the failure of the Federal Government to "come through" with promised assistance, and upon the inability of many communities to fund projects in the light of high interest rates on municipal bonds. Typical of the reports was that received from Minnesota where the State Pollution Control Agency advised it had applications totaling \$15,325,078 in grant requests to cover \$46,733,902 of total construction. Minnesota, however, received only \$3.92 million in Federal aid, or one-fifth of what it felt it needed.

An October 3 telegram from the Consulting Engineers Council of Texas reads: "a survey of ten member firms who perform services on PL660 projects revealed the number of projects per firm last year ranged from 2 to 14 covering all sizes. In every instance, members affirmed capacity to handle twice the number when and if the funds are made available. Construction cut-backs in other areas served to produce even greater engineering capacity for waste treatment plant design."

Even without the compelling compilation of evidence produced by this spot survey, there should be no question but what U.S. consulting engineers can easily assimilate up to \$1 billion worth of waste treatment plant design if called upon to do so. Assuming the average engineering fee on projects from 500,000 to \$2 million is 5%, this would mean a total of \$50 million in engineering fees on \$1 billion worth of work. Divided among the fifty states, that would be only one million dollars worth of engineering design per state. If the average consulting engineer employee is worth, at a minimum, \$100 per day, and there are 200 working days per year, this figures out to services of only fifty men in a state is all the \$1 billion would be purchasing.

Said another way, \$1 billion divided among fifty states, leaves an average of only \$20

million per state. There are few, if any, states with less than twenty engineering firms experienced and qualified in the sanitary field. This means that all that a \$1 billion appropriation would do is require the handling of \$1 million per firm. The average capacity of consulting sanitary engineers is, however, closer to \$7 or \$8 million, indicating that the consulting engineering profession can easily assimilate a \$1 to \$3 billion increase in waste treatment funds with relative ease.

If there is any additional question regarding the availability or capability of U.S. consulting engineers to assume greater responsibility in the waste treatment field, please advise and we will provide factual information regarding firms covered, or expand our survey to cover an even larger number of firms.

Yours sincerely,
LARRY N. SPILLER,
Assistant Director.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR: FEDERAL WA-
TER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION
GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF WASTE TREAT-
MENT WORKS

Estimate of potential Federal grant needs

As of May 31, 1969, it is reported that grant requests on pending applications are estimated to be over \$2.2 billion. Included in this amount is \$204.0 million being processed in FWPCA regional offices, \$485.4 million in the State agencies and \$1,526.7 million in preparation at the local level. In addition to the pending applications there is another \$450.9 million in potential Federal grant needs for projects already approved in which Federal participation by State action, was for something less than the project was eligible for. Many States take this kind of action in anticipation that Federal funds will be available later to make up the difference. These two areas, as of May 31, 1969, represent a potential Federal grant need totalling nearly \$2.7 billion. This amount reduced by nearly \$100 million available from FY 1969 funds leaves a potential need of over \$2.6 billion. The amount of this potential need that could become a reality largely depends on the level of Federal funding available and administrative capability both at the State and Federal level to process these applications. It also depends on other considerations, particularly local ability and readiness to fund their share of cost.

Attached are the following schedules:

Schedule A—Potential Need.

Schedule B—Potential Need versus Selected Appropriation Levels for Fiscal Year 1970.

Effect of select appropriation levels for fiscal year 1970 on obligations and expenditures

Obligations

Based on past experience, 75 to 80 percent of the New Obligational Authority for this purpose for any fiscal year is obligated in the fiscal year for which appropriated with the balance being obligated in the subsequent fiscal year. Again, this is primarily because the allotments to each State are available for eighteen months, and therefore, some States pace themselves accordingly in utilizing their share.

Expenditures

In this program payments are made on an after-the-fact rather than before-the-fact basis. Grantees are permitted to request payments after a certain percentage of the facility has been constructed. Because of this, plus the various ramifications normally associated with a municipal construction program, the expenditure levels are low the first fiscal year for which funds are appropriated. Based on past experience, it takes about five years to liquidate an appropriation with the following percentage levels of expenditures as compared to NOA:

	Percent
1st year.....	5
2d year.....	20
3d year.....	30
4th year.....	40
5th year.....	5

EFFECT IN FISCAL YEAR 1970
[In millions]

New obligational authority	Estimated obligations	Estimated expenditures
\$214.....	\$171	\$11
\$600.....	480	30
\$1,000.....	800	50

CAPITAL OUTLAYS NEEDED TO OBTAIN ADEQUATE MUNICIPAL WASTE TREATMENT FOR THE U.S. URBAN POPULATION, 1969-73

[Dollars in millions, current dollars]

	1968 estimate	1969 estimate
Alabama.....	137.0	137.0
Alaska.....	14.5	125.4
Arizona.....	90.0	90.0
Arkansas.....	48.5	48.5
California.....	732.2	732.2
Colorado.....	103.6	103.6
Connecticut.....	188.3	200.0
Delaware.....	31.5	31.5
District of Columbia.....	23.0	43.7
Florida.....	369.6	369.6
Georgia.....	223.1	223.1
Hawaii.....	40.1	90.0

CAPITAL OUTLAYS NEEDED TO OBTAIN ADEQUATE MUNICIPAL WASTE TREATMENT FOR THE U.S. URBAN POPULATION, 1969-73—Continued

[Dollars in millions, current dollars]

	1968 estimate	1969 estimate
Idaho.....	24.5	24.5
Illinois.....	399.4	556.5
Indiana.....	176.1	176.1
Iowa.....	36.0	36.0
Kansas.....	52.5	52.5
Kentucky.....	130.0	130.0
Louisiana.....	195.0	195.0
Maine.....	47.0	148.8
Maryland.....	136.1	136.1
Massachusetts.....	200.0	450.0
Michigan.....	592.6	592.6
Minnesota.....	186.0	186.0
Mississippi.....	57.0	57.0
Missouri.....	137.6	137.6
Montana.....	27.0	27.0
Nebraska.....	30.5	30.5
Nevada.....	19.5	19.5
New Hampshire.....	35.0	59.2
New Jersey.....	561.1	800.0
New Mexico.....	40.5	40.5
New York.....	1,070.2	1,065.0
North Carolina.....	101.5	101.5
North Dakota.....	13.0	13.0
Ohio.....	500.7	500.7
Okahoma.....	60.5	78.8
Oregon.....	145.3	145.3
Pennsylvania.....	331.6	454.2
Rhode Island.....	41.5	41.5
South Carolina.....	100.0	100.0
South Dakota.....	14.0	18.0
Tennessee.....	154.6	154.6

CAPITAL OUTLAYS NEEDED TO OBTAIN ADEQUATE MUNICIPAL WASTE TREATMENT FOR THE U.S. URBAN POPULATION, 1969-73—Continued

[Dollars in millions, current dollars]

	1968 estimate	1969 estimate
Texas.....	342.5	342.5
Utah.....	136.0	136.0
Vermont.....	19.0	34.9
Virginia.....	206.6	206.6
Washington.....	173.3	173.3
West Virginia.....	55.0	55.0
Wisconsin.....	133.3	133.3
Wyoming.....	9.7	1.2
Total.....	8,693.1	10,580.0

Source: Basic source is the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration's publication, "The Cost of Clean Water (1968)," vol. 2, table I-3A, p. 13; ¹ and ² figures are corrected estimates supplied by 16 States. (2 of the States indicated that they believed FWPCA's 1968 estimate was high; 14 indicated that the estimate was low.)

¹ These figures were supplied by States in commenting explicitly on the estimates in the above 1968 FWPCA report. See letters from the States in FWPCA's "The Cost of Clean Water and Its Economic Impact (1969)," vol. 2, pp. 467-511.

² These figures were taken from table 30, pp. 125-27, "The Cost of Clean Water and Its Economic Impact (1969)," vol. 1, when a State's letter (above) did not explicitly correct the 1968 FWPCA estimate but indicated disagreement with that estimate. Table 30 includes State estimates in their own program plans of municipal waste handling investments over the 1969-73 period. The above report notes (p. 7) that "experience has indicated that State estimates are constrained by the amount of Federal funds anticipated to be available."

PENDING GRANT NEEDS VERSUS SELECTED APPROPRIATION LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF WASTE TREATMENT WORKS

	Grant requests on pending applications May 31, 1969	Partial reimbursements as of May 31, 1969	Total partial reimbursements and pending	Tentative State allocation	Percent available funds to requirements	Tentative State allocation	Percent available funds to requirements	Tentative State allocation	Percent available funds to requirements
Total.....	\$2,216,121,195	\$450,922,401	\$2,667,043,596	\$214,000,000	8	\$600,000,000	22	\$1,000,000,000	37
Alabama.....	479,700	6,308,000	6,787,700	4,135,700	61	11,072,900	163	18,261,700	269
Alaska.....	709,800		709,800	906,100	128	1,386,300	195	1,883,900	256
Arizona.....	1,017,160		1,017,160	2,125,400	209	4,890,700	481	7,756,300	763
Arkansas.....	4,967,753		4,967,753	2,835,800	57	6,629,000	133	10,559,900	213
California.....	41,343,490		41,343,490	14,882,600	36	48,258,800	117	82,845,600	200
Colorado.....	2,367,822		2,367,822	2,414,900	102	6,139,500	259	9,999,100	422
Connecticut.....	9,714,750	37,249,369	46,964,119	2,942,200	6	8,325,700	18	13,904,600	30
Delaware.....	796,150	1,813,500	2,609,650	1,100,300	42	2,047,900	78	3,029,900	116
District of Columbia.....	36,795,000	2,917,510	39,712,510	1,315,300	3	2,937,600	7	4,618,900	12
Florida.....	9,722,808	368,250	10,091,058	5,386,400	53	15,901,500	158	26,797,900	266
Georgia.....	8,678,922	13,634,630	22,313,552	4,589,000	21	12,962,500	58	21,639,600	97
Hawaii.....	3,356,930		3,356,930	1,355,700	40	2,699,400	80	4,091,800	122
Idaho.....	261,000		261,000	1,589,400	609	3,005,900	1,152	4,474,000	1,714
Illinois.....	120,360,269		120,360,269	9,784,300	8	31,192,300	26	53,376,700	44
Indiana.....	28,515,100		28,515,100	5,008,400	18	14,909,400	52	25,169,300	88
Iowa.....	6,365,278		6,365,278	3,311,000	52	9,166,700	144	15,234,600	239
Kansas.....	3,426,746		3,426,746	2,812,700	82	7,439,000	217	12,233,000	357
Kentucky.....	3,363,433		3,363,433	3,827,100	114	10,278,700	306	16,964,300	504
Louisiana.....	8,012,926		8,012,926	4,009,800	50	10,926,000	116	18,093,300	226
Maine.....	16,618,604	643,200	17,261,804	1,853,100	11	3,911,300	23	6,044,100	35
Maryland.....	4,880,690	51,166,376	56,047,066	3,552,100	6	10,136,500	18	16,959,700	30
Massachusetts.....	20,503,995	9,208,180	29,712,175	5,382,800	18	16,315,900	59	27,645,500	93
Michigan.....	86,432,628		86,432,628	7,809,500	4	24,422,500	13	41,638,100	22
Minnesota.....	30,909,761		30,909,761	3,919,100	13	11,168,600	36	18,681,000	60
Mississippi.....	1,814,360		1,814,360	3,350,200	185	7,975,600	440	12,768,900	704
Missouri.....	15,924,832		15,924,832	4,760,400	30	13,933,700	87	23,439,700	147
Montana.....	260,440		260,440	1,535,700	126	2,968,500	1,140	4,453,300	1,710
Nebraska.....	1,679,905		1,679,905	2,115,500	590	5,112,400	304	8,218,000	489
Nevada.....	4,854,900		4,854,900	959,600	20	1,565,300	32	2,192,800	45
New Hampshire.....	12,071,200		12,071,200	1,409,300	12	2,698,100	22	4,033,700	33
New Jersey.....	57,850,610	6,837,316	64,687,926	6,176,800	10	19,059,900	29	32,410,300	50
New Mexico.....	1,400,463		1,400,463	2,058,000	147	4,077,600	291	6,170,400	441
New York.....	1,305,723,195	297,402,900	1,603,126,095	15,832,500	1	51,470,200	3	88,400,700	6
North Carolina.....	5,388,130		5,388,130	6,094,910	83	14,725,900	241	24,751,900	406
North Dakota.....	163,031		163,031	1,583,900	972	2,926,700	1,705	4,318,300	2,649
Ohio.....	33,703,631		33,703,631	9,555,500	28	30,167,500	89	51,527,100	153
Okahoma.....	1,914,372		1,914,372	3,086,900	161	8,031,200	420	13,154,700	687
Oregon.....	13,893,780		13,893,780	2,429,000	17	6,184,800	45	10,076,800	73
Pennsylvania.....	22,320,490	17,476,000	39,796,490	11,029,600	28	35,066,600	88	59,975,400	151
Rhode Island.....	9,363,200		9,363,200	1,568,500	15	3,393,500	33	5,284,700	51
South Carolina.....	5,684,920	3,400,050	9,084,970	3,342,700	37	8,402,400	92	13,645,600	150
South Dakota.....	2,475,637		2,475,637	1,777,400	72	3,222,600	130	4,720,200	191
Tennessee.....	14,702,041	871,340	15,573,381	4,314,600	28	11,889,500	76	19,739,100	127
Texas.....	10,681,186		10,681,186	9,592,800	90	29,935,800	280	51,016,600	478
Utah.....	423,340		423,340	1,780,700	42	3,672,100	87	5,632,100	133
Vermont.....	3,274,270		3,274,270	1,282,200	39	2,110,200	64	2,968,200	91
Virginia.....	19,611,360		19,611,360	4,510,200	23	12,934,300	66	21,663,900	110
Washington.....	15,707,450		15,707,450	3,327,200	21	9,386,300	60	15,665,000	100
West Virginia.....	5,152,800		5,152,800	2,796,100	54	6,746,700	131	10,840,700	210
Wisconsin.....	97,660,090		97,660,090	4,388,100	4	12,779,700	13	21,475,700	22
Wyoming.....	303,847		303,847	1,172,700	386	1,873,700	617	2,600,100	856
Guam.....				1,445,500		1,588,000		1,735,500	
Puerto Rico.....	2,490,000		2,490,000	3,504,900	141	8,494,200	331	13,664,700	549
Virgin Islands.....				1,414,000		1,482,400		1,553,100	

[From an opinion poll in Newsweek, Oct. 6, 1969]

U.S. SPENDING: NEW PRIORITIES

On which problems do you think the Government should be spending more money—and on which should it be spending less money?

(In percent)

	More money	Less money
Job training for the unemployed.....	56	7
Air and water pollution.....	56	3
Fighting organized crime.....	55	3
Medical care for the old and needy.....	47	5
Fighting crime in the streets.....	44	4
Improving schools.....	44	7
Providing better housing for the poor—especially in the ghettos.....	39	13
Building highways.....	23	14
Defense expenditures.....	16	26
Space exploration.....	10	56
Foreign economic aid.....	6	57
Foreign military aid.....	1	66

CITIZENS CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MEMBER: I am enclosing for your information material describing the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water and the deep concern of our organizations over the lack of adequate water pollution control appropriations.

As you will note, the Crusade is unique in that many diverse, and often divergent, organizations have joined together for a common cause on which we all agree. We believe this unity demonstrates only in part public

outrage over the deteriorating condition of our waters.

I trust you will find this material of interest.

Sincerely,

J. W. PENFOLD,
Coordinator.

WATER POLLUTION FACT SHEET

THE PEOPLE WANT CLEAN WATER

A national survey conducted in early 1969 by the Gallup Organization, Inc., shows:

51% of the people are "deeply concerned" about the effects of water pollution, air pollution, and soil erosion on the environment. 35% of the people are "somewhat concerned."

12% of the people are "not very concerned."

73% of the people are willing to pay additional taxes to improve the natural surroundings, including water pollution control.

9% of the people are not willing to pay additional taxes.

18% of the people "don't know."

36% of the people consider air pollution as the most pressing environmental problem.

32% of the people consider water pollution as the most pressing problem.

Since 1964, the voters of 9 states have voted in statewide elections on water pollution control bond issues. Of these 9, 7 were approved and the other two attracted majority voter support. Of 17,625,254 citizens who voted on the 9 proposals, 11,725,444 (66%) voted "yes."

THE FEDERAL GRANTS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Here is what Federal grants to local government for the construction of waste treatment plants have accomplished:

As of March 31, 1969, the Federal program aided in the construction of 9,251 waste treatment projects costing about \$5.7 billion, of which the Federal share was \$1.3 billion. These projects serve an estimated 73.8 million people and have improved the water in about 74,000 miles of streams.

THE FEDERAL "GMC" OR "GROWING MONEY GAP"

WASTE TREATMENT PLANT CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

(In millions)

	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	Total
Authorization.....	\$100	\$150	\$150	\$450	\$700	\$1,000	\$2,550
Appropriation.....	93	141	173	203	214	214	1,038
The gap.....	7	9	-23	247	486	786	1,512

DIVISION OF STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS—CONSTRUCTION GRANTS AND ENGINEERING BRANCH—EVALUATION AND RESOURCE CONTROL PROGRAM

State	State entitlement in fiscal year 1970 under a \$214,000,000 appropriation	Grant funds requested on pending applications for sewage treatment works, Mar. 31, 1969	National needs for sewage treatment facilities, fiscal years 1969-73	State	State entitlement in fiscal year 1970 under a \$214,000,000 appropriation	Grant funds requested on pending applications for sewage treatment works, Mar. 31, 1969	National needs for sewage treatment facilities, fiscal years 1969-73
Total.....	\$214,000,000	\$2,224,863,142	\$8,693,100,000	Montana.....	\$1,535,700	\$263,000	\$27,000,000
Alabama.....	4,135,700	523,200	137,000,000	Nebraska.....	2,115,500	1,855,230	30,500,000
Alaska.....	906,100	709,800	14,500,000	Nevada.....	959,600	2,929,350	19,500,000
Arizona.....	2,125,400	836,160	90,000,000	New Hampshire.....	1,409,300	8,894,200	35,000,000
Arkansas.....	2,835,800	5,069,703	48,500,000	New Jersey.....	6,716,800	56,886,530	561,100,000
California.....	14,882,600	44,828,530	732,200,000	New Mexico.....	2,058,000	1,278,165	40,500,000
Colorado.....	2,414,900	2,759,486	103,600,000	New York.....	15,832,500	1,299,528,965	1,070,200,000
Connecticut.....	2,942,200	19,956,400	188,300,000	North Carolina.....	5,050,800	8,004,200	101,500,000
Delaware.....	1,100,300	796,150	31,500,000	North Dakota.....	1,583,900	246,365	13,000,000
District of Columbia.....	1,315,300	36,795,000	23,000,000	Ohio.....	9,555,500	37,387,161	500,700,000
Florida.....	5,386,400	10,720,268	369,600,000	Oklahoma.....	3,086,900	2,275,359	60,500,000
Georgia.....	4,589,000	8,604,122	223,100,000	Oregon.....	2,429,000	13,847,430	145,300,000
Hawaii.....	1,355,700	3,331,560	40,100,000	Pennsylvania.....	11,092,600	24,133,070	331,600,000
Idaho.....	1,589,400	185,000	24,500,000	Rhode Island.....	1,568,500	1,690,000	41,500,000
Illinois.....	9,784,300	135,673,261	399,400,000	South Carolina.....	3,342,700	5,778,900	100,000,000
Indiana.....	5,008,400	28,432,183	176,100,000	South Dakota.....	1,777,400	2,551,873	14,000,000
Iowa.....	3,311,000	7,050,716	36,000,000	Tennessee.....	4,314,600	14,696,520	154,600,000
Kansas.....	2,812,700	3,426,754	52,500,000	Texas.....	9,592,800	11,358,851	342,500,000
Kentucky.....	3,827,100	7,973,680	130,000,000	Utah.....	1,780,700	342,000	136,000,000
Louisiana.....	4,009,800	8,505,168	195,000,000	Vermont.....	1,282,200	540,050	19,000,000
Maine.....	1,853,100	14,446,065	47,000,000	Virginia.....	4,510,200	19,800,300	206,600,000
Maryland.....	3,552,100	3,723,380	136,100,000	Washington.....	3,327,200	10,041,970	173,300,000
Massachusetts.....	5,382,800	14,157,850	200,000,000	West Virginia.....	2,796,100	4,568,800	55,000,000
Michigan.....	7,809,500	186,743,938	592,600,000	Wisconsin.....	4,388,100	97,719,238	133,300,000
Minnesota.....	3,919,100	33,067,776	186,000,000	Wyoming.....	1,172,700	301,533	9,700,000
Mississippi.....	3,350,200	1,234,560	57,000,000	Guam.....	1,445,500		
Missouri.....	4,760,400	15,903,372	137,600,000	Puerto Rico.....	3,504,900	2,490,000	
				Virgin Islands.....	1,414,000		

REMARKS BY LOUIS S. CLAPPER, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, BEFORE PRESS CONFERENCE CALLED BY THE "CITIZENS' CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER"

People interested in clean water and concerned about contamination of the environment were distressed at a report issued earlier this year by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration on the cost of abatement and control.

This report indicates that, if costs continue to rise, the total bill is expected to amount to \$26 to \$29 billion in the next five years. Broken down, this is \$8 billion for municipal works, \$6.2 to \$4.6 billion for industrial waste treatment, with another \$1.8 billion for industrial cooling, and from \$5.3 to \$5.7 billion for municipal and industrial operating and maintenance costs.

There is a growing money gap between what the Congress has authorized and what is appropriated for Federal grants to local governments for the construction of waste treatment plants. For fiscal 1968, only \$203 million of the \$450 million authorized was appropriated. For fiscal 1969, the authorization was for \$700 million, yet only \$214 million was appropriated. Finally, this coalition was formed with the Nixon Administration joined the Johnson Administration in recommending only \$214 million, or less than a quarter of the authorized \$1 billion for fiscal 1970.

We view the Federal grants as being tremendously important. Unless the Federal Government helps, it is a poor position to require high standards of water quality from the States and local governments. And, unless the governments handle municipal pollution,

they are in a poor position to point a finger at polluting industries. And, so the whole water pollution control program is in jeopardy.

We are confident that the people want clean water and are willing to pay for it—if given the chance.

A survey conducted by the Gallup Organization, Inc., for the National Wildlife Federation earlier this year revealed these statistics:

About half (51%) of all persons interviewed expressed the opinion that they are "deeply concerned" about the effect of air pollution, water pollution, soil erosion, and destruction of wildlife in our natural surroundings. An additional one-third (35%) are "somewhat concerned."

Nearly three-fourths of those interviewed

were willing to pay something in additional taxes to improve our national surroundings.

Three of every four persons favor setting aside more public land for conservation purposes such as national parks, wildlife refuges, bird sanctuaries, etc.

The public is almost evenly divided on whether or not it will, at some time, be necessary to limit the human population if present living standards are to be maintained.

Summarizing this survey, we conclude that the American public appreciates quality in the environment, deplors what is happening to it, and stands ready to support corrective measures, even to the extent of paying for it—as they will, one way or another, in the end.

The Conservation Foundation, as a matter of fact, has compiled data which shows that voters have expressed themselves in this manner. Since 1964, the voters of nine states have had the opportunity to vote in statewide elections on water pollution control bond

issues. Seven of the nine state bond proposals were approved and even the other two attracted majority voter support. Of 17,625,254 citizens who participated, 11,725,444 voted "yes", an average "yes" vote of 66 per cent.

I should like to report to you that the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, of which I am a member, has recommended that the Federal Government meet its obligations. The following was adopted in the December, 1968, meeting of the Board:

The Board recommends that continued efforts be made by the Secretary to ensure that the Federal Government lives up to the commitment made to the States under the municipal grants program administered by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. A failure to press for adequate appropriations can be construed by the States as evidence that the Administration and the Congress were not sincere in their concern for the problem of water pollution control.

TABLE 1.—RESULTS OF STATE ELECTIONS ON BOND ISSUES FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL, 1964-69¹

Election date	State	Amount (in millions)	Vote	Pass/fail	Percent "yes" vote ²
Nov. 3, 1964	Maine	\$25	Yes 222,242 No 81,469	Passed	73.2
Nov. 2, 1965	New York	1,000	Yes 3,373,700 No 718,398	do	82.4
May 16, 1967	Pennsylvania ³	250	Yes 1,163,779 No 677,808	do	63.2
June 29, 1967	Rhode Island	12	Yes 16,451 No 12,439	do	56.9
Nov. 5, 1968	Illinois ⁴	400	Yes 1,656,600 No 1,216,847	Failed	57.6
Do	Michigan	335	Yes 1,906,385 No 796,079	Passed	70.5
Do	Ohio ⁵	100	Yes 1,732,512 No 1,550,759	do	52.7
Do	Washington	25	Yes 845,372 No 276,161	do	75.4
Apr. 1, 1969	Wisconsin ⁶	144	Yes 808,393 No 569,850	do	58.9
Total		2,291	Yes 11,725,444 No 5,899,810		66.5
Less Illinois		-400	No		
Total passed		1,891			

¹ State water pollution control agencies, State election agencies, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration are sources for the information summarized here. The table may not be complete; although each of the 50 States has been contacted, all have not yet responded to our inquiry. All reported bond issue election defeats, as well as approvals, are summarized here.

² The percent "yes" vote is the percentage of "yes" to total "yes" and "no" votes.
³ Pennsylvania's 1967 bond issue totaled \$500,000,000. Of this, \$250,000,000 was for water pollution control (\$100,000,000 for construction of sewage treatment plants, and \$150,000,000 for acid mine drainage pollution control). In addition, \$225,000,000 was for "elimination of land and water scars created by past coal mining practices" and closure of abandoned mines, and \$25,000,000 for air pollution control.

⁴ Illinois' 1968 proposal totaled \$1,000,000,000, which was designated for open space-outdoor recreation land acquisition and air pollution control, as well as for water pollution control. Although no fixed amount was officially earmarked for water pollution control, there was general agreement that \$400,000,000 would go for this purpose. Despite a majority of "yes" votes, the proposal was not approved due to an Illinois law which requires a "simple majority of votes cast for all State legislature candidates" to pass.

⁵ Ohio's 1968 proposal totaled \$120,000,000, which was divided into 2 parts: \$100,000,000 for sewage and water treatment, and \$20,000,000 for water management.

⁶ Wisconsin's proposal totaled \$200,000,000 and included \$56,000,000 for open space-recreation land acquisition. This was an advisory referendum only; the legislature is to make the final decision.

Notes: In 1966 the Massachusetts Legislature authorized a \$150,000,000 bond issue for an accelerated water pollution control program. Massachusetts has no law which requires either State or local bond issues to be referred to the voters for approval. In 1967 the Connecticut Legislature approved a \$150,000,000 bond issue for water pollution control. The legislature took final action on this proposal; there was no referendum by the voters.

TABLE 2.—UPCOMING STATE ELECTIONS ON BOND ISSUES FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Election date	State	Amount (millions)	Vote	Pass/fail	Percent "yes" vote
November 1969	New Jersey ¹	\$190.6			
Do	do ²	222.0			
May 1970	Oregon ³	50.0			
November 1970	Maine ⁴	50.0			

¹ In January 1969 the New Jersey Legislature placed on the November 1969 State ballot a referendum on a proposed \$190,000,000 bond issue for "expanding public sewage facilities to eliminate pollution of surface waters."

² In April 1969 the New Jersey Legislature placed on the November 1969 State ballot a 2d referendum on a proposed \$222,000,000 bond issue for "controlling and eliminating pollution of tidal and surface waters."

³ In April 1969 the Oregon Legislature voted to refer to the voters at the May 1970 primary election a proposed change in the State constitution to authorize the State to issue bonds to finance grants and loans to local governments for sewage works construction. Under the proposal the amount of bonds issued cannot exceed 1 percent of the value of all real property and the amount outstanding at any one time cannot exceed \$50,000,000.

⁴ In March 1969 the Maine Legislature placed on the November 1970 State ballot a referendum on a proposed \$50,000,000 bond issue for construction of pollution abatement facilities.

JUNE 6, 1969.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President, the White House,
Washington, D.C.

Conservation, labor, and many other citizen-civic organizations representing millions of interested and concerned persons firmly

believe water pollution is one of the most important domestic problems, involving serious health hazards and waste of beneficial uses of water.

State-approved applications for matching grant funds totaling \$2½ billion from States and local governments are now on file with

the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

The proposed Federal budget for fiscal 1970 requests only \$214 million to assist local governments in the construction of sewage treatment plants under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Our groups believe that your administration should seek for fiscal 1970 an appropriation of \$1 billion for Federal grants to local governments to help them in the construction of these desperately-needed waste treatment plants. We consider it imperative that the \$1 billion authorized be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969.

CITIZENS CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER.

MEMBERS

American Association of University Women.
AFL-CIO.
American Fisheries Society.
American Institute of Architects.
Association of Interpretive Naturalists.
Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.
Consumers Federation of America.
Izaak Walton League of America.
National Association of Counties.
National Audubon Society.
National Fisheries Institute.
National Rifle Association.
National Wildlife Federation.
Sport Fishing Institute.
The American Forestry Association.
The American Institute of Planners.
The Conservation Foundation.
The League of Women Voters of the United States.
The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.
The Wilderness Society.
The Wildlife Society.
United Auto Workers.
United States Conference of City Health Officers.
United Steelworkers of America.
Wildlife Management Institute.

VOTERS AND WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

(By Joseph W. Penfold)

Most Americans not only want clean water but are willing to pay for it.

This is indicated by a summary of results of recent statewide elections on bond issues for water pollution control. The summary was released today by the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water, a coalition of some 30 organizations concerned about the lagging national water cleanup program.

"The record of the last five years shows that when voters are asked directly in state bond referendums whether they want clean water and are willing to tax themselves to help pay for it, two out of three say 'yes,'" Joseph W. Penfold, coordinator of the Clean Water Crusade, said.

The summary reports that:

Since 1964 the voters of nine states have had an opportunity to vote in statewide elections on proposed water pollution control bond issues.

Eight of the nine proposals were approved and the ninth also was supported by most of those who voted on it.

Of the total of 17,625,254 citizens who voted on the nine proposals, 11,725,444 voted "yes"—an average "yes" vote of 66 per cent.

(Most states have not held elections in this field; their legislatures make the final decisions to issue bonds or to finance pollution control through regular appropriations.)

The state elections involved were in Maine in 1964, New York in 1965, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island in 1967, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio and Washington, all in 1968, and Wisconsin in 1969.

(Of the nine proposals, all were officially approved except the one in Illinois. Although supported by 57 per cent of those who voted on it, the Illinois proposal failed because of a requirement of Illinois law that such proposals must be approved by a "majority of

votes cast for all state legislature candidates" in the same election.)

In commenting on the election summary, Penfold emphasized that "these state bond financing proposals were predicated on the assumption that the Federal government would keep its commitment, as declared by the Congress in the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966, to match the state money."

"If we are to turn the tide and begin to clean up our polluted rivers, streams and lakes, it is necessary for the Federal government to keep this commitment that the states and local communities have been relying on by putting the Federal money on the line in the form of grants at the level authorized by Congress," he said.

The Clean Water Crusade group is asking President Nixon and the Congress to provide \$1 billion—the amount authorized by Congress—in matching grants for community sewage treatment plant construction during the 12 months beginning July 1. The Nixon Administration has asked the Congress for less than a quarter of that amount—\$214 million.

Penfold said "the inadequacy of \$214 million for this program at this time is put into perspective by the size of the backlog of grant applications from local and state governments already received by the Interior Department's Water Pollution Control Administration: \$2¼ billion."

The official Federal-state estimate of state clean-up costs over the next five years is more than \$10 billion.

Penfold noted that in many instances water pollution control bonding proposals passed comfortably at the same time that voters were rejecting bond proposals for other purposes. "In the November 1968 general elections, as Engineering News-Record magazine has reported, voters across the country continued to approve most pollution control bond issues even though they rejected 49 per cent of all bond proposals," he said.

Penfold is conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America. Other organizations cooperating in the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water include the League of Women Voters of the United States, the American Institute of Architects, Consumer Federation of America, National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, U.S. Conference of City Health Officers, National Audubon Society, AFL-CIO, United Auto Workers, National Wildlife Federation, Sierra Club, and American Fisheries Society.

The summary of state election results was prepared by the Conservation Foundation at the request of the Clean Water Crusade. Sources for the election results reported in the summary are state pollution control and election officials, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

CITIZENS CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER

(By Mrs. Donald Clusen)

The entire effort to clean up the nation's waters has been based from the beginning on federal promise to help finance sewage treatment plants. This program is now on the brink of financial disaster, and it is this crisis which has brought together the organizations which realize the need for money in an attempt to galvanize public demand and public support for funds before it is too late.

In a rare show of unanimity Congress, in 1966, passed the Clean Water Restoration Act. This Act authorized \$1 billion for federal sewage treatment facility construction grants-in-aid in fiscal 1970. Thus far the new Administration has left unaltered the fiscal 1970 budget request of the former Administration which amounts to \$214,000,000. This sum, the same amount appropriated for fiscal 1969, is inadequate to accelerate water cleanup. The nation will never achieve the water quality standards set by the states

unless improved treatment plants and interceptor sewers are built. Construction will not be encouraged by \$214,000,000 in federal help. The Citizens Crusade for Clean Water is asking the President to request and the Congress to appropriate the full \$1 billion authorized for fiscal 1970.

The grant program is authorized in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended. The total federal appropriation for this grant program is allotted among the states according to a formula set forth in the law. Each state then allocates its share among localities selected by the responsible state agency. Plans for construction and for funding the local share must meet state and federal requirements.

Congress has consistently failed to meet its commitments to the states and localities via the grant program. In fiscal 1969, Congress authorized \$700,000,000 in treatment facility grants but appropriated \$214,000,000. The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 raised expectations when it removed the dollar ceiling, offered a larger percent of federal aid, and increased the amount authorized for construction grants.

In reality these increases never materialized because federal appropriations have been so low. By 1968, 23 states, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands had passed legislation authorizing a state share of 25-30 percent, but in the same year the Congress appropriated only \$203,000,000 instead of the \$450,000,000 authorized. Thus the incentive offered by the Clean Water Restoration Act has been almost no incentive at all. Only states able to undertake prepayment of the federal share in expectation of reimbursement can get leverage out of the promise implicit in the percentages of the Act. State legislatures that met after the President's budget was sent to Congress in 1967 had scant reason to authorize appropriation of matching state funds.

Every year that we expend less money at the federal level on the grant program, the effect is felt all the way down the line. These are incentive grants and they represent seed money to encourage local and state investment. In the last 11 years, the Federal Water Pollution Administration reports, investment of \$1,200,000,000 has stimulated construction of more than \$5 billion of waste treatment facilities in local communities.

The Citizens Crusade for Clean Water today issues a call to every American who objects to water pollution. Instead of hand-wringing and lamenting about how dirty the river or lake is, every interested citizen should write his Representative and Senator and the President. The message is simple—a much bigger share of our tax money spent to clean up the water. The public has been told on innumerable occasions that what is required for cleanup is a public opinion that is angry and vocal. Members of organizations cooperating in the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water will put this theory to the supreme test and let the Executive and Legislative branches of our government know that pollution abatement has more than citizen support, it has citizen demand.

CITY OF KANSAS CITY, Mo.,
October 3, 1969.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: We have heard that the House Appropriation Committee will recommend \$600 million as the current year appropriation for grants to municipalities for the construction of Pollution Abatement Works. While any increase above past appropriations will be helpful, we are extremely disappointed that the recommendation is not the full billion dollars, as authorized by the Congress.

A considerable backlog of "ready to go" projects has developed over the past few years, because Federal Aid did not become

available as anticipated. Kansas City alone has in excess of \$15,000,000 in construction that can be placed under contract during the fiscal year if grants are made available. I know that many many municipalities are in the same position.

In addition to the above, Kansas City has already awarded contracts for construction work costing more than \$5 million for projects for which a grant offer could not be made because of insufficient grant funds, but for which we expect to receive grants from future appropriations under the reimbursement provisions of the Federal Act. A tremendous backlog of construction in this category exists throughout the country, particularly in states as New York. We do not believe that projects before the Congress for use of grant funds includes adequate provision for construction projects in this category.

Missouri is one of an increasing number of states that have established their own grant programs to ensure their communities a bonus that increases the total Federal grant from 30 per cent to 50 per cent, or even 55 per cent. We seriously question that the accumulative effect of this program has been adequately considered in evaluating the ability of the national program to consume grant funds this year.

We are confident that one billion dollars in grant funds will not be adequate to cover the actual needs of the nation for the current fiscal year, even if funds allocated to but not needed by states of minimum need are reallocated to states having unmet needs.

We urge that the Congress appropriate the full billion dollars and give the municipal officials on the firing line an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to utilize funds of the magnitude authorized by Congress as the base for a national program.

Your interest and assistance in this program is very much appreciated.

Yours very truly,
GLEN J. HOPKINS,
Director.

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, Mich., June 18, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: The following is the text of a telegram I sent today to President Nixon on the federal Clean Water Restoration Act:

"Having just signed into law Michigan's \$285 million municipal sewage treatment grant program, I would take this occasion to urge your recommendation to Congress of the full funding of the 1970 authorization of the Clean Water Restoration Act. Michigan's program, like those of the other states moving ahead in the fight against water pollution, is geared to the federal commitment. Without the full participation of all levels of government in protecting the natural environment much precious time will be lost."

I hope you join me in supporting full funding of this important legislation. Kind personal regards.

Sincerely,
BILL MILLIKEN,
Governor.

AUSTIN, TEX.,
September 10, 1969.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I wish to thank you for all that you have done in the cause of conservation. I have frequently written letters in support of your bills.

Recently I sent a telegram to President Nixon asking for \$1 billion for water pollution control. I was appalled by the answer I received from the Bureau of the Budget. They said it would cause inflation! What

about the billions that have been spent on war, space, and defense? I am willing to pay more taxes for pollution control and all other conservation programs.

I am interested in getting the states to adopt agricultural zoning legislation, as Hawaii has done. It is ridiculous to pave good farm and grazing land. I hope that you will promote this in Michigan.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN H. HICKS.

WINNETKA, ILL., September 22, 1969.

Congratulations on your support of "Clean-Water" amendment.

What can we do to help support your efforts?

K. M. CHAKIRIS.

INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT,
AFL-CIO,

September 17, 1969.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: At a time when water pollution is increasingly a matter of national concern, we are dismayed to find the federal government plans to spend relatively little on the imperative job of providing this nation with clean water.

The gap between what is authorized for waste treatment plant construction and what is finally appropriated continues to grow. In fiscal 1965, that gap was \$7 million. In the budget request for fiscal 1970, the gap has widened to \$786 million. This is the difference between the budget recommendation of \$214 million and the authorization figure of \$1 billion.

The Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, believes the program to combat water pollution is a matter of the highest national priority. We strongly support the efforts of the bipartisan group of congressmen who seek to raise the level of funding for waste treatment. We urge you to join with this group and when the Public Works Appropriations Bill is taken up, to vote for the appropriation of \$1 billion for waste treatment plant construction.

Time is running out on us. We must either massively and quickly get at the dangers to our water supply or ultimately be overwhelmed by our own pollution.

Sincerely,

JACOB CLAYMAN,
Administrative Director.

LAKE OSWEGO CORPORATION,
Lake Oswego, Ore., September 9, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I hear that your bill for funding the Clean Water Restoration Act is continuing to build support in the Congress.

You certainly have the support of residents in the City of Lake Oswego area, which surrounds a beautiful five-mile lake that is the center of one of the Portland metropolitan major suburban communities. The lake is fed by the Tualatin river, which traverses one of the nation's most beautiful suburban valleys—and has become among the most polluted because of urban sprawl and its related effluent disposal problems.

Hopefully the Tualatin river will be one of those included in the project that ultimately will be covered by your bill. Representative Wendall Wyatt, in whose district the Tualatin river is located, is very familiar with this problem and can supply you with any necessary data—if he has not done so already. The Federal Water Pollution Authority, whose regional office is in Portland, Oregon, also is very familiar with this problem.

For your information, the Lake Oswego Corporation owns the lake and its stockholders are residents of the lake area. Directors of the corporation are unpaid local residents representing all property owners with lake privileges.

If we may be of assistance, please feel free

to call on me at any time. My residence address is 17643 Kelok Road, Lake Oswego, Ore. 97304, phone (503) 636-1320. During office hours, I may be reached at Georgia-Pacific Corporation, phone (503) 222-5561. My business address is P.O. Box 311, Portland, Oregon 97207.

Sincerely,

L. E. NEWKIRK,
Vice President.

WHEATON, ILL.,
September 3, 1969.

HON. JOHN DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: I've just this morning read an item in CONSERVATION NEWS titled "135 Congressmen joined drive for clean water," in which your name was mentioned. (Vol. 34, No. 16, August 15, 1969).

The item also mentioned that a Gallup Poll conducted by the National Wildlife Federation reported 85 percent of all Americans are concerned about water pollution. . . . I just want you to know that I'm one of the 85 percent and that I support your work in this direction.

So, for what it's worth, here it is in black and white that I believe firmly in your remark, ". . . providing clean water for the American People is a goal deserving the highest priority."

Good luck.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) CARLEEN HAWKINS.

IZAIAK WALTON LEAGUE,
Walker, Minn., August 28, 1969.

Representative JOHN DINGELL,
House Office Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Our Izaak Walton Club of Walker, Minn., would appreciate it if you would give every support to obtaining the One Billion appropriation for the "Clear Water Restoration Act".

We firmly believe that the matching funds of municipalities will help in the construction of the needed sewer treatment plants.

Although Walker, Minn., is located in the center of the lake and recreational area of the state and has plenty of water, pollution will soon be our big problem.

We urge you in all sincerity to support this much needed appropriation.

Very truly yours,

G. R. SABIN,
President.

LARAMIE, WYO.,
August 31, 1969.

Representative JOHN DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: It is a pleasure to hear about your campaign to get the full \$1 billion for the Clean Water Restoration Act.

I, and untold others that will not write for various reasons, wish you every success.

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN MORTON.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
GAME, FISH AND CONSERVATION
COMMISSIONERS,
August 21, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Thank you for the material on the bipartisan effort within the House of Representatives to secure full funding for fiscal year 1970 of the Clean Water Restoration Act.

The International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners is on record as strongly supporting the Clean Water Restoration Act and its funding. I have, therefore, informed the Conservation

Director of each of the fifty states of your efforts and urged that they act promptly to secure the support of their congressional representatives for adequate funding of this important program.

Sincerely,

W. M. LAWRENCE,
President.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
New Haven, Conn., August 18, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
The House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: An article in yesterday's New York Times gives me to understand that you are in the forefront of the battle for a larger authorization of funds to fight water pollution.

I congratulate you heartily on this stand and wish you success. I am writing also to Representative Mahon of Texas urging him to approve the request for additional funds when it comes to his Committee.

Sincerely yours,

MARIE BORROFF,
Professor of English.

LANSING, MICH.,
August 11, 1969.

DEAR REP. DINGELL: I read with interest the article of "Full Funding of Clean Water Restoration Asked" in the State Journal.

Although I've never spoken out before on the ever increasing problem of water pollution, I want to send you my support now as critical decisions are impending.

Homeowner and particularly industrial abuse of our water resources is at least disgusting and at most an irreversible loss. It is another unfortunate example of the unrepresented interests of the people confronting the well-funded (in this case? industrial) lobbies.

What can concerned citizens do to get legislators to enact anti-pollution laws with teeth in them? And to get the appropriate funding?

I applaud your efforts toward this goal, and I hope that this recent article receives outstate attention as well.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. AUER.

STATE OF GEORGIA,
Atlanta, Ga., July 29, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I congratulate you on your interest in full funding in 1970 for the 1966 Clean Water Restoration Act. As both the Director of the Georgia Department of Public Health and the Chairman of the Georgia Water Quality Control Board, I offer any assistance in any way we can provide in the effort to secure the appropriations up to the full authorization.

In FY 1969, this state had eighty-eight (88) applications for PL-660 projects from cities and counties. The amount of funds requested totaled about \$33 million; Georgia's allocation for FY 1969 amounted to only \$4.59 million. We were able to fund just twenty-one (21) projects, so we find ourselves with a backlog of \$28 million in projects, needed and ready to go.

We have on file now seventy-four (74) requests totaling almost \$35 million, plus three (3) applications for supplementary grants. However, we have been informed by the Southeast Regional Office of F.W.P.C.A. that Georgia's FY 1970 allocation would be about \$4.58 million. This, we understand, is based on an anticipated appropriation of \$214 million.

At the present rate of appropriation, it seems clear that this nation's existing pollution problems could not be cleared before the year 2000. Unfortunately, new problems continue to appear and existing problems

are being compounded. If we do not make a much greater effort, the cost in economic potential and adverse health effects will be overwhelming.

Thanking you for the opportunity to support the need for full appropriations, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. VENABLE, M.D.,
Director.

Re Appropriation for federal grants for sewer facility construction of \$1 billion for fiscal 1970.

Representative JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: For the past ten years while residing in this area I have noticed an increase in water pollution. When I moved to Michigan from New York State I decided Sterling State Park was one of the loveliest beaches I had visited in the world. To my disappointment several years later signs were posted "Waters unsafe for Swimming." This was the only swimming area available to my family. This is what caused me to become interested in the water pollution problem in the Downriver area. In fact I learned that the City of Monroe sewage was polluting Sterling State Park.

After much reading and studying and giving speeches and programs on the subject I have decided that the sooner the problem is solved the sooner our citizens will benefit. With rising costs and increasing population the problem will only magnify unless we spend the money now. Therefore, this is why I support the Appropriation for federal grants for sewage facility construction of \$1 billion for fiscal 1970.

Very truly yours,

PAMELA PESOLD,
Mrs. WILLIAM F. PESOLD.

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: Yours of July 16 is appreciated. In behalf of conservationists everywhere, you and the others are being commended highly for urging the allocation of the full authorized appropriation for water pollution control. The representatives of the national conservation organizations have gotten together upon several occasions and are doing everything possible to secure the full amount. I have felt that this is the only position that could be taken on this vital program.

Best wishes and kindest regards.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Vice-President.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
LABOR AND CONGRESS OF
INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C., September 9, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The AFL-CIO is wholeheartedly in agreement with the conservation, consumer and labor groups participating in the "Citizens' Crusade for Clean Water," an informal coalition working for an improved level of funding for the Waste Treatment Plant Construction Grants Program.

Unfortunately, this key water pollution control activity has consistently suffered from a serious and widening gap between the promises, set forth in the authorization figures, and the performance reflected in appropriations. If the budget request for Fiscal 1970 should be approved as submitted, the authorization-appropriations gap will amount to \$786 million. This would result from the difference in the budget recommendation of \$214 million and the authori-

zation figure of \$1 billion. The enclosed fact sheet attempts to spell out the problem in concise terms.

The AFL-CIO enthusiastically supports the efforts of the bipartisan group of Congressmen who are leading the campaign to raise the level of funding for this important program in the next fiscal year. We urge that you join in this effort and support the move to increase the appropriations for the Waste Treatment Plant Construction Grants Program when the Public Works Appropriations Bill is taken up.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., August 27, 1969.

Mr. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Your letter of July 17, 1969, expressing concern over the lack of funding for the grant-in-aid provisions of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 is appreciated by the members of the Water Pollution Control Federation. We are deeply concerned over the failure of the Congress to appropriate money to carry out the authorizations listed in the Act.

All of the states have energetically pursued the adoption of sound water quality criteria, with the policies needed to implement the intent of the law, and many of these states also have instituted grant programs of their own in addition to other programs, all predicated on the anticipation that the full Federal grant program would become a reality. Failure on the part of the Federal Government to commit the amount of funds as originally proposed, in effect, nullifies the states endeavors and other local efforts to combat water pollution. It is obvious that the success of the fight against water pollution is wholly dependent on Federal funds.

Likewise, it should be observed that maintaining appropriations at or near the same levels as Fiscal 1968 and 1969 does not provide for a consistent program. While the dollar amounts are similar, they provide a constantly smaller share of the growing and mounting needs. It is wishful thinking to assume that the pollution problem is being held "at bay" with such appropriations.

On September 26, 1968, the Water Pollution Control Federation Board of Control adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas, the Congress after careful consideration has written into legislation annual authorizations for grants-in-aid for municipal waste-water treatment facilities, and

"Whereas, the public officials and the public have expectations of receiving this assistance to the limits authorized, and

"Whereas, the Congress has failed to appropriate to the limit of these authorizations in any fiscal year and in fact the disparity between the appropriations and the authorization is increasing year by year, and

"Whereas, public officials are finding this failure of the Federal Government to honor its commitment to be a major obstacle in the construction of pollution abatement works,

"Therefore be it resolved, that the Water Pollution Control Federation call to the attention of the Congress the seriousness of this problem and urge the Congress to make the appropriations more nearly approach the authorization or amend the authorization to more nearly reflect the anticipated appropriations."

This resolution was sent to the Appropriations Committee, Public Works Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

There have been various substitute methods, including so-called deferred payment plans, proposed from time to time that purport to increase the Federal financial par-

ticipation in the water pollution control program. None of these have demonstrated the required merit or capability to make the program successful, and are certainly inconsistent with the program offered to, and supported by the American people. We oppose any plan of deferred financing that does not include interest as well as principal payments.

The Federation respectfully submits these comments in reply to your letter; we appreciate your seeking our views and will be pleased to correspond further if we can be of assistance in resolving this major national problem.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL D. HANEY,
President.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., September 19, 1969.

Mrs. RAYMOND ROBERTSON,
President, League of Women Voters.

I strongly support full appropriations so that Illinois municipalities can improve water quality standards. I hope you support the full budget for the Clean Waters Restoration Act.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR PAUL SIMON.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON
NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: The Citizens Committee on Natural Resources has been advised that a serious effort is being made in the House of Representatives to increase the appropriation for the Clean Water Restoration Act for Fiscal Year 1970.

As you know, the budget request for this vital matching grant program to the States for sewage treatment facilities is \$214 million, a totally unrealistic response to a multi-billion problem. Dozens of nationally-known and respected citizens organizations, most State Governors, and in excess of 120 Members of the House have pledged themselves toward a \$1 Billion Appropriation this year. This amount is deemed to be essential if the federal Government is to keep faith with the States and local communities which are meeting their own commitments under the Act.

There is now being circulated throughout the House of Representatives a letter from a bi-partisan delegation [John A. Blatnik, John Dingell, Michael Feighan, Paul McCloskey, Henry Reuss, John P. Saylor, and Jim Wright] requesting your help for this effort, and our purpose in writing is to respectfully request that you join them.

We believe, as do the other organizations in the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water, that the American people are looking to the House of Representatives this year to determine whether our Nation is serious about creating a more wholesome environment for all of us.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

IRA N. GABRIELSON,
Chairman.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post,
Aug. 23, 1969]

ANTIPOLLUTION FUNDS

Normally no advocate of increased federal spending, we are in accord with a House proposal that would add \$786 million to the national budget.

The difference this time is that the additional money would bring to an even \$1 billion federal matching grants available to state and local governments for the construction of waste treatment plants. The Nixon Administration budgeted only \$214 million for that purpose.

We cannot imagine a better or more necessary purpose on which the taxpayers' money can be expended than reducing the dumping of raw sewage into their streams, rivers and

harbors. It may lack the glamor of hurling men to Mars but assuredly it will do much to promote the health and general well-being of the nation.

It would, moreover, merely honor a commitment Congress itself made when it passed a comprehensive water pollution act three years ago. In no subsequent year has the promised \$1 billion actually been appropriated.

Most state and local governments are making an honest effort to clean up their streams and lakes. But, with Washington hogging the most productive revenue sources and with inflation skyrocketing construction costs, money for those projects is desperately hard to find. Bonds are all but impossible to sell and municipal issues are threatened with the loss of their tax-exempt status.

Washington is responsible in part for this dilemma. The least it can do is to return to the people more of their own money. States and cities have the will to fight pollution. It's the means they lack.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 26, 1969]
POLLUTION BILL GAINS BACKING IN U.S. HOUSE—VOTE BY MAJORITY IS NEARING
 (By Casey Bukro)

Congressmen are banding together to persuade the Nixon administration to appropriate one billion dollars this year for federal matching grants for water pollution control construction.

At the latest count yesterday, 210 members of the House of Representatives had pledged support for an amendment seeking the billion dollar figure if the Nixon administration fails to allot that amount in the public works appropriation bill now under study. A majority in the House would be 218 votes. "Some members of Congress say there has never been such a positive head count prior to floor action on a bill," said J. W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League in Washington. "It certainly reflects the strong public sentiment and support of the clean water program."

TELL OF SUPPORT

Ten of the 11 Illinois Democrat representatives support the measure. One of the 12 Republican Illinois representatives, Robert McClory, supports it.

The public works appropriations bill now under consideration by the House public works appropriations subcommittee calls for 214 million dollars for municipal sewage treatment plant construction grants in fiscal 1970, although the authorization for this year under the clean waters restoration act of 1966 is one billion dollars.

This is the third consecutive year that the federal government is proposing to allot funds for pollution control grants far below the authorized amount. Water pollution authorities say this is crippling the national pollution control effort, and some rate this as the top pollution control problem in the country.

ASSAILED BY BACON

"Congress has not fulfilled its part of the bargain," asserted Vinton Bacon, general superintendent of the sanitary district. "The plan had been for greater federal financial assistance so we could comply with the higher federal water pollution control requirements."

"We stand ready to meet the requirements imposed on us by the federal government, but we think they should come thru with their share of the financing."

Pollution control projects thruout the country are being stalled while communities wait for federal money to share in the cost of the projects, said Bacon. He and the district board of trustees urge full federal funding of the pollution control program.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle, July 20, 1969]

WICHITANS JOIN POLLUTION FIGHT (By Dolores Quinlisk)

Pollution of water in the United States is a national disgrace and it is almost too late to begin to do something about it, according to spokesmen of 25 national organizations who are joining in a nationwide "Citizens Crusade for Clean Water."

Efforts on the local level to enlist public concern for the problem are being spearheaded by Wichita League of Women Voters.

Mrs. Pegge Missal, league chairman, said leagues all over the nation are joining in a campaign to urge Congress to appropriate \$1 billion for sewage control.

Included in the Crusade for Clean Water are such organizations as the National Audubon Society, the American Association of University Women, the AFL-CIO labor unions, American Institute of Architects, Izaak Walton League, National Rifle Association and U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Mrs. Missal said originally \$1 billion was proposed to aid municipalities in sewage control construction. The Nixon administration is asking Congress for only \$214 million, she said, and the appropriation bills are in congressional committees.

"The groups joining together in the crusade feel citizens should be writing now to their congressmen to urge them to fund the full \$1 billion," said Mrs. Missal.

"Our water is getting dirtier by the minute, and the longer we wait to fund this necessary construction, the worse the situation will be."

Kansas is rated among the worst 10 states in the nation for fish-kill incidents, said Mrs. Missal. During the period of 1963-1968, there were 83 major fish-kills in the state and 60 per cent of them were blamed on run-off from livestock feedlots.

"Ten years ago, there were 27 species of fish in the Cottonwood and Neosho rivers," said Mrs. Missal. "They have now been reduced to 14 species due to water pollution. Neosho River catfish have disappeared completely."

In 1967, the state Department of Health reported the state's seven million cattle, hogs and sheep excrete daily the same amount of waste as 70 million people. During heavy rains, some of this washes off into streams, polluting the water.

Pollution in the water uses up oxygen, killing fish. In addition, Mrs. Missal said, about 20 per cent of the bacteria and viruses carried in polluted water is dangerous to humans. Salmonella bacteria is one of these. Disease also can be transmitted from eating fish from polluted rivers.

In 1968, the state health department began requiring feedlots with more than 300 head of livestock to get permits under certain regulations. There are about 4,000 feedlots of this size in the state, out of a total of 13,500. There are still about 100 cattle lots that must register, and about 2,500 hog lots.

"Municipalities are moving at about half the anticipated speed to meet sewage construction goals," said Mrs. Missal. "On March 31 of this year, there were \$2.25 billion in pending applications for federal sewage construction grants."

"The gap between authorization and appropriation for these projects is steadily widening."

U.S. Public Health Service has released figures that out of the \$2 million people in this country served by municipal sewer systems, only 34 million are served by systems that have sewage treatment facilities. Primary sewage treatment removes 36 per cent of the pollution, secondary treatment removes up to 90 per cent.

"One alarming factor is that the amount

of industrial waste is double the amount of municipal waste," said Mrs. Missal, "but industries are reluctant to improve their sewage management until municipalities improve their waste disposal."

Continued Mrs. Missal, "Clean water is a vanishing resource. We're polluting it faster than we can clean it up, yet water is needed to live. Pollution of water everywhere in the U.S. is a shame and a national disgrace, and as costly as pollution abatement may be, it is cheaper to clean up our water than try to replace it by other means."

"It is imperative to keep further pollution from ever starting. It is already very, very late to begin."

A 15-minute film on water pollution, sponsored by Wichita League of Women Voters, is scheduled to be shown at 2:15 p.m. August 9 on KAKE-TV.

[From the Rutland (Vt.) Daily Herald, June 18, 1969]

THE WATER GETS DIRTIER

The spokesman for the Vermont League of Women Voters is quite right that strong pressure is needed to bring funding of water pollution controls up to the level of the need. In March the Conservation Foundation called attention to the huge gap between authorizations and actual appropriations in Federal spending for natural resources since 1965, a gap which exists in spite of the fact this desperately needed spending is near the bottom of the priorities list and calls for only 1.8 per cent of the Federal budget.

Writing of the growing gap, the Foundation says: "In water pollution control, for example, meaningful progress requires, in part, construction of treatment plants by local governments. To stimulate construction of these facilities, the Federal government created a grant program which has indeed helped local governments. But the amounts made available have been nowhere near the amounts deemed necessary and authorized by Congress."

"The figures below tell the water pollution story. In the current fiscal year alone, the estimated gap between appropriation and authorization will be \$486 million. Next year, the gap will jump to \$786 million. The GMG (growing money gap) for the six-year period will be \$1.5 billion. Results: Further delay in controlling water pollution. Dirtier instead of cleaner water." If this sounds bad, it should be noted that the Foundation was writing about an anticipated gap based on Interior Secretary Hickel's budgetary request for \$600 million for the coming fiscal year, not on the greatly reduced figure recommended by President Nixon, \$214 million. In other words, though the gap may be somewhat smaller, the appropriation may very well be smaller yet.

Obviously, the mandatory Federal pollution control program will not be carried out if the 55 per cent Federal share of project costs is not available. In most municipalities large and small, the Federal aid is not only an incentive but the difference between something possible and something quite out of reach.

Military spending, including the cost of the Vietnam war, continues to balk efforts for realistic appropriations to meet the urgent needs at home. As natural resources deteriorate they become ever more difficult to reclaim, if indeed ever can be. There are already some "debts" we owe our environment it is beyond our power to repay.

THIS 'N THAT . . . FROM HERE 'N THERE
 (By Lynn Watt)

Since our report of the annual meeting of the Lake Champlain Committee (Free Press, July 21) we've had a couple of calls from folks concerned about pollution.

They wonder what can be done to speed up the construction of sewage treatment plants. They also want to know what they can do to help fight pollution.

You've probably heard the saying "the squeaky wheel gets the grease." Well, you can help by making the antipollution wheel squeak loud and clear.

Write to your congressman in Washington. Ask him why, when Congress authorized a billion dollars nationwide for grants of aid to meet the federal commitment of the cost of building treatment facilities, the President's budget calls for only \$214 million to be appropriated.

Tell him Vermont's share of this \$214 million is only \$1.3 million which doesn't go very far. Tell him, too, that quite a number of cities and towns in Vermont have voted bond issues for construction of sewage treatment plants, and that now nothing is being done because there is no federal aid available.

Money is great stuff. With it you can even put men on the moon. But ask all of the scientists, engineers, technicians, and others associated with the space program to work for nothing, and see what happens.

Conversely, give antipollution efforts billions of dollars of push and see what happens!

If you don't like to write letters, clip this column and send it to your congressman (or even the President)—it might help put a little more squeak in the wheel!

[From the Chicago Tribune, Oct. 3, 1969]

SUPPORT FOR POLLUTION CONTROL

LAKE FOREST, September 30.—Congratulations on today's fine editorial "Funds for Pollution Control" on federal appropriations for water pollution control. Your fine reporter, Casey Bukro, has been a champion in this crusade against pollution.

As co-chairman of the Illinois State Commission on Water Pollution and Resources, I have been working actively for over a year to encourage our Illinois congressmen to honor the promises of Congress in appropriating one billion dollars for water pollution control.

Likewise, I earnestly urge citizens to make their views known to the governor to get behind House bill 2004 for state grants in aid for sanitary districts and municipalities.

The time for Illinois citizens is now or never to let both the federal and state administrations know their demands for water pollution control.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

FUNDS TO FIGHT POLLUTION

CHICAGO, September 30.—Today's editorial "Funds for Pollution Control" put the spotlight on one of the most pressing matters before the current Congress.

I might point out that the sanitary district requested and received permission from the state legislature to issue 380 million dollars in bonds for new sewage treatment and pollution abatement facilities. If the district, lying wholly within Cook county, can undertake such an obligation, certainly the entire United States of America can afford to appropriate one billion dollars as a contribution to the nation-wide campaign to improve the quality of our water resources.

Of this total amount, the sanitary district will spend 60 million dollars in 1970 from the bond appropriation. This amounts to almost 30 per cent of the 214 million dollars that Congress has been asked to appropriate under the budget for next year.

Failure to appropriate and spend the money now will inflict a most costly burden on the American people, because not only will the cost of the necessary facilities rise dramatically year by year, but the increased contamination of our water sources will likewise add to the annual cost of correction of this vital threat to our environment.

We urge all residents living within the sanitary district—and for that matter living anywhere in the nation—to call upon their congressmen to increase the budget appropriation to the full one billion dollars which was provided for the clean waters restoration act of 1966.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Aug. 20, 1969]

WATER AND FALSE ECONOMY

The budget-cutting Nixon administration is pursuing at least one course that would lead to false economy. Instead of the \$1 billion authorized, it wants to finance the nation's clean-water campaign during fiscal 1970 with only \$214,000,000.

It would be hard to justify this reduction. Water pollution is one of the nation's rampant problems. It has been long neglected and will require heroic measures, and large sums of money. Involved here also is the good faith of the federal government. Twenty-two governors support the larger amount, some of them citing the fact that the government has induced the states to expand their clean-up efforts but is now refusing to give the degree of assistance it promised.

Gov. Ogilvie has said that Illinois would receive only \$9,800,000 if the administration has its way, rather than \$53,300,000 expected. "Many construction projects have been held back," he wrote to Congress, "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."

That act, passed in 1966, authorized matching federal grants to state and local governments to cover 30 to 55 per cent of the cost of sewage facilities. The program has always been shortchanged, with Congress appropriating less than authorized. Now the administration would cut it by \$786,000,000.

Such budget paring may be thwarted, as it should be. A drive in Congress has brought support from 162 House members for the larger sum. Rep. George Mahon (D-Tex.), chairman of the Appropriations Committee, will try to halt the government. "After all," he said, "who can be against clean water?" Who indeed?

THE POLLUTION FIGHT: IT'S UP TO WASHINGTON

Lake County residents who suffered through the hot, humid summer months without benefit of their beaches don't need reminding that there is a water pollution problem.

Congress, which deliberates next door to the murky, odorous Potomac shouldn't have to be reminded either. Apparently, however, some sort of prodding is necessary to stimulate the federal government to do its share in combatting this ever-increasing problem.

In the 1968 fiscal year, the Congress promised to provide \$450 million in federal grants and matching funds for the anti-pollution fight. Only \$203 million was appropriated. During the 1969 fiscal year, which ended June 30, \$700 million was pledged but only \$214 million was delivered. For fiscal year 1970, \$1 billion was promised, but President Nixon has asked for an appropriation of only \$214 million.

Meanwhile, pending applications for grants for sewage treatment facility construction alone total \$2.25 billion. One of these applications is from the North Shore Sanitary District, which serves Highland Park, Highwood, Lake Forest, and Lake Bluff. And while Deerfield is not a member of the sanitary district, its residents, too, were prevented from using Lake Michigan beaches by pollution from the district's outmoded and inefficient sewage treatment system.

In this period of inflation, we normally would not encourage greater federal spend-

ing. But pollution is one problem that supercedes local political boundaries and therefore requires federal action. Furthermore, pollution is one problem that must not be allowed to worsen while we wait for a decline in the inflationary spiral.

Ordinarily, we would not encourage a wealthy area like this one to seek federal aid, believing that its residents can and should finance their own improvement projects. However, the state's constitution, as outmoded as the sanitary district's treatment plants, prevents the district from issuing bonds for more than \$35 million of the \$60 million it needs to upgrade its facilities. So the district has no choice but to turn to Washington for help.

Our congressman, Robert McClory (R-12th), has introduced a bill that would provide a direct grant to the sanitary district, separate from the appropriation in the total anti-pollution measure. However, passage of his bill does not appear likely.

Meanwhile, he is supporting the full \$1-billion appropriation for the comprehensive pollution fight. We are glad he is backing this effort, and hope he will sign a petition backed by 152 other congressmen formally pledging their support. Even if our sanitary district is able to solve its own pollution problems, we still would suffer from pollution from other sources, including industries from Waukegan to Gary and the Army Corps of Engineers.

Only such a comprehensive approach to the pollution problem will result in meeting the goal all should share: a total end to the desecration of our precious recreational areas and water supplies.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 30, 1969]

FUNDS FOR POLLUTION CONTROL

When Congress enacted the clean waters restoration act of 1966, it was regarded as a significant step in the nation-wide campaign against water pollution. But since then Congress has failed to fulfill its obligations under the act by falling far short of appropriating all the funds authorized. Such funds are to be used as federal cost sharing grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment plants.

In Illinois, for example, there are federal grant applications for 273 water pollution control projects but proposed federal funding sufficient for only 20 to 25 of them. Gov. Ogilvie points out that this short funding has a serious impact on this state's progress toward construction of necessary pollution abatement works, particularly in cities along the Illinois river, Lake Michigan, and other interstate waters. Other authorities warn that the whole national anti-pollution effort is being crippled.

Although the 1966 act authorized one billion dollars for such purposes in fiscal 1970, the Nixon administration's budget calls for appropriations of only 214 million dollars to stimulate the cities to get on with the job of cleaning up pollution, a strong movement is under way in the House to persuade the administration to provide full funding under the act. This movement has the support of most state governors, mayors of many cities, and nearly 40 conservation, civic, and other groups and agencies, including the AFL-CIO, the Chicago metropolitan sanitary district, the Izaak Walton league, and the League of Women Voters.

Sponsors of the movement assert they have 219 "firm" votes pledged in the House—enough to approve an amendment to increase appropriations to the full billion dollars in the event the House appropriations committee fails to recommend this sum. Pollution control costs money, but it is necessary if Americans are to avoid fouling their environment even more seriously than they have already. The longer control measures are delayed, the more it will cost eventually to stop pollution.

FALSE ECONOMY

President Nixon's efforts to cut the federal budget has led to at least one serious false economy. He wants to cut the nation's proposed billion-dollar clean-water campaign for fiscal 1970 to only 214-million dollars.

Water pollution is one of this nation's most important problems. It has long been neglected. It requires massive efforts to correct the situation. At least 22 governors—including Governor Ogilvie—support the need for spending more on cleaning up water pollution. The federal government under the 1966 Clean Water Restoration Act pledged to help solve the problem. But it is now backing out of its promise.

Many construction projects in Illinois will be stopped unless Congress votes the full amount originally promised. For example, under the Nixon budget-cutting idea, Illinois would get 9-million 800-thousand dollars for cleanup efforts. But under the original act, we would get more than 53-million dollars.

This clean water program has always been short-changed. While we support efforts to cut the federal budget, we say it is a bad idea to cut the funds for the clean water campaign. Clean water is a vital problem. We hope that Congress will not reduce the needed funds.

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, Alaska, July 1, 1969.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives U.S. Congress, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Thank you very much for your June 6, 1969, letter inviting me to comment on the implications to Alaska of the shortage of Federal funding of water pollution control programs.

For several years Alaska has made good use of its entire allocation of construction grant funding in the water pollution control program. Particularly, with the implementation this year of our new Water Quality Standards, I anticipate that substantial additional amounts could be used by our local governments for the construction of sewage treatment plant if these funds could be made available.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

KEITH H. MILLER,
Governor.

STATE OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, Alaska, September 26, 1969.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Thank you for your letter of August 27, 1969, concerning the Federal Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

As stated in my letter of July 1, 1969, the implementation of our new Water Quality Standards would mean substantial additional funding could be used by our local governments for the construction of sewage treatment plants.

I shall follow with great interest the efforts of you and your colleagues as you work for full funding for the Public Works Appropriation Bill. I will be happy to lend my support at every opportunity.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

KEITH H. MILLER,
Governor.

STATE OF IDAHO,
Boise, August 13, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: I share your interest and concern over the fact that con-

struction grant appropriations under the Federal Clean Water Restoration Act have been grossly short of the authorizations contained in the Act.

Although the grant level of such appropriations has not been a major handicap in the construction program in the State of Idaho up to the present time, we do anticipate that failure to appropriate at a significantly higher level in the next few years will certainly slow down our clean-up program. We are also aware that the present funding level has severely handicapped the clean-up programs of some of our neighboring states.

Sincerely,

DON SAMUELSON,
Governor.

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 section 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	495,000
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.

Enclosed is a brochure (not printed in the RECORD) prepared by the Illinois Sanitary Water Board for fiscal 1969.

Table III lists the 218 applications last year for grant requests of \$45 million. The \$9.8 million appropriated allowed funding of only 25 projects.

Table II lists the municipalities on inter-

state waters and the date construction must start to meet the water quality standards deadline.

Table I is a list of municipalities statewide that must provide additional sewage treatment over the next five years. There are 553 communities listed which include most of the projects contained in Table III. There will be additional municipalities added to this list over the next few years. This five-year list reflects project costs of \$314 million and a Federal grant funding of approximately \$100 million.

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 INDIANA,
Indianapolis, August 19, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Reference is made to your letter of June 6, 1969, relative to the effect of past federal funding on Indiana's water pollution abatement program. The lack of adequate federal grant funds has been the major deterrent to our program. This has become acute in the past few years.

Each year since the grant program was initiated in 1956 we have received applications for more funds than were available. In the earlier days of the program the requests usually amounted to from two to three times the amount of money available. Following the enactment of the 1966 amendments which increased the authorization and provided for an increase in the federal grant from 30% to 50% if the state gave a 25% grant, the 1967 Indiana Legislature appropriated \$8.6 million for state grants for the 1967-69 biennium. This appropriation was sufficient to match Indiana's federal allotment from a \$300 million appropriation for 1967-68 and \$400 million for 1968-69.

In 1967-68 we received 57 applications for \$17.2 million in federal funds, on a 50% basis. However, only \$4.9 million were allotted to Indiana. In 1968-69 we received 93 applications for \$31.5 million federal funds. Only \$5.2 million were received. As a result a considerable portion of the \$8.6 million state funds which were available reverted to the state general fund.

The 1969 Indiana Legislature appropriated \$3.0 million for 1969-70 which is sufficient to match our allotment from a \$250 million federal appropriation. It appropriated \$3.5 for 1960-71. The experiences of the previous biennium were a major factor in determining the amount of state funds appropriated for the current biennium.

The 1969-70 applications for federal and state funds are now on file. There are 135 applications for \$44.3 million in federal funds. Priorities have been established by the Stream Pollution Control Board. A copy of the priority list is attached hereto. Since Indiana receives only \$5 million from a \$214 million appropriation a glance at the table will show we can satisfy only the first four applications.

It is obvious that the lack of federal grant funds has slowed our program. In fact, our rate of construction for the past two years, and our apparent rate for this year, is barely keeping pace with population expansion.

The Indiana Constitution does not permit bonding of the state. Consequently we cannot raise the money to pre-finance the federal grant as New York and a few other states have done.

Sincerely,

EDGAR D. WHITCOMB,
Governor of Indiana.

IOWA STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Des Moines, Iowa, August 12, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Governor Ray has asked that I reply to your letter of June 6, 1969 regarding the effect of funding of the construction grant program on the water pollution control program in the State of Iowa.

During the early years of the grants program subsequent to 1956 the State of Iowa was receiving only approximately \$700,000 annually as compared with the \$3,200,000 allocation now received under the \$214 million national appropriation. Priorities for grant funds were given to communities with the greatest water pollution control need but approximately one third of the communities proceeded without Federal assistance during the early years of the program. Likewise, many communities received much less than the 30% grant due to early limitations on maximum grants.

Construction grant funds under the \$214 million appropriation have been ample to fund all Iowa projects on a 30% basis. The State of Iowa has approached 100% treatment of the municipal sewer population for a number of years and a major share of the federal funds are utilized in expansion of treatment plants in the larger cities. The state has averaged construction of 30 to 50 treatment plant projects annually and Federal funding has been ample during recent years to support our water pollution control program, although for the current year priorities have again become necessary.

Legislation to establish a program of 25% state aid to municipalities for sewage treatment plant construction failed to pass during the last Iowa legislative session. In the event this state aid program should be adopted, there would be a need for increased federal assistance to fund the 50% federal share for which the state would be eligible.

I hope this information will be helpful to you and we will be glad to furnish additional information.

Very truly yours,

R. J. SCHLIEKELMAN,
Director, Water Pollution Division.

IOWA STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Des Moines, Iowa, September 24, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Governor Ray has referred your letter of August 27 regarding short-funding of the construction grant program to this Department for reply.

For your information, we are enclosing a tabulation of 61 construction grant applications for FY 1970 which we have listed in order of priority based on water quality and financial needs. We will have sufficient funds to reach approximately 52 projects. The total need on the basis of the grant requests at 30% or 33% of the project cost is \$5.6 million compared with the Iowa allocation of \$3.3 million. All listed projects are intended for start of construction on or before June

30, 1970. A number of projects have proceeded to construction on a possible reimbursement basis when Federal funds have not been available at the start of construction.

As indicated in our previous letter, the State of Iowa has approached 100% treatment of the municipal sewer population and our needs are not as great as some other states. However, it is likely that our grant requests will exceed current Federal funding for several years. If Iowa should adopt a 25% state-aid program, the 50% Federal share would greatly increase the need for increased Federal funding.

We hope this information will be of assistance to you.

Very truly yours,

R. J. SCHLIEKELMAN,
Director, Water Pollution Division.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL CONSTRUCTION GRANT APPLICATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1970, AUG. 25, 1969

	Grant request	Total project cost
1. Hinton.....	\$34,490	\$129,270
2. Anthon.....	40,200	134,000
3. Vail.....	13,080	54,130
4. Panorama.....	26,880	95,700
5. Templeton.....	20,618	99,330
6. Hudson.....	152,625	462,500
7. Ute.....	16,860	67,850
8. Correctionville.....	56,230	173,400
9. Hancock.....	17,390	55,900
10. Battle Creek.....	19,965	77,500
11. Royal.....	25,170	96,900
12. Granville.....	14,610	59,700
13. Oskaloosa.....	522,000	1,760,000
14. Doon.....	15,660	58,550
15. Andover.....	11,250	42,000
16. Eldon.....	68,100	237,000
17. Harris.....	7,890	32,310
18. Postville.....	42,630	187,100
19. Callender.....	27,543	108,410
20. Vinton (effluent sewer).....	6,330	21,100
21. Kiron.....	8,856	29,520
22. Moville.....	32,280	134,200
23. Spencer.....	213,000	780,000
24. Marshalltown.....	412,170	1,249,000
25. De Soto.....	13,800	51,500
26. Packwood.....	18,900	67,800
27. Worthington.....	28,204	73,190
28. New Vienna.....	40,590	125,010
29. Alburnet.....	20,000	79,000
30. Kimballton.....	24,000	95,920
31. Swisher.....	29,073	111,910
32. Jesup.....	89,250	297,500
33. Early.....	25,245	119,200
34. La Motte.....	17,700	66,650
35. Clutier.....	15,000	54,100
36. Lake View.....	85,500	285,000
37. Scott County Conservation Board 1-280 Lake.....	47,533	144,039
38. Larrabee.....	7,200	26,095
39. Fort Madison (chlorination).....	52,800	160,000
40. Dallas.....	13,800	56,450
41. Charleston (Red Haw Lake Int.).....	13,300	44,305
42. Rockford.....	42,600	148,000
43. Des Moines STP Contr. 3.....	610,500	1,850,000
Subtotal.....	3,000,822	10,001,039
44. Lidderdale.....	6,990	26,300
45. Raymond.....	32,000	116,500
46. Keokuk.....	39,600	120,000
47. Knoxville.....	139,860	466,200
48. Des Moines (Highland Hills STP).....	33,000	100,000
49. Walker.....	25,170	89,900
50. Ottumwa (interceptor).....	27,820	84,300
51. Stanhope.....	8,658	33,360
52. Davenport (chlorination).....	78,870	239,000
53. Ankeny.....	301,950	935,000
54. Des Moines (4 Mile Creek pump station).....	52,800	163,500
55. Des Moines (pump station monitors).....	21,450	65,000
56. Cedar Rapids (solids handling).....	726,198	1,992,156
57. Walcott (interceptor).....	11,900	39,800
58. Waterloo.....	990,000	3,000,000
59. Cedar Rapids (Prairie Creek interceptor).....	86,790	265,000
60. Laurens (interceptor).....	18,240	60,800
61. Council Bluffs (grit removal).....	43,230	131,000
Subtotals.....	2,644,526	7,927,816
Totals.....	5,645,348	17,928,855

STATE OF MARYLAND,
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 Funds 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 NEW YORK,
Albany, July 22, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Thank you for your letter concerning Federal funding under the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Municipalities, under the \$1 billion New York State Pure Waters Bond Act, are provided a basic State construction grant of thirty percent, and prefinancing of the Federal share up to thirty percent; thus, the State guarantees to the municipality a sixty percent grant of the eligible project cost.

As you are aware, existing Federal legislation currently entitles municipal sewage treatment works projects to either a fifty percent of fifty-five percent Federal construction grant. Due to the short-funding of the Federal program, no project in the State of New York has received its full Federal grant. The national appropriation for the Federal program for fiscal year 1969 was only \$214 million, with the New York State allocation being only \$15.8 million of this appropriation. If the active projects in the State were funded to the 50/55 percent figure, an additional \$752 million in Federal grant funds would be required.

The failure of the Federal Government to match existing authorizations with appropriations has slowed our Pure Waters Program. If Federal funds were available, municipalities would be eligible to receive a total con-

struction grant of eighty percent or eighty-five percent of the eligible project cost. This would then limit the local municipal share of the project cost to either twenty percent or fifteen percent; would make it easier for the taxpayers within the municipal to shoulder the fiscal burden; and would encourage the municipality to move ahead with its project to abate water pollution.

Your efforts to secure full funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act for fiscal year 1970 are very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Phoenix, Ariz., June 16, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: This is 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 authorized 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 next two 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.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely,

WINTHROP ROCKEFELLER,
Governor.

STATE WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD,
Atlanta, Ga., July 18, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: We note from the Congressional Record of July 10, 1969, that you wrote the Governors of the States requesting information related to construction grant needs under the provisions of the Clean Water Restoration Act. We have checked with our Governor's office and there is no record of your letter having been received. However, since this matter is so urgent to us, we are taking the liberty of providing you with the information anyway.

The failure of Congress to appropriate the funds authorized in the Act has left the State of Georgia in a very difficult position in obtaining effective water pollution abatement programs from local governments during the past three to four years. The implementation plan and water quality standards adopted by this State and approved by the Department of the Interior in 1967 are becoming less and less a reality.

This State now has seventy-four (74) applications and three (3) requests for supplemental grants pending which are requesting almost \$35 million in FY 1970. Based on engineering reports already reviewed by this office, the situation will be worse next year.

By letter dated July 9, 1969, this office was informed by the Southeast Regional Office of F.W.P.C.A. that Georgia would receive \$4,589,000 for FY 1970. This, of course, is based on an appropriation of \$214 million. You can see that the bulk of the applications will remain in the drawer for another year.

Your interest and concern in this matter are vital. Your assistance in obtaining additional funding will be appreciated by many.

Best regards,
Sincerely,

WARREN O. GRIFFIN,
Assistant to the Executive Secretary.

STATE OF GEORGIA,
Atlanta, August 12, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Your letter dated July 21, 1969, in reference to my views on the impact of present funding for the construction grant program under the Clean Water Restoration Act, was greatly appreciated.

The Georgia State Water Quality Board in its letter dated July 21, 1969, and the Georgia Department of Public Health in its letter dated July 29, 1969, have provided you with details of the effects of present funding. On behalf of the people of Georgia, I urge you to press for increased funds for the construction grant program. Without this help, we and other states face a frightening future in our fight against water pollution.

If I can be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate calling.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,

LESTER MADDOX,
Governor.

STATE OF MAINE,
Augusta, Maine, 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 Acts 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 prefinancing 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 prefinancing 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.

STATE OF MAINE,
Augusta, Maine, August 19, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Recently, an article in the Conservation Foundation Newsletter was brought to my attention in which it was stated that you and six other Congressmen were pushing a drive for the full \$1 billion authorization for waste treatment plant construction. My letter to you of June 19th detailed Maine's deep interest in having the full authorization funded.

Subsequently, a resolution was introduced by me and unanimously passed by the New England Governors' Conference, of which I am Chairman, calling upon the New England Congressional Delegation to support efforts for further Federal funding and specifically, to work for the full authorization of \$1 billion. I am enclosing a copy of the resolution for you.

Any suggestions you might have as to how we could be helpful to you in your effort would be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH M. CURTIS,
Governor.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the continued pollution of our region's lakes, rivers, estuaries, and coastline is a serious threat to the economic vitality, environment and public health of our six States; and

Whereas, each New England State has demonstrated leadership and determination in attempting to resolve these critical water quality problems through the development of water quality standards on interstate and intrastate waters; through regional cooperative action and the establishment of one of the Nation's first interstate water pollution compacts and also one of the first river basins Commissions; through substantial State aid to local communities for the construction of waste treatment facilities and prefinancing of the Federal share of these facilities; and

Whereas, the Federal Government after enactment of strong water pollution control legislation has not appropriated the funds authorized under that legislation required to assist in the task of restoring the quality of this region's polluted water; and

Whereas, the National fiscal gap over the past five years between the appropriations and authorizations under that legislation amounts to a total of one billion five hundred twelve million dollars;

Now therefore be it resolved, that, the Governors of the New England States call upon the members of the New England Congressional Delegation to support all reasonable methods designed to resolve this crucial financial problem. Specifically, we urge Congress to fund the full authorization under the existing program and that we oppose any move to reduce the current 50 to 55 percent level of Federal support to individual projects as now established under the Water Pollution Control Act.

Be it further resolved that, we urge that the Congress seriously consider long term financing of the Federal share of the cost of water pollution control facilities in order to extend Federal assistance to the maximum number of projects within allocated funds if these allocated funds remain significantly below the authorization; provided that, the Federal obligations incurred as a result of State pre-financing of the Federal share are assumed by the Federal Government.

STATE OF MAINE,

Augusta, Maine, September 4, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DINGELL: I appreciate your letter of August 27th bringing me up to date concerning the effort being made in Congress to obtain the full one billion dollar federal grant assistance for pollution abatement that has been authorized for fiscal year 1970. I also appreciate receiving a copy of the status of applications made by the State of Maine which are under the Federal Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

My best wishes to you and your efforts to obtain full funding for this vital program.

Sincerely,

KENNETH M. CURTIS,
Governor.

STATE OF TEXAS,

Austin, Tex., September 3, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I encourage the bipartisan support that you and your fellow Congressmen have created to foster full funding of the Federal Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. The nation as well as the State of Texas have a very vital interest in your combined effort.

In this regard, I wanted to take this occasion to bring to your attention and to recommend that the federal share of financial assistance for water quality projects be provided in a block grant and be 100% of total construction costs. State and local governmental entities would then assume full management and maintenance of the completed facilities. I consider this approach mandatory because of the severe funding handicap of cities and state governments. There is also a vital necessity for prompt water pollution, abatement for the environmental quality necessary for the continued prosperity of the United States.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this very important national task.

Sincerely,

PRESTON SMITH,
Governor of Texas.

STATE OF COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF
NATURAL RESOURCES,

Denver, Colo., July 1, 1969.

Mr. 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 necessary 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 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 authorizations 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.

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, Conn., 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 1966. 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 authorization 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 co-operative 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 WATER AND AIR
RESOURCES COMMISSION,
Dover, Del., 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 re-submit 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.

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.

RUSSELL W. PETERSON,
Governor.

STATE OF FLORIDA,
August 20, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Florida for the past several years has required at least twice the amount of federal funds available from the Clean Water Restoration Act. In fiscal year 1968-69, the State could have used more than three times the amount allocated. Florida's allocation in FY 1968-69 was \$5,695,400. There was an additional sum of some \$4,000,000 available from previous years from municipalities whose grant applications could not be approved for one reason or another. There will be no surplus this year.

Some 75 grant applications totalling more than \$17,000,000 were received during this fiscal year which is ending. The State has been able to recommend funding on only 26 of these. An additional 18 applications have been certified to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration as reimbursable. Because of the squeeze on funds, the State had to set a limit of funds for any individual project of no higher than 25 percent of the federal allocation. Florida's water quality standards require all sources of municipal and industrial waste attain a treatment efficiency of 90 percent or better no later than January 1, 1973. This early deadline is expected to increase the pressures in this State for more federal funds to aid in sewage treatment plant expansion and improvement. Other sources of funds, such as bonds, are becoming increasingly hard to obtain, especially for the smaller communities in the State. The cost of money has risen sharply and is still climbing.

This brief outline shows that the situation regarding availability of federal funds for water pollution control and abatement shortly is critical in Florida. The State has not taken up the slack left by the underfunding at the Federal level. It is my hope that we will move more vigorously at the State level. A strong presentation will be made to the Legislature next April for a State grant program. However, even this

will not serve to lessen the need for Federal funds to carry on this important battle. Let me assure you of support from this office in your attempts to secure full funding for the Clean Water Restoration Act for Fiscal year 1970.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE R. KIRK, Jr.,
Governor.

STATE OF HAWAII,
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 dollars 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.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS WATER RESOURCES
COMMISSION,

Boston, July 18, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Massachusetts has adopted a most comprehensive water pollution control law featuring a \$150M bond issue authorization with pre-financing capabilities and a strong enforcement program vested in a new Division of Water Pollution Control under the control of the Water Resources Commission in the Department of Natural Resources. We also have provided two tax inducements for industry and a new and broad authority for control of oil pollution in the waters of the Commonwealth.

Since the inception of this program, grants have been made to communities reflecting about \$55M worth of sewage treatment works construction. In recent years the Federal government's contribution to this program has been about \$5.3M/year requiring the pre-financing of approximately \$11.0M of State monies in anticipation of future Federal reimbursements. This has maintained the integrity of the implementation program adopted by the State up until now but as the larger community projects come due, the program will unquestionably be severely curtailed.

The Federal government has not honored its financial commitments to the State and as such one must question the advisability

of continuing to subsidize the Federal share on eligible pollution control projects throughout the State.

The Federal interest in this program can only be confirmed by positive action in overcoming the accumulative Federal appropriation inadequacies and making provisions for a separate authorization to reimburse the states that have utilized their pre-financing capability.

Should alternative methods of financing be the subject of future Federal legislation, it is obligatory on the Congress of the United States to maintain the equitability of alternatives to the present construction grant percentages specified in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. If a debt service contract approach is necessary, it is extremely important that the interest charges for the Federal share be borne directly by the Federal government.

I appreciate your concern in this matter and am hopeful my comments may be of assistance to you.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS C. McMAHON,
Director.

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.

PRESS RELEASE OF GOV. WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN,
OF MICHIGAN, JUNE 12, 1969

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 dollar 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 the clean water bond program."

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
St. Paul, July 23, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Thank you for your recent letter requesting information on the impact of the reduced level of Federal funding on water pollution abatement and control in this state.

Applications submitted over the last four fiscal years have been broken down as follows:

TABLE I

Fiscal year	Amount requested	Number of applications	Federal allocation
1970	\$15,333,257	43	\$3,931,000
1969	15,453,640	61	3,931,000
1968	11,843,586	41	3,728,000
1967	6,896,473	35	2,743,250

TABLE II

Fiscal year	Number of grants certified	Projects that proceeded under reimbursement
1970	129	9
1969	36	14
1968	18	8
1967	10	2

Assumes same level of funding as fiscal year 1969.

As can be readily noted in Table I the grant amount requested greatly exceeds Minnesota's actual or anticipated congressional allocation. Based on discussions with municipal officials or their representatives, we do not expect as many communities to utilize the reimbursement provisions of the Federal Act in FY 70 as did in FY 69 (see Table II). The main reason for this is the difficulty of arranging the necessary financing for the entire eligible project rather than only 70 or 67 percent as the case may be if a Federal grant were available.

Because of change in Minnesota's FY 70 and 69 system for establishing priorities which split the congressional allocation based on population between what is known as the seven county metropolitan area (basically Minneapolis, St. Paul and some fifty suburbs) and the balance of the state, it was possible to certify a substantially greater number of applicants for grants (see Table II). Based on the 1960 Federal census, this results in a respective 45 and 55 percent split of funds between the seven county metropolitan area and the rest of the state. The seven county metropolitan area has a much lower number of projects, however, substantially higher cost while the reverse situation exists for the remainder of the state.

No community outside of the metropolitan area in FY 69 proceeded under the reimbursement provisions, nor do we anticipate that any will in FY 70. While many larger communities which have an immediate water pollution control need have indicated their desire and are proceeding to comply with Minnesota's interstate and intrastate water quality standards, some have qualified their statements contingent upon the availability of Federal Aid.

In general, it can be stated that some projects have been delayed because of the lack of Federal assistance and any substantial increase over the funding level of FY 69 will greatly assist in water pollution abatement and control.

Minnesota does not have a state grant program. A bill was introduced in the last legislative session but failed to pass. Instead a 1.5 million dollar program to pay the interest on the Federal portion of an eligible project was passed. It is still too early to predict what effect this program will have.

Your effort in securing full or a substantial increase in funding of the act for FY 1970 will be greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions, or if we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD LEVANDER,
Governor.

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
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 Clear 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 BELL WILLIAMS,
Governor.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Jefferson City, Mo., July 10, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: This is in reply to your letter of June 6, 1969 concerning the impact on our pollution control program caused by the shortage of federal funds on our water pollution control program.

The funds authorized by the Water Quality Act would have provided sufficient federal funds for matching municipal projects in Missouri. However, the funds appropriated are only a fraction of those authorized. The result has been that construction of abatement works has been materially reduced. The backlog continues to grow, and if we are to make real progress in pollution abatement, federal funds and state funds must be increased.

During Fiscal Year 1969 and in Fiscal Year 1970, the Missouri Legislature has appropriated state funds to match all of the federal funds available to Missouri municipalities. A survey of municipal needs indicates that if the federal funds for Missouri cities were increased from \$5 million to \$12-15 million per year, and accompanying state grants of \$6-7½ million were available, that the backlog could be wiped out in approximately five years.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN E. HEARNES.

STATE OF MONTANA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Helena, July 18, 1969.

Re your letter of June 6 in which you ask for information relative to the impact which short funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act may have caused the State of Montana in the area of water pollution control and abatement.

Hon. JOHN DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: The short funding of this Act has not had a great deal of impact on Montana in the past, but possibly could have in the future.

In explanation, in Montana, all municipalities that were sewerage have had treatment plants provided. This program was completed in 1966. The federal allocation of funds to the state has been more than ade-

quate to meet the grant requests on these sources.

When the Water Quality Standards of 1967 were adopted, it was required that secondary treatment be provided for all municipalities and industries. Most municipalities were given until 1972 to upgrade their treatment from primary to secondary. This involved primarily our larger municipalities, approximately twenty of which are involved. In order to meet this need, it is anticipated that during the next three years there will be approximately thirteen million dollars spent on sewage treatment projects in this state.

The last two sessions of the Legislature have seen considerable activity by our larger municipalities endeavoring to have legislation passed authorizing the state's participation in construction grants for sewage treatment works. There were several reasons for the legislation not passing. However, the one that probably had the greatest influence on our Legislature was that the majority of our municipalities already provide secondary treatment of their wastes and these communities apparently question whether they should be responsible for providing funds for those that need additional treatment when they have already paid for it themselves.

The problem is that by 1972 all municipalities will have to meet the standards set up by the Water Quality Standards of the 1967 Session of the Montana State Legislature. If the state does participate in helping provide funds to pay for secondary sewage treatment, this will mean that the Federal Government's share of funds towards completion of the secondary plants will be greater according to federal standards. The other alternative is if the Legislature did not fund construction grants for secondary treatment plants, many of the municipalities, which are waiting until the 1971 Legislature has met and considered this funding, will be applying for federal money at the same time in order to complete their secondary treatment plants by the deadline of 1972. This would mean a greater influx of requests for federal funds which might result in a shortage of the same.

I trust this is the information which you desired. I will be pleased to supply you with any additional information you may need.

Sincerely yours,

FORREST H. ANDERSON,
Governor.

STATE OF NEBRASKA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Lincoln, June 11, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. Congressman,
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 NEBRASKA,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Lincoln, Nebr., June 16, 1969.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. Congressman,
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 Sorensen 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,
NEBRASKA WATER POLLUTION CONTROL COUNCIL.

T. A. FILIP,

Executive Secretary.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Carson City, Nev., July 2, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress, 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 re-imbursable 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 construction 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,
Governor.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Trenton, N.J., 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-back 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 Subcommittee 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 re-imbursability feature, contrary to the suggestion being made by some now that it should be removed. Without re-imbursability 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 BEFORE U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIR AND WATER POLLUTION (Hearings on S. 3206 Water Quality Improvement Act of 1968, April 11, 1968)

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 sewer communities provides treatment of its waste before discharge into the receiving water. 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.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Santa Fe, July 3, 1969.

Re funding for water pollution control activities.

HON. JOHN DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: I sincerely appreciate your letter of June 6, 1969. I can with pride report that the State of New Mexico has 100% of all sewer communities complete with secondary sewage treatment facilities.

In the past several years, the State of New Mexico has not completely utilized its construction grant funds under the P.L. 660 Program. Construction needs in the State are only those necessary to keep up with increased population and industrial growth of the State.

The funding which our State requires is

in the administrative and regulatory area. We hope to improve operation of existing facilities by closer supervision. Anything which you can do to permit an increase for water pollution control funds under the State Program Grant Provision of the Federal Water Quality Act would be greatly appreciated and would benefit the State of New Mexico substantially more than an increase in construction grant funds.

Yours in water pollution control,
DAVID F. CARGO,
Governor, State of New Mexico.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Santa Fe, September 23, 1969.

Re Effect of Federal funding on water pollution control efforts.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. Representative,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: I am very pleased to hear of the support which is being mustered for full budgeting for construction grant assistance authorized by the Federal Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. As I advised in earlier correspondence, the present level of funding is sufficient for New Mexico as we are in a relative good position in regard to the physical facilities for waste treatment within the State.

I would like to advise, however, that Federal administrative procedures and staffing patterns in the Department of the Interior, FWPCA, are causing delays in the processing of grants for construction.

Basically, state and municipal government is honestly trying to curb water pollution. I very strongly recommend that fewer controls be used by the FWPCA. It would be better if states and municipalities were permitted a great deal of leeway in the processing of construction grants in order to expedite actual construction. If any fraudulent action is proven, FWPCA could always prosecute for the return of federal funds.

I sincerely hope that you and your colleagues can effect a more simple grant processing procedure for water pollution control.

Sincerely,

DAVID F. CARGO,
Governor.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
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,
Governor.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, DE-
PARTMENT OF WATER AND AIR RE-
SOURCES,
Raleigh, N.C., July 7, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Congress of the United States,
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 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,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Bismarck.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
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 pro-

gram under the Clean Water Restoration Act so that pollution control programs nationwide 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,
Member of Congress, 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 cost.

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 OHIO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbus, September 9, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: By direction of Governor Rhodes I am forwarding your letter of August 27 to the Ohio Water Development Authority, which will be much interested in your listing of local governments that have requested Federal water pollution control assistance. A copy is also going to our Water Pollution Control Board.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. McELROY,
Executive Assistance.

OHIO WATER DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY,
Columbus, Ohio, September 13, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: A copy of your letter of August 27 addressed to Governor Rhodes was forwarded to this office.

Your efforts in behalf of additional federal funding for the Federal Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 is greatly appreciated. To aid in this endeavor a press conference was held with the League of Women Voters of Ohio to obtain new media coverage. Numerous newspaper articles were written concerning the need for additional funds and excellent TV coverage was obtained.

Your list of aid applications for FWPCA Funds was appreciated.

The State of Ohio will continue to support you on this issue.

Sincerely,

NED E. WILLIAMS,
Executive Director.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Salem, June 18, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Congress of the United States,
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,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Harrisburg, June 26, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
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,
Governor.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER
Providence, September 4, 1939.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Your letter of August 27, concerning your efforts to secure full construction grant assistance for water pollution control, has been referred to me.

Thank you very much for enclosing the list of aid applications. This is important information which certainly backs up your contention that states have fallen far short of their expectations in this area.

Now, of course, Governor Licht is very much concerned about the announcement concerning a heavy cutback in federal construction projects. This could make your efforts to secure full funding for water pollution control for construction even more difficult.

I wish you all possible success in this effort. Please be assured that Governor Licht and his staff are prepared to provide any assistance you may desire.

Sincerely,

JACK THOMPSON,
Federal Coordinator.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbia, June 20, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
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,
Governor.

SOUTH CAROLINA
STATE BOARD OF HEALTH,
Columbia, S.C., June 30, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress, 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,
Member of Congress,
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	406,278
1966.....	1,302,070	449,834
1967.....	1,393,350	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,
Member of Congress, 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,
Congress of the United States,
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.

—
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICE,
DIVISION OF HEALTH,
Salt Lake City, Utah, June 26, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
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 possibly 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,

G. D. CARYLE THOMPSON, M.D.,
Director of Health.

—
STATE OF VERMONT,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Montpelier, Vt., June 30, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
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 Federal 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.

—
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Richmond, Va., 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 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 $\frac{1}{4}$ — $\frac{1}{2}$ 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.

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	4,500,000

¹ Approximate.

STATE WATER CONTROL BOARD,
Richmond, Va., September 17, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Thank you for your letter of August 27, which The Honorable Mills E. Godwin, Jr., Governor of Virginia, has forwarded to this office.

We are most interested in your drive to secure Congressional approval of more sewage treatment plant grant funds. The applications for funds in Virginia have always greatly exceeded the available money.

Sincerely,

A. H. PAESSLER,
Executive Secretary.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
Olympia, June 23, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building,
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 \$23,163,000 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 pro-

viding 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 enabling 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 principal 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.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
Madison, June 19, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives, Rayburn Office Building, 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 authorization 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 sewerage 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 3, 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.

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Thank you for your letter of June 6, 1969, expressing your concern about Federal short-funding and its impact on the District of Columbia's water pollution control program.

We will be happy to provide the information you have requested. However, it will take a few days to get it together, and I will forward it to you as soon as we have it ready.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

WALTER E. WASHINGTON,
Commissioner.

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 sewage 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. L. GUERRERO,
Governor.

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

Washington, D.C., July 10, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: This is in further response to your letter of June 6, 1969, expressing your concern about the low-level funding of the federal sewage treatment construction grants program and its impact on the District of Columbia's water pollution control program.

The principal impact of funding below authorized levels has been to upset fiscal planning. The result has been more frequent and increased use of borrowing authority to keep the construction program going. Inasmuch as loan repayments must be made from revenue, that action, in turn, has reflected the need to increase sewer rates. Thus, existing authority to increase rates and to borrow has been reduced in increasing degree. This fact, coupled with an imminent, enlarged construction program of abatement facilities, will necessitate requests to Congress for additional borrowing and rate increase authority. Although the impact on our water pollution control program has not been significant in amount up to this point, since District funding for the expanded program did not begin until F.Y. 1969, nevertheless we are now faced with the necessity of requesting additional funding authority. Our 1970 program is unfunded by approximately \$7.8 million, a large portion of which can be attributable to low-level federal funding.

According to Public Law 660, as amended, the District is eligible for grants of 55 per cent to aid with the construction of sewage treatment facilities. In order to meet water quality standards, we will need to upgrade basic treatment facilities over the next five years to remove 90 per cent of organic pollutants at a cost currently estimated at \$108 million.

The District's eligibility for construction grants on that amount would be \$59.4 million. However, full eligibility cannot be realized since the formula in the Act would limit D.C. to \$15.8 million even if appropriation of the full authorization were made. Recognizing that the Act expires in F.Y. 1971 and assuming that the present level of appropriation of \$214 million will hold, we cannot expect more than \$5.2 million on the above construction. Thus, it is obvious that local financing will have to make up the difference, \$10.2 million in this case.

In the years ahead the District is faced with extremely large expenditures for waste water treatment. I am advised that it will cost not only the \$108 million previously mentioned to upgrade our basic treatment facilities to provide 90 per cent biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) and suspended solids removal from flows expected in 1980, but, following this, additional expenditures of \$170 million for advanced waste treatment for the same flows must be contemplated if water quality standards are to be met. Increased sewer service charges and borrowing authority to be requested together with anticipated federal grants will enable us to construct and operate the basic plant only. The method of financing of the advanced waste treatment facilities has yet to be worked out. This should show you the magnitude of our problem.

I hope the above information will be helpful. If I can be of further service, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER E. WASHINGTON,
Commissioner.

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.

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR MEMORIAL DEDICATION

(Mr. McKNEALLY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of the Members of the House an important event which recently took place at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. On September 12 of this year, a magnificent statue of the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur was unveiled and dedicated. It shows the general in a characteristic pose, with his collar unbuttoned and his coat over his arm. It is reminiscent of that great general's stance as he went forth to meet the enemy on the battlefield.

What American can fail to remember with pride General MacArthur's unmatched service to this Nation. What a man he was—and especially as he is measured against the leaders of movements in the country today calling for surrender.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the speech given by Maj. Gen. Max C. Tyler, U.S. Army, retired, on the occasion of the dedication. General Tyler was a classmate of General MacArthur. He spoke eloquently and intimately of him. The exceptional qualities of our greatest general were apparent from his earliest days.

General Tyler's speech is as follows:

DEDICATION ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. MAX C. TYLER

(Dedication of Douglas MacArthur Memorial and Barracks, Sept. 11, 1969)

I thank you, General Eddleman, for this generous introduction, Mrs. MacArthur, General Eddleman, General Groves, General Koster, General Sverdrup, members of the Corps of Cadets and distinguished guests. The surviving members of the Class of 1903 are grateful for being included among you today to honor the memory of that great soldier, statesman and patriot, Douglas MacArthur. His career is history well-known to all of you. For one of his classmates to attempt to eulogize such a world famous leader of armies would be presumptuous indeed. However, he clearly displayed all the qualities of leadership in his cadet days. Perhaps a brief discussion of those days will not be considered irrelevant to this occasion. Douglas MacArthur showed up at the beginning of our plebe year as a leader of every section in academics. We immediately saw that here was no scared fumbling plebe, but a young man well prepared in academics, who knew where he wanted to go and how to get there.

He continued to lead all of our academic sections for our four years here. The "makes" were announced soon after the graduation of the Class of 1900. The Tactical Department had observed Douglas' competence in drills, parades and field exercises and his name appeared at the head of the list of cadet corporals.

In second class year, he was a senior first sergeant, and in our first class year, commanded "A" Company, the right of the line of the Corps of Cadets then consisting of six companies. He was The First Captain of the Corps of Cadets. He had a strong voice. It was said when the wind was right, his commands at battalion formations could be heard distinctly across the river. Douglas went out for baseball and in 1901 added an athletic triumph to his academic and tactical excellence. He earned the winning run in a tied game with Navy at Annapolis giving West Point the victory. No cadet either before or after his time has equaled Douglas MacArthur's distinguished record at West Point. How had he been so thoroughly prepared to lead at so young an age? Of first importance was his family. Theirs was a closely knit family with no generation gap. His father, General Arthur MacArthur, exerted a strong influence on Douglas' life and career. Their sons were taught always to be honest, to stick to the truth regardless of the cost, never to tattle, and to be gentlemen under all circumstances.

Douglas had often discussed with his father the latter's heroic performances as Adjutant of a Wisconsin volunteer infantry regiment during the Civil War for which he had been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. Thus, in his youth, Douglas became aware of the qualities which are necessary for military leadership. His father sent him to the Texas Military Academy. That was where he learned how to study. He majored in English and Speech and played shortstop on the baseball team and quarterback on the 11. He graduated there in 1897. In 1898, Douglas took a competitive examination for a West Point vacancy which would occur the following year in a Milwaukee, Wisconsin, congressional district. He won the appointment. Thus, we see him early in his

career starting to create his own opportunities. After graduation in 1903, his assignments further matured him and trained him for his future. He served in the Philippines and as aide to his father who had been detailed as observer of the Russo-Japanese War, which was followed by nine months of travel with him in Eastern Asiatic Countries. All these experiences increased his knowledge of the world, especially in Asia, our Federal Government and our Army.

In 1913, Douglas was on duty at Fort Leavenworth with Engineer Troops and was an instructor at the Army Service Schools. He was ordered to Washington and placed in charge of the State War and Navy Building.

In 1914, Europe was divided by war and the United States was threatened. Steps were being taken to strengthen our military weaknesses. Mr. Newton Baker became Secretary of War and he detailed Douglas as his Military Assistant in charge of the Bureau of Information of the War Department. Then the Secretary appointed him Press Censor and the link with the newspaper men who covered the War Department. Congress declared war on Germany in April, 1917.

The Army General Staff had recommended against the use of the National Guard in the impending conflict. Douglas, perhaps recalling his father's success with citizen soldiers, saw the situation from a different point of view. He recommended to Mr. Baker the maximum possible use be made of the National Guard. He went further, and recommended the formation of a special National Guard Division to be composed of guard units from all the states and suggested as appropriate the name of "Rainbow" for it. The Secretary of War and President Wilson quickly approved both recommendations. The Secretary of War thereupon commissioned Douglas a Colonel of Infantry in the emergency army and assigned him as Chief of Staff of the new Forty Second, "Rainbow," Division.

Douglas was now in the line of the Army where he had always wanted to be, and he had opened wide the door to his future opportunities for tremendous services to his country.

We, who were observing his progress, now realized that he had moved into a much higher league than when he led in 1903 as a cadet. His brilliant record with the Forty Second Division in battles of World War I is history known to all of you. But what he did for West Point immediately after that war also seems relevant here today. So, if you will be patient for a couple of minutes more, this rough sketch of Douglas MacArthur's early service at West Point will be completed.

When he was informed by the Chief of Staff of his appointment as Superintendent, he was also told that the Academy was forty years behind the times and in dire need of a general overhaul. Douglas was then a temporary Brigadier General. On assuming command in June, 1919, he found the Institution in disorder. Moreover, a threat of complete abandonment of the Academy required immediate action. Influential members of Congress, in response to public clamor, could not see the need for a Federal Military Academy when "The War to End All Wars" had just been won. Douglas promptly went to Washington and conferred with the interested members of Congress, many of whom he knew personally. He made such a convincing argument for the retention of the Academy that all agitation for its abandonment ceased. If Thayer was the Father of West Point, surely Douglas MacArthur was its Savior.

The demand for officers with little training had caused the course to be reduced to one year during the war. There were no upper classmen to pass on the traditions of

the Corps to the juniors. Morale was low and the Honor Code almost had been forgotten. Douglas succeeded in having the four-year course re-established. He revitalized the Honor System by placing its administration under an Honor Committee of cadets.

A few of the other changes he made show how carefully and wisely he worked. He knew from his own experience in battle that, in future wars, all of the people of the nation would participate, few of whom would have any training for military duty. In order to bring the Academy and its graduates into closer contact with the outside civilian world with which they would have to deal, he had professors visit other universities to learn of their methods of instruction and contents of their courses. He sent instructors to other universities to obtain advanced degrees. Douglas also knew that training officers in the seclusion of a monastery-like Academy, which in the past had been adequate for small regular armies, would not produce graduates competent to lead citizen soldiers. The old summer cadet encampment on the Plain was a part of the monastery system. Instead of the entertaining annual comedy presented in a setting of sentry boxes, tent floors and gravelly sentry walks, he had the campsite cleared and levelled and he had cadets assigned to arm commands for summer field maneuvers.

There was something else that Douglas felt had to be done. Physical fitness in the Army needed attention. He established intramural competition in all major sports here at the Academy. Every cadet had to participate. The program improved the physical condition of graduates, enabled them to train and coach their commands in the major sports and to spread the spirit of athletic competition throughout the Army. Looking back more than seventy years to our plebe year, the few remaining members of the Class of 1903 believe that Douglas MacArthur, who led our class during all of his cadet days, performed here as Superintendent one of the most important services of his career. He saved West Point from abandonment, he forced the Academy out of isolationism into the main stream of American life where it went on to attain its present high standing in education and athletics.

He was largely responsible for reviving the Academy's Code of: "Duty, Honor, Country," in the hearts of its graduates. All of you know how devotedly he loved this Academy. We are proud to honor his memory here with you today for what he did here for his country and for West Point.

I thank you.

SERIES ON "LAW AND THE ENVIRONMENT"

(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, the Christian Science Monitor has done a tremendous service providing an in-depth study as to the conserving of our natural resources and heritage. The latest series, "Law and Environment," by staff correspondent Robert Cahn, is no exception. Based on recent discussions between selected lawyers at Arlie House, Warrenton, Va., the series will focus on environmental problems from another point of view; namely, what legal strategies to protect the environment are available to the public against big business or big government?

There is nothing new about public concern, but perhaps the growing use of legal suits by citizens against environ-

ment-damaging construction projects is indicative of a heightened awareness of the critical status of the battle against the polluters. A "law of the environment" is very much to be desired; I am sure Members of both Houses will find the story of the evolution of such a law particularly valuable in contemplating legislation which affects the Nation's natural heritage.

The first article in the series follows:

LAW AND ENVIRONMENT—1: ENVIRONMENTALISTS BLAZE LEGAL TRAIL TO PRESERVE NATURE

(A growing concern over man's endangered environment has uncovered the lack of legal mechanisms with which to combat the danger. The following is the first in a series of articles highlighting discussions at a recent conference on law and the environment held in Warrenton, Va.)

(By Robert Cahn)

WASHINGTON.—Early in 1968, a group of California citizens and lawyers considered taking legal action to prohibit leasing of oil and gas tracts in the Santa Barbara Channel and to prohibit construction of offshore drilling facilities.

The possibility of successful legal action appeared slim and the costs of a lawsuit extremely high, so the idea was dropped. Leases were granted by the federal government, drilling was started, and in January, 1969, the now infamous Santa Barbara oil spill started.

Across the country another group of conservationists faced a different type of development which they felt would harm the environment—a six-lane expressway planned along the Hudson River near Tarrytown, N.Y.

The New York citizens group went to court. They charged four agencies of the federal government with failing to follow an 1889 law in giving a permit for a dike in the Hudson River without getting prior consent from Congress and the Cabinet department concerned.

Surprisingly, a United States district court ruled against the government, and the conservationists won a skirmish (the government is appealing the decision) in the constant battle to preserve environmental values.

ENVIRONMENTAL INTEREST RISES

All across the country these days lawsuits are being filed, lawyers are becoming concerned with environmental problems, and law schools are starting courses and programs in environmental law.

Court actions now draw the most attention. Citizens groups go to the courts as a last resort when legislation, governmental executive decisions, and public opinion have failed to halt actions which they believe are endangering the environment.

There are many causes for action: air, water, and noise pollution; loss of wilderness and open space to commercial development; dredging and filling of wetlands, rivers, and bays; effects from excessive use of fertilizers and pesticides; oil spills; radiation hazards; defacing of scenic landscape by expressways, power lines, billboards, and junk yards.

Successes in coping with these environmental influences have increased in the last few years, but have not yet produced significant national gains. For the most part, lawsuits have been useful in getting injunctions which serve as holding actions until public opinion can force a change in legislation or executive action. Or sometimes the lawsuit has brought about a modification or change in plans so that environmental effects will be negated or softened.

LITIGATION BUILDS BASE

No clear constitutional basis has developed to aid environmental interests, as has been the case, for instance, in the field of civil rights. Other theories in the common law

have not been widely enough accepted to become practical. And legislation has not caught up with the public demand for environmental protections.

One of the nation's leading trial lawyers in the environmental field, Victor J. Yannacone Jr., has stated:

"Every piece of enlightened social legislation that has come down in the past 50 or 60 years has been preceded by a history of litigation in which lawyers around the country have focused forcibly the attention of the legislature on the inadequacies of existing legislation."

In answer to conservationists' calls for a drive to stimulate attention on environmental problems through use of the courts as well as the legislatures, the first Conference on Law and the Environment was held recently at Airlie House in Warrenton, Va. The conference drew 46 participants (mostly lawyers) and about 20 observers. It was sponsored by the Conservation Foundation of Washington, D.C., and the Conservation and Research Foundation of New London, Conn.

SOME DEGRADATION ACCEPTED

Among the participants: consumer advocate Ralph Nader; Rep. Paul N. McCloskey Jr. of California; Roger P. Hansen, executive director of the Rocky Mountain Center on Environment, Denver; former Vermont Gov. Philip H. Hoff; Philip Berry, president of the Sierra Club; Raymond A. Halk, president of the Izaak Walton League of America, and Mr. Yannacone.

All except the most radical conservationists concede there may be cases in which some environmental degradation may be necessary in the overall national interest to obtain other objectives. Even then, the conservationists feel environmental concerns should at least be fully considered in planning new developments.

They say that alternatives to avoid environmental harm can be taken. They also suggest that if these alternatives will add to the cost, the public should have an opportunity to decide whether to pay more in the marketplace, or in taxes, in order to preserve a better environment.

The purpose of the conference, according to one of the instigators; Malcolm F. Baldwin of the Conservation Foundation, was "to bring together leading lawyers in this field to exchange ideas on most effective use of legal tools, to suggest new legal theories for the use of citizens in court, and to recommend programs for law schools, foundations, and conservation organizations in the emerging field of environmental law."

Some of the lawyers present felt the courts were the most responsive forums to resolve social conflicts. Others felt there were dangers in asking courts to do what legislatures are conceived to do.

Concern was expressed that too hasty an effort to bring lawsuits might result in bad law and precedents which would pose greater long-range hurdles for the environmentalist.

Some lawyers expressed views that the environment time clock is running out.

"I am still not persuaded that anything in the environment is negotiable, whether it is air or wilderness or parks or wildlife or whatever," said lawyer Brock Evans of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, Seattle. "I think we have lost too much already all around. We talk about balancing equities. We should consider what has happened in this country in the last 300 years where the balance has been all the other way."

COORDINATION SUGGESTED

A position was taken by some participants that neither the court nor the legislature nor administrative agencies could furnish all the answers independently.

"We are talking about tools, about de-

vices," said Robert Hansen. "We have to play all of these things like a string orchestra. We have to work on the legislative process. We have to work on the administrative processes. We have to engage in litigation. And we have to engage in litigation based on various theories."

For those who decide to go to court, numerous approaches were suggested by the conferees, such as using parts of the Constitution, or the trust theories from the common law, or seeking injunctions based on real or threatened damage to life or property.

Conferees agreed that both the environmental lawyer and plaintiff face great difficulties.

Compared to his adversary (often big business or big government), the citizen plaintiff involved in environmental litigation has the short end of the stick with regard to funds to carry on a case (costs often run to six figures), information sources, ability to obtain expert witnesses, and a background of substantive law.

The environmental lawyer has the added disadvantage of frequently having to deal with emotional clients who are volunteering their time for a cause (and expect the lawyer to do likewise).

Most important, as plaintiffs, the environmentalists must bear the burden of proof. They must show that a proposed new development will be ecologically or aesthetically damaging. And, the lawyers noted, in an economy dedicated to growth of the gross national product, it is difficult for courts, legislatures, or administrators to think in other than narrow economic terms.

THE KINGS AND QUEENS OF ENVIRONMENTAL DECLINE—NAME- LY, YOU AND I

(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, I have taken the liberty of lifting the title of my remarks from a speech made by Edward C. Crafts before the American Forestry Association in Colorado Springs, Colo. Many of my colleagues will know Dr. Crafts as a man who spent almost 40 years in Government service in research and program planning for the benefit of our national forests, parks and recreation areas, most recently as the first Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

The thrust of his remarks was to outline the steps necessary to reverse the trend of environmental retrogression. He lauds the legislation in force and bills contemplated to do the job, but he pulls no punches when he cites the shortcomings of what has been done or is proposed. Perhaps one of the great services Dr. Crafts has rendered in this speech is to make sense out of the multiplicity of groups, commissions, boards and bodies that are dedicated to getting the message across to Congress, the executive departments of the Government, and business leaders of all industries. He also provides a valuable working guide to the problems we face in upgrading the quality of life with his "Nine Basic Truths of Environmental Decline."

But I believe the single most important aspect of his speech is that he lays the burden of leadership responsibility at the Capitol steps. There is much wishful thinking on the part of legislators that

engineers, systems analysts and scientists will somehow solve the problems we face. Dr. Crafts notes that "the politicians and other policy officials in all walks become the ultimate key." Hereafter, leadership has come from outside the Congress. The American people are light-years ahead of Members of Congress as to an awareness of our environmental decline. In Congress we see the dotted "I's" and the crossed "t's" of legislation. The public sees the bulldozer slashing away at the wilderness, lives amidst urban sprawl, tastes and feels the sting of pollutants, and clasps his ears as the jet rattles his dinnerware.

The public support is out there for a massive congressional drive against further erosion in the quality of our lives if only Congress will bite the "hot bullet" and respond.

Dr. Crafts outlines seven hard steps which must be taken to reverse the trend of environmental retrogression. Not everyone will agree with the particular steps outlined but a plan of action is necessary and Dr. Crafts provides one approach.

To conclude his remarks, Dr. Crafts quotes one of the most moving statements ever made as to why one must be concerned with the quality of our lives. In making the decision to turn from the technological race to the race for human survival, Charles Lindbergh made some "enshrined" comments. One brief sentence of Lindbergh's statement may serve as reason enough to convince our colleagues to read the full text of Dr. Crafts' remarks. Lindbergh said:

I believed some of the policies we were following to insure our near-future strength and survival were likely to lead to our distant-future weakness and destruction.

The text of the speech by Dr. Crafts follows:

WILL POLLUTION WIN THE PUBLIC LANDS?

(Remarks by Edward C. Crafts at the 94th Annual Meeting of the American Forestry Association, Colorado Springs, Colorado, September 24, 1969.)

The Nation's press, public figures and eminent scientists all overflow these days with pieties of abhorring the environmental degradation of the United States.

Environmental quality is the catch phrase of today, just as conservation and outdoor recreation were the phrases of yesteryear. Everyone is trying to get on the band wagon; environment is not clearly defined; it apparently covers just about everything; and there is much talk but relatively little action when compared to real needs.

Environmental retrogression is being prostituted in opposite ways by both dedicated do-gooders and industrial polluters. Despite the flow of rhetoric only a handful of national leaders really understand the seriousness of the threat to America and are trying to save the Nation. One problem is that the term can mean so many different things and is so all-inclusive as to be almost self-defeating.

Let us express some basic truths and then look at the major symptoms of environmental deterioration including some environmental issues on public lands.

1. Man's environment generally is considered to be everything outside his own body. The scope immediately becomes overwhelming. Environment must be broken down into some of its more important components for rational consideration. To our best knowledge, and this appears to be sup-

ported by recent photos of the moon and Mars, the world's environment is unique in the solar system—possibly in the universe. Our unique combination of atmosphere, water in liquid form, and land first spawned life and then man.

2. The growing danger is that man will destroy himself by degrading the environment to where it is no longer livable. This degradation is being caused by man's failure to dispose adequately of his waste products. It results from his misuse of technological know-how.

3. Failure to use properly man's scientific knowledge is causing serious water, air, and land pollution, pesticide poisoning, and improper disposal of solid waste. The worst polluter of all is the automobile with its internal combustion engine. Generally the finger is pointed most accusingly at the mining, chemical, steel and utility industries as the foremost polluters. But let us not forget the road builders, construction industry, real estate developers, timber depleters, and our misdesigned, smog-laden, slum-ridden cities.

4. The motivations that cause environmental degradation are the desire for profits, creature comforts, status living, social conformity, and material affluence.

5. Man can learn about—but he cannot alter—the natural laws of this earth nor the solar system. To survive he must control the technological apparatus by which knowledge of those earthly laws is put to practical use.

6. If there are certain industrial "princes of pollution," the kings and queens of environmental decline are the men and women of the world,—namely you and I. We have it in our power in countless ways to halt the downward trend and maintain the biotic balance between nature and man that is essential to survival of the species.

7. However, the price runs against our grain, and against "progress." It includes a social ethic for the environment, control of the world's population, willingness to fore-swear profits, pay greater taxes, and higher prices, reduce the material standard of living, sacrifice certain creature comforts, educate ourselves and our children, revise social priorities, raise sufficient public opinion against principal industrial offenders to compel change, and an ability to recognize the point of no return before it is too late. In short, the people of this Nation must develop a consciousness and determination regardless of individual, corporate, or collective sacrifice. We as a people must be willing to bite the hot bullet.

8. The main deterrents to correction are neither scientific nor technological. They are social, economic, and political.

9. At stake is man's survival. The environmental threat is no less certain than that of unleashed nuclear weapons. But it is far less dramatic, less sudden, and more insidious. Thus it is far more dangerous.

SYMPTOMS OF ENVIRONMENTAL DETERIORATION

Generally speaking there are three resources subject to environmental pollution—air, water, and land. All of the air, nearly all of water, and much of the land is in the public domain. Therefore consideration of environment needs to be much broader than the scope of "public lands" as generally referred to in the United States.

Pesticides, solid waste, heat and noise are important kinds of pollution; but in reality they are causes, each of which adversely affects more than one of the three basic environmental resources.

Air has its visible and invisible contaminants with the latter the more serious. The principal sources of air pollution include autos, trucks, busses, jet planes, factories, garbage and city dumps, pesticides, heating and power plants. All of us recall big city smogs, heat-inversions, haze, belching

smokestacks, dust bowls, and forest fires. The air over most of the East Coast from Maine to Florida is polluted up to 20 or 30 thousand feet.

Of all, the automobile is the worst offender. But despite great talk of auto safety, little beyond research has been done yet about that most dangerous source of all,—the exhaust pipe. Smog in Los Angeles would be ended if gasoline sales were banned in southern California.

Noise is another form of air pollution that is increasingly serious. The growing noise pollution is traceable to big city din, trucks and railroads, jet planes and jetports, sonic booms, interstates, turnpikes, beltways, and expressways, and the construction industry.

Water is polluted from soil erosion, sewage, industrial, agricultural, and consumer waste of all kinds, and of course always pesticides. Most major rivers of the Nation are polluted as are many minor streams. Lake Erie may be dying. So may Lake Tahoe whose color is changing from blue to green. The Coho salmon of Lake Michigan are contaminated. Estuaries and wetlands are disappearing to high rises and condominiums. Even the oceans are becoming dumping grounds for trash, sewage, and chemicals. Disaster points such as the oil off Santa Barbara are fresh in mind. Who wants poisonous gas stored near Denver; but on the other hand what would be the long-range effect of dumping such gas in the ocean. Oceans are an increasingly common receptacle for junk and other solid waste all the way from automobiles to beer cans. Oceans too are the end of the line for persistent pesticides, much industrial waste, and chemical effluents.

Thermal pollution, mainly from nuclear power generators raises the temperature of rivers and lakes, and possibly in due time even the oceans to the point of affecting sea life in unknown ways and the polar ice caps with possibly disastrous results through flooding the continents and destruction of man.

Land pollution is multitudinous and diverse in character. Pesticides upset the biotic balance, erosion and construction tear the land apart and deface it. Examples are endless and include overcutting the forest, overgrazing the range, suburban sprawl, urban slums, plebeian design of cities and structures, over-crowding our parks, highways splattering ribbons of concrete across the landscape, strip mines, utility lines, litter, advertising signs, trash, junk yards, industrial decay, and ad infinitum.

WHAT IS BEING DONE?

At long last the Nation's press is coming alive. Scarcely a day passes without feature articles about the deteriorating environment appearing in leading newspapers, magazines or the Congressional Record.

There is a baffling maze of Federal and State legislation, public programs, trade associations and other private groups, universities and research organizations, all either pushing one aspect or another of environmental improvement, or conversely protecting a special interest.

Presently 11 Federal departments and 16 independent agencies are engaged in environmental matters.

The United Nations is convening a World Conference on the Environment in 1972.

DDT has been banned in Sweden and Denmark. About 10 States either have restricted its use or are considering such action. Michigan has impounded the salmon from Lake Michigan because of excessive DDT in their tissue.

There are other good signs. Maryland is the first State to require undergrounding of all utility lines in new construction. The Department of Agriculture has cut back the use of persistent pesticides in Federal-State insect control programs, but this accounts for only 1 percent of total consumption. Jet

planes and autos are scheduled for partially-effective emission-control devices by 1970 or 1971. California has taken steps to save San Francisco Bay. Reynolds Aluminum is paying \$200 a ton for discarded cans. Time magazine is running a new weekly section on the "Environment." The jets versus the Everglades has become a cause celebre and there is hope. The promise of peaceful use of nuclear energy is challenged by the fear of contamination.

New magazines, newsletters and organizations are springing up such as the Environmental Defense Fund, Committee for Environmental Information, Environmental Clearing House, and an ad hoc Committee on Environment consisting only of members of Congress.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has created recently a Secretary's Commission on Pesticides and their Relationship to Environmental Health.

Out of the vast array of literature of the last five years, reports of the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, the Environmental Pollution panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty, the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Science and Technology are outstanding. But their recommendations are far from being implemented.

Last May the President by Executive Order created a coordinating Environmental Quality Council, chaired by himself, and with six Cabinet officers and the Vice-President as members. The Council has met twice in contrast to the comparable Urban Affairs Council which has met about 20 times. The Council is to be staffed by the Office of Science and Technology which is the wrong place because the problems of environment are not primarily scientific.

The President established a Citizens' Advisory Committee chaired by Laurence Rockefeller. In its first report, the Committee chided Congress for the gap between authorizations and appropriations.

The new Council and Advisory Committee are a continuation and broadening of the former Council and Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty. So far they have done little and created little enthusiasm. The House has cut funds for staff support. The objectivity and independence of Cabinet Officers is questioned as well as whether the President has the time to chair the Council personally.

Congress is bestirring itself. It probably will enact a strengthened water pollution control act. Also it has numerous bills before it to create a full-time Environmental Council with its own staff and wholly independent of the executive departments and agencies. Such a Council would closely parallel the Council of Economic Advisors. In the 90th Congress there were some 120 bills on environmental quality. By the close of this Congress there may be an even larger number.

The Senate recently passed a "National Environmental Policy Act of 1969" sponsored by Senator Henry Jackson and others. The House and Senate also are moving on related bills by Congressman Dingell and Senator Muskie.

Among other things Senator Jackson's bill: (1) establishes a National policy that the Federal Government shall use "all practicable means" to see that each person has a healthful environment; (2) directs that each Federal agency interpret its policies and laws to implement the National Environmental Policy; and (3) establishes a 3-man full time Board of Environmental Quality Advisors appointed by and responsible only to the President and with adequate staff. Duties would include appraising Federal programs and the environmental state of the Nation for the President and the Congress.

Senator Jackson predicts:

"The law will immediately hit the Atomic Energy Commission's nuclear power program by requiring the AEC to curb thermal pollution. It will have an immediate impact on all defense programs—everything from the siting of ABM missiles to chemical and biological warfare. It will affect federally financed highway programs and every Army Corps of Engineers project."

Surely some sweeping, across the Board, and overriding measures of this nature is needed. No piecemeal approach can do the job. Already on the statute books but not doing the job adequately, partly because of colossal under-financing, are some major Congressional enactments as the Air Quality, Clean Air, Water Pollution Control, Solid Wastes Disposal, Water Resources, Clean Waters Restoration, Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide, Federal Food and Drug and Cosmetic, Fish and Wildlife Pesticide, and Pesticide Research acts.

The best features of the Jackson-Muskie-Dingell bills should be enacted in this Congress. Then there would be over-all legislation with teeth and an independent overview and coordination body responsible only to the President and the Congress

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ON PUBLIC LANDS

I know the theme of this meeting is the destiny of public lands, meaning in general those lands under the purview of the Public Land Law Review Commission. But in relating to environment, "public" should mean the broader concept of all public lands—Federal, State, and local—as well as the public air and water

The issue of environmental quality transcends by far the more conventional questions of fair market value, revenue sharing, and private rights and privileges on public lands.

How much is enough is the real question. This means how far do we push our environment downhill in order to enjoy the fruits of technological knowledge, and can we detect the point of no return far enough ahead to not go over the brink of a snow-balling irreversibility? It all comes down finally to a judgment balance between what technology can supply and what biology can stand. This is why politicians and other policy officials in all walks become the ultimate key rather than scientists and engineers.

With big cities the core of environmental deterioration, and with degradation usually diminishing as the distance increases, one might conclude that the far countryside where much of the Federal public lands are located would be in little danger. Not so! You have only to read "Threatened America," "Last Chance to Save the Everglades," "Peaceful Atom Sparks a War" all in recent issues of *Life Magazine*; or "Polluted Air—Potent New Selective Force in Our Forests," in the *Journal of Forestry*, or "Pests, Pesticides and People" by the Conservation Foundation and The American Forestry Association, to conclude otherwise.

You have only to be an administrator of public lands to know otherwise. Following are a few other examples in all of which the long-term issue is environmental management versus destructive development, or continuing utilization of resources versus destructive landscape alteration:

1. Conflict between environmental protection and "progress" is the proposed jetport in south Florida versus the Everglades National Park, as is the proposed jetport in St. Thomas at the expense of wetlands, lagoons, island beauty and the Virgin Islands National Park. Recent press reports on the Everglades sound favorable. But the final decision on the Everglades jetport could well be the first test for the President's new Environmental Quality Council and Advisory Committee as well as a revelation of President Nixon's own environmental philosophy.

2. Why is mining permitted to continue for 25 years after establishment of Forest Service wilderness areas? Why won't Con-

gress intervene at Miner's Ridge to stop Kennecott Copper inside the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area? The reason in both cases is mining industry's desire for profits and pressure on vote-conscious members of Congress. The result is violation of wilderness of which there is so little left. Wilderness is irreplaceable America.

3. There are environmental public land issues in this State of which a proposed interstate through a wilderness and a proposed Forest Service timber sale taken to court are examples.

4. The construction of an expressway through Humboldt Redwood State Park in California caused such an outcry that hopefully the continuation of the expressway will by-pass two other redwood State parks, both of which are within the Redwood National Park.

5. People over-crowding of the National Parks is acute. The crunch will become greater as more and more people come to the parks on one hand, and as most acreage in the parks is classified as legal wilderness on the other. Here is real environmental conflict, the only solution appearing to be both restricting visitor numbers in the parks and accommodating over-night visitors on outside surrounding lands which often are national forests or other public land.

6. The high-timber yield bill directed at National Forests and ardently advocated by the West Coast timber industry would be an environmental intrusion by overriding the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act, the judgment balance of administrators, making optimum timber yield the management objective, and requiring moneys to be spent where the need is not greatest.

Large clear-cuttings in redwoods and Douglas fir that look like a battlefield, plus slash accumulations and timberland lying idle from fires or cutting is environmental destruction of the worst sort.

I recall Congressman Poage of the House Agriculture Committee in flying over both private and national forest timberlands on the west slope of the Washington Cascades registering shock at what he saw and later writing to thank me for showing him the national forests that had trees as well as those that did not.

7. The Mineral King controversy between recreation for winter sports versus keeping a wild valley wild and forestalling an access road through a National Park has caused the Sierra Club to go to court with initial success. This is a conflict solely between a people's varying cultural desires, one group for wilderness and one for winter sports. In this instance economics is not a key determinant.

8. Finally there is Alaska. Must the oil of the northern slopes ruin the priceless domain under the care of the Interior Department including the forest, wetlands, and the irreplaceable habitat for wildlife. The balance of nature is delicate at best in Alaska. Here perhaps is the ultimate testing ground in the United States as to whether the American people can and will harmonize technological progress with a delicately balanced environment.

Now to summarize: The chemical industry produces effluents and the chlorinated hydrocarbons that pollute our air, water, land, fish, animals, and man. The auto and highway industries pollute the air and desecrate the landscape. The utility and steel industries pollute the air, water and land. The mining industry with its strip mining in the East and Midwest, and pit and deep mines in the West destroy the land. Real estate developers with their urban sprawl, shopping centers, industrial parks erode the land, spoil the landscape, and offend the senses. These are the industrial big six.

But do not blame the industries as much as yourself. Responsibility is shared by each of us, by the American way of life, and by unwillingness to bite the hot bullet.

The Nation's population and material afflu-

ence is overdrawing and despoiling its natural resources and pushing the environment toward a danger point of no return. It may take a killing heat inversion along the eastern megalopolis, or some other catastrophe to shake up this Nation sufficiently to take action. Unfortunately Americans usually react after crises rather than before.

Absolutely essential to survival is restoration of harmonious balance between people and the laws of nature. To reverse the trend of environmental retrogression there are at least seven hard steps that are unavoidable. These are population control, higher taxes, higher consumer prices, lower corporate profits, lower material standard of living, revision of National priorities and coercion. These are hard prospects but they are not fantasy.

Finally, may every administrator of public land, holder of public office, board chairman, corporation president, and policy maker of every sort keep in mind the words of Charles Lindberg when making the hard decision:

"I had become alarmed about the effect our civilization was having on continents and islands my military missions took me over—the slashed forests, the eroded mountains, the disappearing wilderness and wildlife. I believed some of the policies we were following to insure our near-future strength and survival were likely to lead to our distant-future weakness and destruction."

"After millions of years of successful evolution, human life is now deteriorating genetically and environmentally at an alarming and exponential rate. Basically, we seem to be retrograding rather than evolving. We have only to look about us to verify this fact; to see megalopolizing cities, the breakdown of nature, the pollution of air, water and earth; to see crime, vice and dissatisfaction webbing like a cancer across the surface of our world."

"We know that tens of thousands of years ago, man departed from both the hazards and the security of instinct's natural selection, and that his intellectual reactions have become too powerful to permit him ever to return."

"That is why I have turned my attention from technological progress to life, from the civilized to the wild. In wilderness there is a lens to the past, to the present and to the future, offered to us for the looking—a direction, a successful selection, and an awareness of values that confronts us with the need for and the means of our salvation. Let us never forget the wilderness has developed life, including the human species. By comparison, our own accomplishments are trivial."

PRESIDENT BOYD OF THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Wil- lard L. Boyd is the new president of the University of Iowa. He brings to this position some outstanding credentials and background. He is well qualified to deal with the incredibly complex problem of running a modern university community. I have the greatest confidence in President Boyd, and look forward to even greater studies by the University of Iowa.

President Boyd recently addressed the faculty, and made a very thought-provoking analysis of some of the problems faced. I would especially like to call the attention of my colleagues to President Boyd's plea for additional Federal support for instruction as well as research.

His speech follows:

AN ADDRESS TO THE FACULTY BY PRESIDENT
WILLARD L. BOYD, THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA,
SEPTEMBER 16, 1969

No time has been without its problems. Our time is no different. As in all times, simple solutions are sought. Some advocate destruction, some repression; many stand aloof and only criticize. Reasoned action is too often the exception and difficult to pursue in a confusing melee of jumbled slogans and conflicting interests.

These approaches are applied no less to higher education than to other social issues. They exist both within and without our universities and colleges. Most people today agree that there is something radically, or conservatively, wrong with higher education. That is the extent of their agreement. The country abounds with experts on our inadequacies and each has his different panacea. On and off the campus the slogans oversimplify the causes—

"Publish or perish"—those who publish are poor teachers or teach not at all

"Berkeley"—anything and everything about the University of California at Berkeley is bad per se

"Too much or too little Ivory tower"—we should run society, or society should run us, or we should have nothing to do with society

"Evil university presidents"—viewed by some as too permissive, by others as too repressive, and by most as arbitrary and obscene managers.

Internally, we flail away at ourselves with gusto and relish. When we cannot agree, we say we cannot trust each other, and then we invite outsiders to make our decisions. When they begin to do so, we say we cannot trust them either. Our belief in institutional autonomy seems to depend on what it yields on a specific issue rather than on the basic soundness of the concept.

I believe we should be committed to institutional autonomy. By saying this, I do not deny our accountability for the stewardship of the institution. Accountability is the protection the public and future students have against any corrupt practices by the present administration, faculty, staff, and students. Nevertheless, we must assert our autonomy if we are to achieve individuality as an institution. It is the curse of American higher education that there is so little diversity. Too many colleges and universities seek to emulate the same model. The pressure is great for us to comply with the standardizations set for us by the scholarly, professional, accrediting, governmental and other external groups which consist of academicians as well as laymen.

The critical issue for this academic community is whether we should seek institutional and individual uniqueness. Iowa is distinctive in a time of multiversities. Not only are all of its colleges physically present on one campus, but they are also intellectually present. The core of the University is arts and sciences surrounded by well integrated professional colleges. Several years ago it might have been said that Iowa was only a collection of autonomous colleges. With the development of a University-wide Faculty Senate and continued adherence to a single graduate college there is a growing sense of university. Increased interaction breaks down academic isolation, and educational perspectives are broadened beyond narrow disciplines.

University-wide interaction should not lead to excessive central administration. A single university should be pluralistic and decentralized in administration if individuality is to be accentuated. Whatever the level of administration, it must be remembered that people, not structures, make a great university. Since I feel that flexibility is essential to academic planning, I am ever mindful of the comment that organization is the enemy of improvisation.

Hearing me emphasize the importance of people, you will understand why I do not stress job description. However, I do want to indicate generally the responsibilities of the central academic officers. I am delighted that Mr. Heffner has returned as Provost of the University. His responsibilities are university-wide, and he is the chief executive officer of the institution in my absence. His office will be principally concerned with academic affairs. Mr. Hubbard will continue to work with the student personnel units, the Council on Teaching, the Afro-American Studies Committee, and other instructional programs. Mr. Chambers will serve as director of summer session and will coordinate budget planning, including the collection of data for the several external studies of the institution which are under way. In addition to his duties with the hospitals, Dr. Hardin will work with the Provost in health affairs planning throughout the University. Dean Spriestersbach's role as Vice President is broader than his title implies because of the inseparability of research and teaching. For example, he and his associates aid faculty and students in the development of programs and in seeking funds to support both instructional and research projects. All of these colleagues along with the other members of the central administration and the deans are dedicated to the advancement of the University.

If we are to be a university, as opposed to a multiversity, we must be concerned as a university with all aspects of the institution including its core—the educational program. Since the educational program is primarily the responsibility of the faculty, the Faculty Senate has appropriately established a Committee on the Future of the University. In my judgment the time has come for a reevaluation of the University's educational programs and goals. To accomplish this I recommend that the Committee, in consultation with the Provost, initiate a study of the University which will be continuing in nature. As I pointed out to you in my July letter concerning budget, this Committee should develop liaison with students, staff, and administration in carrying out its charge.

Having said this I probably should say no more. Traditionally university presidents are not supposed to talk about education since this is the province of the faculty and the deans. More recently, university presidents are not supposed to have the time to do so. Yet I am foolish enough to make some comments about the educational issues before us. Most of our academic talk centers on who will decide these issues, not what ought to be decided or how well they will be decided. The debate too often concerns procedure instead of substance. I hope continual self-study will enable us to get to substance—to determine why we do what we do and how we can do it better. We above all should be open-minded in our own ways and amenable to change.

I approach self-study with the attitude that we seek opportunities for students, not prestige among our peers; that we encourage diversity, not uniformity; and that we are willing to be imaginative and flexible in the use of existing as well as new funds.

Self-study has to be more than financial analysis. It must reflect ends and means, not only at the University level but also at the collegiate and departmental level. The Committee on the Future of the University could undertake a general analysis of the goals of the University while the colleges, departments, and other units are simultaneously undertaking their individual analyses. Some of the information will be required in January for the preparation of our 1971 legislative requests which must be submitted to the Board of Regents in May 1970. After the initial self-study it would be useful if the various units were to submit annual or biennial

reports on their programs and activities. In addition to initial self-analysis and periodic reports, much could be derived from a coordinated and comprehensive system of departmental review. Such a system should cover all units over a five-year period. This process is now occurring in the medical school and the idea is being discussed in the Graduate Council. Review committees consisting primarily of persons from other disciplines within the University can expand the understanding of both the reviewed and the reviewers.

What are the questions we ought to ask in a self-study and review? Generally they relate to purpose, faculty, students, teaching, research, service, and fiscal support. To know about the whole of the University, we must know from its parts what are their objectives, their role in the university, their means to achieve these objectives, their priorities, and their method for planning. Specifically we must look at enrollment and admission policies; number of student applications; student mix; distribution of enrollment among programs including service courses, majors, graduate, and post-doctoral; student-teacher ratios; class sizes; number of courses taught; faculty and student recruitment and retention; number of students graduated; length of time required for degrees; distribution and evaluation of the effort of faculty, students, staff and administration; need and effectiveness of student advising; role of teaching and research assistants; curriculum objectives and instructional methods; plans to add, drop or consolidate programs and courses; participation by faculty, students, staff and administration in departmental affairs; professional contributions and service by faculty such as clinical assignments and off-campus teaching; sources and adequacy of fiscal support including size of faculty and supporting staff, compensation, space, equipment, library, and computer center; opportunities for efficiencies in operation; extent and need of program liaison with secondary schools, community colleges, and four-year colleges; reports of accrediting agencies; intra- and interinstitutional programs and exchanges; and comparable data from other institutions, both similar and dissimilar.

No matter how extensive the data collected, the hard task of assessing quality remains. This is finally a subjective determination requiring the exercise of judgment. Like happiness, quality is an elusive state which can be defined variously but cannot be standardized. Nevertheless, we seek quality as a university. Surely quality involves more than the Carter Report.

Before the quality of The University of Iowa can be determined, it is essential to fix its mission. Through sustained self-study and review, objectives can be constantly examined and consciously altered. The objectives of this University cannot be determined in a vacuum. We are affected by educational developments in Iowa, the region, and the nation. There ought to be different kinds of educational institutions with different missions in Iowa and elsewhere. I do not believe that one educational institution can be all things to all people. Moreover, I do not think that any combination of different educational institutions ought to try to do everything. It is unsound to have courses and degrees in everything.

Accordingly, I argue for a limited mission for this University. Historically, state universities have expressed the threefold purposes of teaching, research, and service. In practice this set of objectives can encompass anything and all things. It is necessary for us to decide how much we can do well and what balance ought to be struck among our objectives.

I prefer to think that teaching and research are the service of the University. We not only must disseminate knowledge; we also

must create it. Students of all ages are exposed to our teaching and research through classrooms and publications, before and after graduation, on or off the campus, with or without credit, formally and informally. Because of research, we are a producer of new ways and not just a teacher of old ways. Teaching and research are questioning processes. It is the work of scholars to examine and evaluate. Thus the university also serves as social critic and auditor. Since change is constant, there is no status quo, and universities are needed to lead the way for change. It is not enough for the university merely to reflect the present for as Robert Hutchins said a long time ago, "It (must) illumine rather than reflect; it (must) be a beacon rather than a mirror."

Whom does the University serve? In recent years we have re-emphasized The University of Iowa's commitment to professional, graduate, and continuing education. At the same time we have favored the development of comprehensive community colleges and have phased out our vocational-technical programs. We have not been as clear in our posture toward undergraduate education. We acknowledge the need to provide the junior and senior years for community college transfer students, and we have assumed that our undergraduate distribution will shift markedly to the upper division. To achieve this, considerable cooperative educational planning is yet required of the faculties of the community colleges and the Regent institutions. But what about freshmen and sophomores? The college-bound student should have a variety of institutions open to him. I feel that a university, like a community college and a four-year liberal arts college, offers much to the new college student. For example, it can offer a greater number and breadth of arts and science programs than many of the colleges. Further, freshmen and sophomores add much to a university. After all, they are the freshest minds and frequently ask the most penetrating questions since they are not encumbered by all of the knowledge that burdens the rest of us. While maintaining our commitment to professional, graduate, and continuing education, I contend that this University ought to maintain a strong commitment to undergraduate education.

In determining mission, every institution faces the question of optimum enrollment. No fool-proof formula exists to determine appropriate size. We do know that limited enrollments will not eliminate student unrest or reduce costs. Student concern exists in small colleges as well as in large universities. Fiscal support must continue to expand if quality is to be advanced in an institution of a fixed size.

Even though The University of Iowa is by far the smallest CIC state university, it is the most concerned about growing too large. In recent years we have sought to control our enrollments. The admission policies of all colleges except Liberal Arts have been modified to permit more selective admissions. At the request of the Board of Regents a similar proposal for Liberal Arts has been deferred because there is a single admission policy for all Regent freshmen except our engineering students. The rate of increase in the Graduate College enrollment was reduced when the category of unclassified students was dropped. In addition, the other two Regent institutions and the community colleges are growing faster than we at the freshman level. As a result of these and other factors, the enrollment growth at the University has been slowed so that in 1968-69 we had an enrollment of 19,500 students as opposed to an earlier projection of 22,500.

Now the issue is, should other steps be taken to limit enrollment? We should consider the following:

1. Enrollment quotas. Since graduate and professional studies are the fastest growing

section of higher education, we should examine the desirability of setting quotas in these areas. Each graduate department and professional college could determine the number of students it should serve in the future. Attention is already being given to this problem. A given area's decision might be to hold at the present size, to decrease, or to increase. It may be best to expand expensive programs at Iowa City rather than duplicate them elsewhere. Such was the basis for the decision in the early 1960's to enlarge the enrollments of the health colleges in the 70's.

2. Reduction of enrolled time. To provide opportunities for more students, the time required to secure a degree could be reduced. This can be done in at least two ways:

a. Full-time study could be required of all students unless special circumstances warranted a reduced load for a period of time. Such a requirement should not preclude the expansion of economic opportunity programs for students who need a longer time in which to finish. Full-time study also makes it possible for such curricular options as variable credit.

b. The time required for a degree could be shortened. Is it necessary or tradition that dictates four years for the baccalaureate, the M.D. and the D.D.S., three years for Law, five years for Pharmacy, to say nothing of the lengthening period for graduate study? We need to ask whether high schools should not extend their college preparatory work so that such requirements as language could be satisfied before college; whether higher education is educating students or merely stuffing them with information; and whether we are justified in deferring the entry of students into full-fledged adulthood for so long. These are questions which we ought to examine with a willingness not to be bound by time-worn traditions.

How can we best educate our students? Many answers can be given and many are correct. Ultimately, however, the answer lies in the quality of the faculty. The individual faculty member has a more profound effect on the student than any curriculum plan. Therefore, the recruitment and retention of able and energetic faculty members is paramount.

What are among the factors essential to the flourishing of a stimulating faculty?

First—There must be an atmosphere of free inquiry. As stated in the AAU Statement on The Rights and Responsibilities of Universities and Their Faculties:

"... A university must... be hospitable to an infinite variety of skills and viewpoints, relying upon open competition among them as the surest safeguard of truth. Its whole spirit requires investigation, criticism, and presentation in an atmosphere of freedom and mutual confidence. This is the real meaning of 'academic freedom.' It is essential to the achievement of its ends that the faculty of a university be guaranteed this freedom.... To enjoin uniformity of outlook upon a university faculty would put a stop to learning at the source."

Second—The faculty should have diverse backgrounds. In the selection of faculty we should ask as much of ourselves as we do of those who do business with us. Not only should we look for minority faculty members where they are most likely to be found, but we should also have programs designed to increase their numbers. Appropriately, this University through the Graduate College is playing a major part in the development of a C.I.C. Ph. D. program to increase the numbers of available minority faculty members.

Third—There must be adequate opportunities for the professional development of faculty members. If the practitioner is outdated at 40, what of the faculty member? He too must revalidate his credentials. Perhaps he should even have a second academic ca-

reer, for we cannot afford to limit him perpetually to the subjects he studied in graduate school. Instead of more study, he may simply need to get outside the academy to broaden his outlook. Leaves of absence with or without pay and academic load adjustments must be utilized to protect our enormous investment in the faculty.

Fourth—the faculty member must be protected from himself. His work needs evaluation if he is to realize his fullest potential. Unfortunately, many of us regard our classroom performance as our most private act. Like a student, however, a teacher is not the best judge of his own performance. Informally, he ought to consult with his students and colleagues in order to improve his teaching. In discussing the components of good college teaching with students, he can demonstrate that the way to assess his load is not by the number of hours spent in the classroom but rather by the total number of hours a week he devotes to his work. Formally, departmental reviews afford an excellent opportunity for evaluation.

Besides knowing more about himself within his discipline, the faculty member needs to know more about the interrelationship of disciplines. Hence he should seek, not shun, interdisciplinary teaching and research with other faculty and students.

The interrelationship of faculty and students is manifested in the curriculum. As I have already indicated, it ought not be our curricular aim to stuff each other with information. Instead the purpose of the curriculum should be to develop the student's analytical capacity and his ability to reason from the specific to the general. This objective can be attained in many ways. In a university we should have multiple approaches to instruction so that diverse students and faculty can be drawn out in the most effective way. There is no single best curriculum or instructional method. Curriculum should be under constant review. Few "innovations" will result for most have been previously tried. A major value of curriculum revision lies in the ferment it creates. Curriculum ferment motivates faculty and students, and this in itself is an essential element of the educational process. Furthermore, we can never be satisfied with what we are doing. There cannot be a status quo for us any more than there can be for the rest of society. Curricular review is needed as much at the graduate and professional level as it is at the undergraduate.

Curricular diversity does not mean that it is necessary or even desirable that a university attempt to cover all fields of knowledge. A university should not overextend itself intellectually or financially. We should be conservative and should add new disciplines, subdisciplines, and levels of study sparingly. This has been Iowa's posture, and I recommend our continued adherence to that policy.

Nowadays there is much student concern about the relevancy of curriculum at all levels. Is "relevancy" really relevant to a curriculum discussion? I say yes. Although I persistently demonstrate that I am not omniscient, I think there are three parts to the matter of curricular relevancy. First is the wish to have "how to do it" courses, more occupationalism; second is the need to relate specialized knowledge to the broader problems of society; and third is the desire to be involved with society. I am sympathetic to the second and third parts but not the first.

These are my reasons.

First—"How to do it" courses and excessive occupationalism are highly impractical because they limit the student's long-range flexibility. Although there may be a need for familiarity with some core knowledge, the course content approach locks the graduate into the current state of knowledge. Anyway, the amount of knowledge in even the sub-specialties is so extensive that one can never learn it all. Some of our professional

areas are wisely beginning to de-emphasize specialization and course sequences. The shift is from training to analysis to permit greater career flexibility. On-the-job training and continuing education programs can be relied upon effectively to impart skills and information to our graduates as their careers unfold. By taking this more fundamental approach, the College of Business Administration is doing more for its students than if it were to grant purely occupational bachelor's and master's degrees. We will do an injustice to our students if we yield to undue occupationalism.

Second—Specialization is a narrowing process; it causes us to back off from the broader issues about which we know less. We need to be generalists as well as specialists. An educated person must be able to put his share of knowledge into a worthwhile whole. Presumably higher education facilitates this through general education, but general education is currently caught in the vice between career-oriented students and specialty-minded faculty. All of us are restive about this and assert that we should redress the balance. This is up to us—not to those faculty members whom we may appoint at some future time when we have the money. For is it not also true that today's graduate programs accentuate specialization—so where will these broader gauged people come from if not from among ourselves?

Numerous suggestions have been made which could prove useful. General education can come at the beginning, at the end or throughout one's academic career. The residence halls could well play a large role in the general education program for freshmen and sophomores. Since specialization is narrowing, the senior interdisciplinary seminars which the Liberal Arts College is instituting can be a powerful antidote. Perhaps students who have their disciplines well in mind as freshmen should go directly to them and use their junior and senior years for breadth.

Whenever this is done, there ought to be concern for problem courses and seminars. These offerings should be interdisciplinary and should deal with large complex problems such as poverty and war. To this end we should encourage Afro-American, comparative, human rights and similar studies which cut across disciplines. Several ways have been suggested as economical approaches.

a. Establish a University College—One alternative would be a college with no faculty, like the Graduate College and the Extension Division. Students would be admitted who seek functional majors, ad hoc majors, or general studies. They would be able to take courses offered throughout the university pursuant to a plan of study agreed upon with a faculty advisor. Another variation of a university college would be a credit awarding unit which might engage fifteen different faculty members each year for a portion of their time to offer interdisciplinary problem-centered courses and seminars. Credits earned in the university college would then be acceptable at the discretion of the individual departments and colleges.

b. Establish a faculty teaching requirement—This idea suggests that each faculty member be required to teach periodically an interdisciplinary course or seminar. This might be added as one of the criteria for promotion. The point is to replace an existing discipline-oriented course with a broader one.

c. Establish a course development support program—This suggestion is to beg or borrow—but not steal—enough funds to establish a program of summer support or partial regular semester support to afford a limited number of faculty members the time necessary to develop interdisciplinary problem-centered courses of substantial interest throughout the University.

Besides "how to do it" courses and interdisciplinary study, there is a third aspect of relevancy. Students are anxious to be involved. They want to apply the knowledge they are acquiring. This is nothing new. Practice teaching, legal aid, health clinics, and archeological digs are a few well accepted examples. If the development of social awareness is desirable, then we ought to encourage more field experiences. The Extension Division and the Office of Student Affairs are available to help provide these outside opportunities through their wide contacts. We should also cooperate with our sister Regent and CIC universities to provide rural and urban work-study experiences.

Whatever the curriculum, rigor should be stressed. The study of new or different subject matter or the use of new or different methods of instruction is neither an excuse, nor a request, for lower standards. Quite the contrary, they are frequently more demanding of us than the old and familiar.

Along with the need for intellectual vigor, we must be mindful of human passion. The interrelationship of the intellect and emotion is well stated by T. R. McConnell:

"Many students are suspicious of the aloof and nonpartisan intellect, which, they say, easily becomes the juiceless mind, a mind without esthetic awareness and emotional drive. But one might ask, does anyone really believe that it is necessary for intellectual processes to crowd out esthetic or humane sensibilities, or, on the other hand, for emotion to displace reason? Would it not be more appropriate to say that if education is to enable young people to cope with the problems which beset society, it should neither be devoid of passion nor sparing of intellect? Is not the problem we face that of submitting emotion to reason and of coupling intellectual solutions with feeling and commitment?"

Having dwelt on the need for academic diversity, the essence of my plea is to have more curricular alternatives.

In addition to teaching, The University of Iowa serves through research. Research, like instruction, needs to be the subject of continual review. Can we excel in teaching if we also seek to excel in research? Are these roles incompatible or are they inseparable? Is the issue "one or the other" or is it balance?

It is not necessary or desirable for all of higher education to be engaged in research nor for any one educational institution to be engaged in all forms of research. Research is, however, essential to the work of an institution which offers graduate and professional study. Methods of inquiry are emphasized in advanced study so that research becomes an invaluable means of instruction. This is as true in professional work as in graduate. My strong conviction on this point led me to serve for eleven years as faculty advisor of the *Iowa Law Review*. It is significant that the new medical curriculum provides research opportunities for students. To assure quality instruction at the advanced level, it is also critical that the faculty be constantly updated, and this is accomplished in large part through continuing research. The faculty member's research efforts must be fed into the classroom so that the student remains the primary concern. Besides the beneficial interaction of teaching and research for the student, new ideas are needed for both students and society. Since the teacher of advanced students is among the best equipped in society to engage in research, we should not prohibit him from finding new solutions. Through research the University can indeed "illumine rather than reflect; it [can] be a beacon rather than a mirror."

Since The University of Iowa has for many years been heavily involved in graduate and professional study, we need to as-

sess our past and present commitment to research before we consider the future of research. The newly revised criteria for appointment and promotion set forth in the Faculty Handbook reflect the most recent discussions concerning educational balance. To be a faculty member at Iowa it is stated that one must be "directly engaged in the teaching of courses approved for listing in the University catalog or engaged in research which involves the teaching of graduate students." This new definition evidences a policy that all faculty should teach and that we should not use the term "research professor" for new appointments. Conversely, we should not use the term "teaching professor" because the same criteria exist for all faculty.

The matter of different classes of faculty was extensively discussed by the graduate faculty four years ago. The issue was whether the criteria for the selection of the graduate faculty should differ from that used by the other colleges. The purpose was to demand more of the graduate faculty. That faculty voted against such a distinction lest adoption constitute a downgrading of teaching responsibilities in the other colleges. So we continue to have a university rather than a multiversity faculty.

All faculty are judged on the basis of teaching, research, and related activities. These criteria are broadly defined and applied so that individual differences are recognized. For the most part there is a high correlation between good teaching and good research as shown in the recent Tufts survey. Where exceptions exist they should be acknowledged. Outstanding teaching or research should offset lesser strength than is usually required in the other area.

In the recent revision "professional contributions" was added as a subsidiary criterion. The Faculty Handbook states:

"From time to time, a faculty member is called upon to render major professional services to the University or to society in general. Such contribution should be evaluated in terms of the effectiveness with which the service is performed, its relation to the general welfare of the University, and its effect on the development of the individual."

Reliance on professional contributions is limited to situations which will enhance the individual's capacity as a faculty member or the University's welfare.

After five years of reviewing justifications for promotions and appointments, I can only conclude that there is much more teaching and much less research occurring in this University than we all seem to think.

Research at Iowa has been marked more by its decentralization than by its centralization, more by individual than by group effort. Interest in research has been University-wide, and it has been primarily basic in its nature. We have no extensive research institutes within or affiliated with Iowa as has been true in some other universities. Although we have established numerous institutes and centers, they have been limited in their programs and usually integrated into departmental or college programs. As a result, it has been alleged that we have sacrificed interdisciplinary research for departmental interests. Our failure to be expansive in research institutes is probably due more to our fear of intrusion on teaching and the simple awareness that one cannot direct the research of faculty members within the university. To accomplish that requires a non-university setting.

A further attempt to balance teaching and research within the University is the Teaching-Research Fellowship Program. This is an attempt to counter the research weighting of federal funds available to support advanced students. The objectives of the program are to improve the quality of in-

struction at the undergraduate level and to stress the importance of teaching to graduate students. Although our budget precludes expansion of this program during 1969-70, the investment previously made of scarce funds illustrates concern for balance.

So much for the past and present. What about the future of research at Iowa? Our research efforts should be germane to our teaching functions. The integrity of the University as a place of learning must be retained.

Traditionally, university faculties have enjoyed a substantial degree of autonomy in determining the nature of their research. Today, institutional questions are being raised about the appropriateness of the research they conduct within the universities. The issue is not just classified research. The questions extend to the kinds of research projects they undertake.

As I have already said, no educational institution should engage in all forms of research any more than it should engage in all forms of instruction. Universities are not the only institutions capable of research. Government institutes, non-profit research foundations and industry are especially well qualified to handle applied and mission research. Universities are properly the chief source of basic research. This University should never become a research service station willing to undertake any and all research for a price. We need to develop general principles by which to judge the suitability of our research. Among other things our research should contribute to the instruction of students, be of a nature consistent with the University's missions, be a matter for scholarly investigation, and be a project which cannot readily be dealt with by another agency.

More than principles must be formulated if the integrity of university research is to be maintained. American universities must be more vigorous and convincing in stating the case for financing research specifically and higher education generally. With respect to federal funds, this should be a matter of utmost interest to the Faculty Senate Committee on Federal Relationships working with the Vice President for Research. We need to be concerned about the increasing federal stress on mission research and suggestions for urban grant universities which will operate whole segments of society.

To advance the idea of such urban grant institutions is to misunderstand the function of land-grant universities. If we extend our service beyond teaching and research, it will be clearly at the expense of instruction. While it is appropriate for us to develop research models, the general application of research is not within the scope of the university. Other agencies, private, public, or quasi-public, can be organized for this purpose. When needed, our faculty can take leaves of absence to help these agencies with their programs. In this way the faculty member volunteers for those projects he can best aid without losing his research autonomy on the campus. The student is also protected because the absence of the faculty member will permit a temporary replacement with a full-time commitment to the University.

Federal support for research must increase, but it needs to be accompanied by support for instruction. Federal funds should be both block and project. They should be geared to quality as well as size of program. We must urge a balanced program of research so that the humanities and social sciences are adequately funded. Moreover, our research, like our teaching, needs to have its fragments put into a meaningful whole. This University will have difficult decisions as to whether, and how, it fits into various federal programs including centers for excellence and proposed programs of support for national universities.

Throughout every discussion of financing,

be it state or federal, I hope that we will make the strongest possible argument for low tuition.

As in the past, so now and in the future, this University has great issues before it. We must have continuous educational discussions not only throughout the University but also at the University level itself. More than fiscal analysis is required. We should approach our problems with humility and open-mindedness. Our aim must be to provide better educational opportunities for the students of today and tomorrow. The responsibility for accomplishing this belongs primarily to the faculty working with students, staff and administration.

The challenge before us is no greater than that before our academic predecessors. We should welcome the challenge and have confidence in our ability to meet it. In the face of negativism we should remember the words of a Korean schoolmaster who years ago startled his community with new teachings. He observed: "Many say that bad times have come over us. Then (we) must answer them: the times are not bad, it is only that new times have come. . . ."

RADIO STATION ADMITTING FRAUD GETS RENEWAL

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, the Communications Act of 1934 was formulated and passed to assure that the broadcast airwaves would be used in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. The Federal Communications Commission was established to be the watchdog over this area of the public domain. The Congress charged the FCC with the responsibility of insuring that the radio and television outlets would be used according to the 1934 act. In most cases, the FCC has fulfilled this role well, but in other instances it has left much to be desired.

The New York Times reported on October 4, 1969, the case of an Indianapolis radio station that had admitted fraudulent billing and a false advertising contest, and yet had its license to broadcast extended. These breaches by the radio station of the public trust came at a time when it was already on probation for earlier infractions.

I concur with the dissenting statement registered by Commissioners Nicholas Johnson and Kenneth Cox of the FCC. As a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I have followed the FCC's licensing practices and wondered aloud sometimes whether we could not develop a more equitable practice.

This Indianapolis case reinforces my belief that something has to be done to assure that the public is protected. Too often we have been concerned with the licensee or the applicant, when our prime interest must be administering the Communications Act so that the airwaves will serve the public. Surely fraud and deceit should not be rewarded with license renewal. The entire question of licensing and renewal must be studied to determine how the requirements of the 1934 Communications Act can best be met and used in the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

I include a copy of the New York Times article at this point in the Record:

STATION ADMITTING FRAUD GETS RENEWAL (By Christopher Lydon)

WASHINGTON, October 3.—By a 4-to-3 vote, the Federal Communications Commission today extended the broadcasting license of an Indianapolis radio station that had admitted fraudulent billing and a fake advertising contest during a period when it was on probation for earlier infractions.

The case dramatizes the sharp difference in disciplinary standards within the seven-member commission, at a time when Congress is considering elimination of competing license applications as a challenge to established license holders.

Senator John O. Pastore of Rhode Island, the chief sponsor of legislation to abolish competitive applications, has argued that the F.C.C. can and should take the initiative in revoking the licenses of irresponsible broadcasters.

Dissenting commissioners suggested, however, that today's decision illustrates the F.C.C.'s unwillingness to impose this final sanction, and an undue sensitivity to the economic interests of its licensees.

Radio station WIFE and its FM affiliate in Indianapolis have been operating on a temporary license since October, 1964, when the F.C.C. found they had "hyped" or distorted their audience ratings through a promotional giveaway contest.

In subsequent months, the commission later determined, the station billed advertisers for spot commercials that had not been used, or had not been used at their specified times. The station conceded \$6,000 in over-billing, and also admitted awarding prizes in an advertising contest to its own staff when listeners did not respond.

The commission majority ruled that "WIFE's operation has only minimally met the public interest standard," but said that the evidence did not warrant the station's disqualification as a licensee. The renewal is for only six months, and new applicants will be eligible to compete for the station against WIFE thereafter.

In a joint dissent, Commissioners Nicholas Johnson and Kenneth A. Cox described the majority decision as "truly shocking."

"If fraud and deception of more than \$6,000 are 'minimally' in accordance with the public interest," they said, "it must be apparent to all that the F.C.C.'s attempts at 'serving the public interest' are themselves without even minimal standards."

Commissioner Robert T. Bartley also dissented from the majority opinion, which was supported by F.C.C. chairman Rosel H. Hyde and by James J. Wadsworth, Robert E. Lee and H. Rex Lee.

THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I was privileged to appear before the special subcommittee of the Small Business Committee under the chairmanship of the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan, whose vigorous, tenacious, and knowledgeable leadership constitutes one of the best defenses the small business community has today.

This special subcommittee has embarked upon an examination in depth of the Robinson-Patman Act, and I heartily endorse and commend the chairman and his subcommittee members for this great and necessary public service.

My statement before the subcommittee

follows—as well as a statement made by Mr. Harold O. Smith, Jr., executive director of the Food Merchandisers of America, Inc., which I found extremely informative and persuasive:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WRIGHT PATMAN,
BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON
SMALL BUSINESS, OCTOBER 7, 1969

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, you know that it is needless for me to say that it is a pleasure for me to appear before you and to express my views regarding the subject matter you are studying here today.

I congratulate this committee on its determination and its announcement of this study of attacks by study groups on our antitrust laws and our public policy of antitrust. You have stated that these study groups are criticizing the Robinson-Patman Act and antitrust laws in general, and the enforcement policies essential to the survival of small business. This criticism of our public policy of antitrust has been made public and is well known. Criticism of this kind is not new, but this recent criticism is particularly disturbing in that it has involved challenges through influential voices going beyond the critical reassessment of the implementation of our antitrust policy to the questioning of the underlying assumptions of that policy. This new criticism of our antitrust policy seems motivated by a kind of economic determination holding in effect that sheer size and absence of free and fair competition in the marketplace must be accepted as the inescapable price for economic progress.

Of course with that view I disagree, and I believe that a majority of the Congress and responsible people in government, and, yes, in private life as well, disagree with the thought that we must compromise our public policy of antitrust in order to secure economic progress.

Many of these influential persons who would have us compromise our public policy of antitrust, make their "advice" on antitrust policy and what to do about it available to the President of the United States and to other leaders in this country. Some of this "advice" has come from self-appointed advisers in the form of public writings to the effect that sheer size and absence of free and fair competition in the marketplace is the inescapable price for economic progress, and that steps should be taken to substitute regulation of our economy through some vehicle similar to a corporate state, rather than through force of free and fair competition in the marketplace.

An attack of that kind on our public policy of antitrust is a bit more subtle than attacks made by some others. For example, an economist by the name of Allen Greenspan evidenced greater bluntness in his attack on antitrust. Mr. Greenspan's advice on what to do about our antitrust policy is evidenced in a book which was published in November of 1967 of writings edited by Ayn Rand and entitled "Capitalism: The Unknown Ideal," Chapter 4 of that book attributed to Mr. Greenspan contains the following statement:

"The Sherman Act may be understandable when viewed as a projection of the nineteenth century's fear and economic ignorance. But it is utter nonsense in the context of today's economic knowledge. The seventy additional years of observing industrial development should have taught us something.

"If the attempts to justify our antitrust statutes on historical grounds are erroneous and rest on a misinterpretation of history, the attempts to justify them on theoretical grounds come from a still more fundamental misconception."

More recently a committee was named and authorized by President Lyndon B. Johnson to provide him with advice in the form of a report on "Antitrust Policy." That committee made a report to him on July 5, 1968,

entitled "Task Force Report on Antitrust Policy." That report urged drastic revision in our antitrust policy by cutting it back in many respects and providing for restructuring of our entire economy to such an extent that it is obvious such restructuring will not, as a practical matter, be effectuated (see the Congressional Record for May 27, 1969, pp. 13890-13907).

It is believed that it would be worthwhile for this committee to closely study, analyze and report upon that "Task Force Report on Antitrust Policy." It appears that anyone doing that logically will be led to the conclusion that it contains not only proposals for relaxing and compromising our present antitrust policy against the building up of monopolies, but also suggests that what one could consider doing about a monopoly once it has been built up, amounts to a proposal to proceed to break it up. Therefore, I would say that a more apt title for the "Task Force Report on Antitrust Policy" would be "Monopoly: A Report on Proposals for Building Up and Breaking Up Monopolies." For example, this report did urge repeal of major provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act, which of course were designed to prevent the buildup of monopolies.

Those who are urging either complete repeal or substantial revision of the Robinson-Patman Act, or at least some of those who do that, express concern about the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few large firms. I also express concern about that matter but I am not unmindful of how some of this concentration of economic power was achieved. The records show very clearly a large number of firms have used price discrimination as a weapon to destroy competition. As recently as March 31, 1952, the Select Committee on Small Business of the U.S. Senate published a report on "Monopolistic Practices and Small Business," and on page 8 thereof referred to the practice of price discrimination and how it is used to achieve monopoly conditions. As I shall discuss later, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, as well as the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, have made a number of reports to the House which contain findings to the same general effect.

Now I am not opposed to those provisions of our antitrust laws such as section 7 of the Clayton Act, the antimerger section. I favor the retention and effective enforcement of that section of the law as well as section 2 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. The national policy which relies on competition to regulate and improve the performance of markets should include, as it does, provisions of law such as the Robinson-Patman Act to prohibit practices which build up monopolies as well as provisions such as section 7 of the Clayton Act, the antimerger section, to be used to break up monopolies.

Indeed, both of these laws are concerned with concentration and its effect on competitive performance. The recent surge in the increase of conglomerate mergers is resulting in the blurring of boundaries between various industries and presents a most pressing antitrust problem because of the possible impact of a large conglomerate concern with respect to its competitive behavior in a particular industry regarding its sale of particular products in local geographic markets. It is in such situations where a large conglomerate firm, not subject to being broken up through enforcement of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, can subsidize discriminatory pricing practices through charging high prices in some markets while driving competition out in other markets. The availability of a prohibition against discriminatory practices is vital to our antitrust policy in such situations. We must have such laws if we are to avoid significant structural changes in

our industrial economy in which we are seeing the development of new monopoly power. As I have said, modifications in the structure of our economy of this kind are not brought about by mergers alone. Small firms limited to single markets with narrow product lines are increasingly coming into competition with large multi-market diversified firms. Where such market power exists, the mere prohibition of further mergers is not enough. Moreover, the suggestion is made in the Neal report that we not rely upon our laws against discriminatory practices to prevent the buildup of such monopoly power but that we seek a new law to dissolve such market power. I can't believe that the writers of that report could have been serious in making that suggestion, which obviously will not be effectuated.

As you know, this so-called "Task Force Report on Antitrust Policy," which for convenience is sometimes referred to as the Neal Report, was followed by a report entitled "The Task Force Report on Productivity and Competition." The first of these two reports was submitted to President Lyndon B. Johnson on July 5, 1968 and the second was submitted to President Richard M. Nixon on February 18, 1969. According to information I have received, neither President Johnson nor President Nixon did more than file these two reports at the time they were received. Later, however, after there had been some leak concerning them, President Nixon released them without comment. For convenience, a number of people have referred to the second of these reports as the "Stigler Report."

In your press release of August 11, 1969 in which you first announced that this Committee would hold hearings on this subject, it is noted that you stated that "the reports of these study groups suggest that this policy is anti-competitive rather than protective of our economic system". I agree with that general appraisal of those reports.

Quite recently, September 15, 1969, President Nixon received a "Report of the American Bar Association Commission to study the Federal Trade Commission." A review of that report reveals that some members of that American Bar Association Commission held views that perhaps some of our antitrust effort should be revised or cut back. However, I add my voice to yours, Mr. Chairman, in commending the American Bar Association Commission on the Federal Trade Commission in not joining "those extremist critics who have recently called for either repeal of the Robinson-Patman Act or sharp curtailment of its enforcement." Perhaps some of the members of this American Bar Association Commission had acquired some knowledge and some experience regarding the facts involved in the situation on which they were reporting. It appears that this cannot be said of those who prepared the Neal Report and the Stigler Report to which I have referred. And, Mr. Chairman, you and I know how valuable it is to have some knowledge of the facts involved in these situations to which we commit ourselves for study and consideration. Perhaps it is easier to dismiss situations without any knowledge of the facts, but I repeat, it is more valuable and useful to an adequate and appropriate consideration of the situation to have knowledge of the relevant and material facts involved.

I have given close study to what members of a number of these study groups have written and said about our public policy of antitrust, and I have noted that they have substituted for an analysis and citation to the facts involved in situations references to the writings and arguments made by members of other study groups who were also without knowledge as to the facts involved. The continual repetition of this practice perhaps has led some members of these study groups to actually believe the arguments they are making about the facts to be true.

In any event, my plea to you today is that we should not surrender to those arguments without knowing what the facts are. For example, when it is said that price discrimination in the sale of goods and merchandise promotes competition, and that laws to prohibit practices of price discrimination are anticompetitive, I say we should test that argument against the facts and not against another argument to similar effect.

In following this line of thought I take advantage of this opportunity to make reference to the factual situations which were studied by the Congress before it considered and acted upon proposals for amending and strengthening section 2 of the Clayton Antitrust Act in 1936.

Prior to consideration of that matter by the Congress the Federal Trade Commission had made a 6-year investigation, study and report of the facts involved in discriminatory acts and practices in the sale of food and food products through chain stores and other outlets. The Commission reported in Senate Document No. 4 of the 74th Congress, December 1934, that the law as it then existed had been interpreted so as to permit destructive price discriminations, and that the practice of destructive price discrimination was rampant in the food distribution industry. The Commission rejected suggestions which had been made to the effect that the Sherman Antitrust Act be relied upon and used to halt destructive price discriminations. Instead the Commission proceeded to recommend to Congress that section 2 of the Clayton Antitrust Act be amended and strengthened by eliminating certain nullifying provisions which exempted discriminations involving quantity purchases and those exempted when made in good faith to meet competition.

The report of the Federal Trade Commission was carefully made and considered by the Congress as were reports made by a special committee of which I was chairman, after we had studied the facts. Out of all of these considerations, Senator Robinson (D.-Ark.) and I introduced bills proposing to amend and strengthen section 2 of the Clayton Antitrust Act. These bills were considered by the Judiciary Committees of the House and the Senate. The Judiciary Committee in its report to the House on the bill I introduced contained the following statement:

"Your committee is of the opinion that the evidence is overwhelming that price discrimination practices exist to such an extent that the survival of independent merchants, manufacturers, and other businessmen is seriously imperiled and that remedial legislation is necessary." (See House Report No. 2287, 74th Congress on H.R. 8442).

To remedy that situation Congress passed the bills that Senator Robinson and I had introduced and consequently the legislation became known as the Robinson-Patman Amendment to the Clayton Act. That legislation was approved June 19, 1936.

Later, in 1956, the House Committee on the Judiciary, after investigating and reporting upon a related matter, stated:

"Price discriminations favoring preferred buyers present a danger to the competitive enterprise system which is inconsistent with the policy of the price discrimination statute." (House Report 2202, 84th Congress).

I have cited these instances of findings by the Congress based upon studies of evidence reflecting factual situations to demonstrate the fallacy of the arguments now being advanced by various study groups that our antitrust laws which prohibit price discriminations are laws aimed at competitive practices, and that we should repeal or weaken these laws to permit these practices to be resumed and continued. Let me reiterate that arguments to this effect are clearly without basis in fact, and that those who make the argument are without knowledge regarding

the facts; but that Congress which enacted the laws, acted only after careful investigation, study and consideration of the relevant facts.

I do not suggest that we should close our eyes and our minds to further study of evidence which reflects the facts in any situation, and if this Committee would care to do so and time would permit, a review of business practices and discriminatory acts, including a review of the economic significance of those particular acts and practices would be in order. But let us not take the arguments from someone who does not know what the facts are concerning the economic significance of these acts and practices. Instead, let us get the small businessmen in here who experience the effect of these acts and practices. Have them to inform the Committees of the Congress regarding the facts, showing the effects of these practices. Let us not close our eyes and minds to considering only the arguments of theorists, and then only those theorists who have their own particular axes to grind.

I trust you will bear with me for a few minutes to refer to several of the situations which we considered in 1935 and 1936, and upon which we based our judgment that subsections 2(c), 2(d) and 2(e) should be included as provisions in the amendments to Section 2 of the Clayton Act. I suggest this because attacks made on our public policy of antitrust include specific attacks on these mentioned subsections (c), (d) and (e).

Before we thought about including anything in the law which resembled the provisions now included in subsection 2(c), we had before us much evidence of many examples of abuse and unfairness in the buying and selling of merchandise. For example, there was presented to us evidence that field brokers located at or near producing points of fresh fruits and vegetables had been operating so as to secure some producers' agreements to represent the producers in the marketing of the producers' crops for a certain brokerage fee. Then some of these field brokers, once having entered into such agreements with the producers, went to the buying agents for some of the large buyers and informed such buyers that they now had under their control the marketing of large quantities of produce. They then proceeded to enter into arrangements with the representatives of the buyers for the buyers to pay a brokerage fee in consideration of the field brokers' agreement to serve the interest of the buyers in delivering to the buyers the produce for which in the marketing they were supposed to be representing the producers. We found that in a number of these situations the producers did not fare so well. That is what I have meant when I said that we discovered abuses and unfairness.

Therefore, such double-dealing was outlawed through the provisions of section 2(c) of the Robinson-Patman Act. Now, some of the critics of that provision of the law want it repealed; other critics who do not have the courage of their convictions, instead of advocating repeal, simply say "do not enforce this provision of the law unless you can prove in each instance that someone is really injured by the action which is prohibited by the law." This abuse or unfairness and double dealing should not require that the victims have been injured before you proceed against the unfair act. That is what Congress determined in 1936; that is the way it should be determined today.

Considerations not unlike those I have enumerated in discussing subsection 2(c) apply with equal force to subsection 2(d) and 2(e). In other words, in 1935 and 1936 we found abuses and unfairness in the granting of advertising allowances and promotional services on a disproportionate and discriminatory basis and we concluded as we did about the pseudo brokerage that these disproportionate and discriminatory advertis-

ing allowances and all allowances for promotional services should be prohibited. That is the rationale underlying subsections 2(d) and 2(e).

Moreover, the language written into subsections 2(d) and 2(e) is such that cooperative advertising allowances and allowances for promotional services may be made, but only on proportionately equal terms to the large and the small alike if they are in competition with each other. But some of these critics of our public policy of antitrust think that is wrong. They think that we should not be so specific in our effort to insure fairness and equality under this law. I urge you to go deeply into this matter and when you do I am satisfied that you will see how fallacious these arguments are which are for the repeal or modification of subsections 2(c), (d) and (e) of Section 2 of the Clayton Act as amended.

Before concluding my testimony and my remarks to you here today, I would be remiss if I should fail to mention the Federal Trade Commission. As you know, it has been under severe attack and criticism. It is my view that these criticisms should not be considered in a vacuum; they should be considered objectively and in the context of the full record of what the Federal Trade Commission is and what it has been doing. Also, in that connection, we should consider who are the critics—what are their motives—what do they know what they are saying, and how objective are they in what they are writing and saying. When we get the answers to all of those questions, I am confident that we are likely to have before us a picture somewhat different from some of the pictures which have been painted recently of the Federal Trade Commission. Of course, even in a true picture of the Federal Trade Commission, we will perhaps see some faults—no one is infallible—but in that picture when we see the Commission in its true light, I am confident we will see much more good than we will see fault in it.

The Federal Trade Commission was conceived by a great American—Woodrow Wilson. It was conceived as an agency to act in the public interest in helping to promote and preserve free and fair competition in the marketplace. It is my view that when you review the record of the Federal Trade Commission over the history of its 55 years of service to the public, you will find good reason to applaud what it has done in the public service.

From time to time, as the Commissioners acted in the public service, the Commission has been subjected to strong criticism from those against whom it was acting, or from those who had some privity of interest with or sympathy for those against whom the Federal Trade Commission was acting. This is a history that isn't new and is not confined to the last year or the last few years. For example, upon the close of World War I the Federal Trade Commission was directed to investigate the "beef trust." The Commission made its investigation, study and report upon that problem and good results came from its report. Among those results was the disposition of a suit brought against meat packers. That suit was settled in 1920 by what has come to be known as the Meat Packers Consent Decree of 1920. That decree prohibits meat packers from engaging in retail distribution of their products. At the same time, the Federal Trade Commission made a report in which it recommended legislation aimed at prevention of recurrences of acts and practices which prompted the Meat Packers Consent Decree of 1920. Out of those recommendations developed the Packers and Stockyard Act of 1921, providing for the regulation of the marketing of cattle and livestock products.

Despite all of the commendable work done by the Federal Trade Commission in that instance, it was promptly assailed on the

floor of the United States Senate by one or two who insisted that the Federal Trade Commission was infested with Bolsheviks and that they were responsible for the Commission's report and recommendations regarding the "beef trust." Fortunately, the Commission survived that criticism and those attacks.

At the turn of the 1930's the Commission was again under severe attack. It was engaged at that time in some very important work in investigating public utilities and in making other investigations of important industries. Out of these investigations, studies and reports, the Commission made recommendations for improving our laws. A number of those recommendations were approved by the Congress, including legislation which established the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the laws it administers.

Some of the criticism that was experienced in that period of time came from within the Commission, as well as from without. One of those members had been unhappy about what the Commission was doing in carrying forward some of its important work. Instead of helping the Commission, he hindered it and finally he was removed from office. Then the Commission moved on in succeeding years to add to its illustrious record of public service. However, as the years have passed, there has been additional criticism of the Commission from both without and within. It is my hope that not only this criticism should be investigated, but, as I have said earlier, an investigation should be made of those who express the criticism and their motives for making it and the justification or lack of justification for their criticism. If this Committee will undertake to do that it will be rendering a public service and perhaps in doing so will be assisting this great agency, the Federal Trade Commission, to continue as a champion of the public interest.

Let me summarize: We now have a national public policy of antitrust. It provides for the maintenance of free and fair competition in order to preserve a free and competitive enterprise system. An integral part of that public policy is the Congressional objective underlying Section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, "to halt the gradual demise of the small businessman" and to preserve "an organization of industry in small units which can effectively compete with each other." Moreover, the Congress in 1958, when it enacted the permanent Small Business Act (15 U.S.C.A. 631), made it clear that—

"It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist and protect, insofar as is possible, the interest of the small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise."

Among those who are proclaimed as advocates for the interests of consumers are some who would say that this policy is not in the interest of the consumer. With that point of view I disagree. My record as an advocate for the consumer is one of which I am proud. I have fought for and supported proposals for truth in securities, truth in fabrics, truth in packaging, and quiet recently legislation for truth in lending. I have helped enact laws such as those prohibiting the sale of dangerously flammable fabrics, and other legislation for the protection of the public. I consider that what I do in the interest of maintaining free and fair competition for businessmen in the marketplace is in the interest of the consumer. The consumer benefits from an effective antitrust policy. It is this policy which provides for efficiency and for keeping prices down to reasonable levels in the interest of consumers. You can't have competition without competitors and you can't have efficiency and low prices without competi-

tion. I do not regard our laws which provide for all of this as being laws for "business protectionism," but instead I regard them as laws which provide for the enhancement of the public interest, including consumers.

In conclusion, let me say that we should do nothing to weaken any of our laws designed to preserve and promote free and fair competition in the marketplace. Instead, we should act to strengthen those laws. I repeat, in order to determine what we should do, we must look at the facts and not restrict our consideration to the arguments of special interests and those representing special interests. I am confident that when you have heard from representatives of small business interests from throughout the nation and from others who know what the facts are about the use of business practices and the economic significance of those practices, you will find that these arguments now being made against our public policy of antitrust are without merit. Again, I congratulate you upon undertaking this task and request that you follow through on it.

STATEMENT OF HAROLD O. SMITH, JR., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, FOOD MERCHANTISERS OF AMERICA, INC., BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, OCTOBER 7, 1969

My name is Harold O. Smith, Jr. I am Executive Director of Food Merchandisers of America, Inc., a national trade organization of independent voluntary food chains with headquarters in Washington, D.C. I am also Chairman of the National Affairs Committee of the National Federation of Food Distributors with headquarters also in Washington, D.C.

I welcome this opportunity to share with your committee my twenty-four (24) years of close relationship (since 1945) with the workings of the Robinson-Patman Amendment to the Clayton Act; two years as Manager of the National Confectioners Association's Washington office and twenty-two (22) years as Executive Vice President of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc.

The current danger of possible action to make disastrous changes in the Robinson-Patman Amendment to the Clayton Act lies to a large extent in lack of personal experience by those who would condone such changes.

Business management has operated thirty-four (34) years under the protective antimonopoly restraints of the Robinson-Patman Act.

There are discriminations today, but these are law violators and "child's play" compared to no restraining law, or the "watering down" of present antimonopoly laws.

Few men of eminence today had the personal experience of management responsibilities in dealing with discriminatory and monopolistic practices that were so disastrous to independent and small business in the early 1930's.

Today the people most knowledgeable in the workings of the Robinson-Patman Act are businessmen and their legal staff who have over the years searched for "loopholes" and endeavored to do a "hatchet job" on the law to get around or destroy the restraints from monopolistic practices and the use of coercive power to gain unfair competitive advantages.

Frequently men of good intention, but without the practical experience of meeting payroll, paying taxes, and operating a business in the competitive market, will promote theories that may even be profound, but are narrow and show lack of experience as they do not look at, nor do they appear to understand the "other side of the coin."

Current reports by the "White House Task Force" study of antitrust policy and President Nixon's Task Force on Productivity and Competition deal very critically with the

Robinson-Patman Act and recommend a thorough revision "to remove features that unduly restrict the free play of competitive forces." We see this theory expounded in text books, but how practical is it?

Getting back to that "coin," we see on one side the battle of the giants in food distribution, firms and groups of firms having the coercive capabilities of literally billions of dollars buying power. On the other side, we see the vast numbers of independent wholesalers and retailers who serve more than one half of the consumers' purchases of food in the United States. The Equality of Opportunity in the Market Place protected by the Robinson-Patman Act enables the alert, efficient, independent to compete with the giants in this industry.

Under the restraints of the Robinson-Patman Act, efficiency in operations determines the competitive advantage. Without the Robinson-Patman Act, especially the "brokerage clause" of the Act, the coercive capabilities of the "Big's" would place emphasis on buying that could far outweigh the importance of efficient operations.

Theorists frequently overlook the fact that, when competition is killed off, the consumer is at the mercy of suppliers who may not have the incentive to operate at a competitive low cost and the consumers' costs could go up appreciably.

The "Brokerage" section of the Robinson-Patman Act is a main target of those of limited vision who think of the advantages their buying power would give them, if prohibitions in the Robinson-Patman Act were removed. However, they would find that even \$3 billion concentrated buying power is merely "Minor League."—The "Major League" operators could have much higher overhead costs and still have enough left over to dominate sales.

Study the history of the early 1930's that caused both the House and the Senate to almost unanimously approve the Robinson-Patman Act. Even Safeway and Kroger (the 2nd and 3rd largest) were no match for A & P's Atlantic Commission Company which often received as much as 8% better price, which price was, at times, 18% better than independent wholesalers. Consider this in light of the fact that the wholesale grocers' gross mark-up to cover all warehousing and distribution services and profits is less than 8%.

The theorist who has a fixation on his ideas of "hard competition" and "free trade" apparently does not realize what his proposals, if taken seriously and acted upon by The Congress, would do to the farmer and the local packers and manufacturers. Let us suppose that Packer "X" at Benton Harbor is selling to many independent and chain customers. He abides by the Robinson-Patman Act and his "better prices" reflect no more than his actual savings made possible by quantity or services rendered by either an independent or chain customer.—Then the Robinson-Patman Act's restraints on price discrimination are removed.—Packer "X" is under coercive pressure from one or more big customers. Packer "X" has competitors who would like to get this business, so Packer "X" gives in to these unreasonable demands.

Packer "X" was price competitive and made only a fair profit. Selling big customers at below costs and competition will not permit him to compensate by raising his price to his other customers puts Packer "X" in a critical position. Packer "X" must turn to the farmer or grower to share in the costs of staying in business with big customers dictating the price.

What could possibly be properly gained for the consumer, the grower, the manufacturer, or the practical, hard working, efficient businessman by removing the antimonopoly restraints and restraints on unfair trade practices as provided in the Robinson-Patman Act.

Most businessmen are fair and honest, but there are some with selfish motives who would destroy anything and anybody standing in their way, even American private enterprise.

We believe that the dedicated, thoughtful men in both houses of the Congress will consider the record of the 74th Congress in 1936 and the compelling reasons for overwhelming approval of the Robinson-Patman Act.

In the food distribution business today, competition is keener, margins are much lower and efficiencies in operating techniques are industry wide. No high purpose would be served by destroying or rendering ineffective the protective anti-monopoly restraints of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Just because we drive cars with 150 to 200 miles an hour capability is no reason to remove the restrictions on speeding. We must all be governed by laws that restrain the reckless ones even in business.

GOVERNMENT - INDUSTRY-CITIZEN COOPERATION ON MANUFACTURING OF COLLEGE TEXTBOOKS

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

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I participated in a project that involves all the elements of Government-industry-citizen cooperation. What these groups have achieved together can well serve as a model for others who are interested in seeing this country develop its full potential.

The story began several years ago when McGregor & Werner, Inc., a Washington-based graphic arts firm, decided to build a multimillion-dollar facility for the manufacturing of college textbooks. It envisioned a modern plant, using all the latest techniques and equipment which would provide jobs for 200 persons and produce 35,000 500-page textbooks every 24 hours.

With this goal in mind McGregor & Werner, Inc., began looking for a suitable site. This site would have to be located in a depressed area, as the company had reached a decision to cooperate in the Government's efforts to provide jobs for the unemployed and the underemployed.

After considering several locations, and studying local conditions, the company selected Woodbine, N.J.—in my congressional district—as the site for its new manufacturing facilities, McGregor & Werner Graphics, Inc. The citizens of Woodbine were eager to participate in this venture, as was I.

To prove its interest, the Cape May County Economic Development Commission, in participation with the State of New Jersey, provided 5 percent of the plant's capital investment in the form of a long-term loan to McGregor & Werner Graphics, Inc.

This loan also qualified the company for additional long-term participation by the Economic Development Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce. It is this Federal-State-local cooperation which encourages industrial and economic development in areas of relatively high unemployment and slow economic growth.

The company's plant will be located on 65 acres of land adjoining the Woodbine

Airport. As initially constructed, the building will contain approximately 47,000 square feet on one floor with designed expansion to 150,000 square feet. This multimillion-dollar facility will occupy about 10 acres of the 65-acre tract. At the ground-breaking ceremony in Woodbine on August 15, citizens and dignitaries turned out on a hot, humid day to celebrate the long series of events which culminated in the ground breaking. But this has not been the end of the cooperative endeavors.

The plant will be finished in January 1970. Well over 100 employees will be hired during the first year and by early 1972, up to 200 employees will be on the company's payroll. Approximately 80 percent of these employees will be hired from the Woodbine area and will be given an intensive 12-week, full-time training course, followed by 26 weeks of on-the-job training. McGregor & Werner Graphics will provide the instructors. Training will be conducted under provisions of the Manpower Development Training Act. It will benefit from the joint participation of the U.S. Departments of Labor and Commerce and from the New Jersey State Department of Education.

McGregor & Werner Graphics, in its first year of operation will be the largest employer and taxpayer in Woodbine. The first year's payroll is estimated at over \$350,000.

It is easy to see how Government-industry-citizen cooperation will soon be paying dividends in my congressional district. Naturally, the citizens of Woodbine gave the project all the moral support they could. They held meetings with representatives of Government and industry and I met with them from time to time to report on progress from my end. We are all immensely pleased that construction finally is underway; and I say this because all of us encountered numerous problems along the way.

In the words of Robert K. Clark, president of McGregor & Werner Graphics, Inc., "less determined men would have thrown in the towel."

What we have accomplished here is something that can be duplicated by others with the determination to succeed: a company that knows what it wants and where it wants it; a community that knows it wants and needs that company; local, State and Federal Government officials who recognize a responsible undertaking and are willing to work to help make it succeed.

Success is what we all predict for McGregor & Werner Graphics, Inc. The parent company has proven its abilities over the past 25 years, including work in the Nation's space programs. The new plant will offer book publishers the most modern and efficient service for the manufacturing of college textbooks.

These are the reasons why I am proud to have participated in this venture. And these are the reasons why I am inserting these remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, because I believe by citing an example of what one group of determined people has achieved can be an incentive to other groups.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT

(Mr. SMITH of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, though we continue to hear much sound and fury from those who would withdraw immediately from South Vietnam, the President's course continues to have the approval of the majority of the American people. Even the growing numbers who feel that previous Presidents made a mistake in involving the United States in Vietnam still support the President's efforts to extricate us.

These are the most recent findings of the most respected national poll, the Gallup Poll.

Those who claim that the people of America are willing to settle for unconditional surrender should take careful note of its findings.

I include the following article from the New York Times dated October 5, 1969:

DISILLUSIONMENT WITH WAR FOUND—GALLUP POLL REPORTS 58 PERCENT IN U.S. SCORE INVOLVEMENT

PRINCETON, N.J., October 4.—Disillusionment over the Vietnam war has reached a new peak, with 6 persons in 10 or 58 per cent, now of the opinion that the United States made a mistake getting involved in Vietnam, according to the latest Gallup poll.

The proportion of Americans who hold this opinion now clearly exceeds the proportion who in the early nineteen-fifties felt our involvement in the Korean war was a mistake. This reached a high of 51 per cent in April, 1952.

President Nixon has thus far not been seriously hurt by disillusionment over the war, but his predecessors, Presidents Johnson and Truman, fell rapidly from grace because of attitudes over United States involvement in Southeast Asia.

President Johnson took office with 79 per cent of Americans giving him a vote of confidence. His popularity slipped to 35 per cent in August, 1968, as frustration over Vietnam mounted.

President Truman took over the reins of the Presidency in 1945 upon the death of President Roosevelt with 87 per cent registering a vote of confidence. His rating dropped to a low of 23 per cent in November, 1951, after the Communists broke off truce talks at Panmunjon.

A slight majority of citizens today, 52 per cent, say they approve of the way President Nixon is handling the Vietnam situation, but survey evidence showed that his rating on Vietnam had declined sharply prior to his Sept. 15 announcement of further troop withdrawals.

In a survey conducted of 1,513 persons Sept. 12 through 14, 45 per cent expressed approval and 40 per cent disapproval.

QUESTIONS IN SURVEY

Following is the question asked, the latest results and trend:

In view of the development since we entered the fighting in Vietnam, do you think the U.S. made a mistake sending troops to fight in Vietnam?

[Percent]	
September late:	
Yes	58
No	32
No opinion	10
March 1969:	
Yes	52
No	39
No opinion	9

RESULTS—1968

August 1968:	
Yes	53
No	35
No opinion	12
April 1968:	
Yes	48
No	40
No opinion	12
March 1968:	
Yes	49
No	41
No opinion	10
February 1968:	
Yes	46
No	42
No opinion	12

RESULTS—1967

December 1967:	
Yes	45
No	46
No opinion	9
October 1967:	
Yes	46
No	44
No opinion	10
July 1967:	
Yes	41
No	48
No opinion	11
May 1967:	
Yes	37
No	50
No opinion	13
February 1967:	
Yes	32
No	52
No opinion	16

RESULTS—1966

November 1966:	
Yes	31
No	51
No opinion	18
September 1966:	
Yes	35
No	48
No opinion	17
May 1966:	
Yes	36
No	49
No opinion	15
March 1966:	
Yes	25
No	59
No opinion	16

RESULTS—1965

August 1965:	
Yes	24
No	61
No opinion	15

TREND DURING KOREAN WAR

In August 1950, when the Korean war was two months old, a large majority of the American public said it had not been a mistake to enter the war.

Opinion changed sharply after Communist China entered the fighting in the winter of 1950. The average citizen at that time felt that war against North Korea was one thing, but war against Red China was quite another.

The trend of sentiment during the Korean war follows:

[Percent]

August 1950:	
Yes	20
No	65
No opinion	15
March 1951:	
Yes	50
No	39
No opinion	11
April 1952:	
Yes	51
No	35
No opinion	14
October 1952:	
Yes	43
No	37
No opinion	20

Following is the next question asked in the survey:

Do you approve or disapprove of the way President Nixon is handling the situation in Vietnam?

Here are the latest results and trend:

[Percent]

September (late)	
Approve	52
Disapprove	32
No opinion	16
September (mid-)	
Approve	45
Disapprove	40
No opinion	15
August:	
Approve	54
Disapprove	28
No opinion	18
July:	
Approve	53
Disapprove	30
No opinion	17
June:	
Approve	52
Disapprove	24
No opinion	24
May:	
Approve	48
Disapprove	27
No opinion	25
April:	
Approve	44
Disapprove	24
No opinion	32
March:	
Approve	44
Disapprove	26
No opinion	30

Those who approve of the President's handling of the war feel he is doing all he can in a difficult situation. Others welcome troop withdrawals as a sign that concrete steps are being taken to break the Vietnam stalemate.

Disapproval of the President's handling of the situation stems from the belief that President Nixon is not doing things much differently than President Johnson or that he is not living up to his campaign promise to end the war. Others feel that the troop withdrawals thus far are only token steps.

SUPPORT OUR PRESIDENT ON VIETNAM POLICY

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this is a critical time in the affairs of our Nation. The hour is critical because for the first time in the history of our country some Americans are refusing to give our President the support he needs to make his negotiations with the enemy credible. It may be that some of these nonsupporters, notably those in the Congress, simply are not sufficiently aware of the ramifications of President Nixon's Vietnam policies—particularly the policy of Vietnamization of the war. To those individuals and indeed to all Members of the Congress I commend a reading of a speech delivered at the AFL-CIO convention today by Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird. In his speech, Secretary Laird makes it clear that Vietnamization goes far beyond replacement of U.S. troops in South Vietnam and is rather an alternative plan designed to make the enemy want to negotiate a political settlement. Secretary Laird's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MELVIN R. LAIRD, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, BEFORE THE EIGHTH CONVENTION OF THE AFL-CIO, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., OCTOBER 7, 1969

It is an honor to be the first Secretary of Defense ever to address a national convention of the AFL-CIO.

As George Meany and others in this audience know, this is not my first contact with organized labor. For 17 years I have had close contacts with your national leaders, first as a member of Congress and now as Secretary of Defense.

The outstanding contributions made by labor in keeping our nation secure and free have become even more apparent to me in my present office. I know firsthand how much the skill and productivity of American labor mean to our defense forces.

As an illustration of labor's support of defense, let me recall the action three years ago of the Building and Construction Trades Department. At that time the Navy was seeking to recruit apprentices and journeymen to bolster the Seabee units in Vietnam that were undertaking a backbreaking construction job. In response to the Navy's appeal, some 5,000 building tradesmen came out of your ranks into the Seabee's.

I could relate many other instances of this kind that have meant so much to the young Americans in the military forces in Vietnam—such things as the help of maritime unions in unsnarling the tie-up in Saigon harbor.

The positions taken by organized labor in the areas of foreign and military affairs have been uniformly wise, farsighted, realistic, and free from illusion. The support of your Executive Council for the President's decision to begin on the SAFEGUARD Antiballistic Missile System was of major importance in bringing about favorable Congressional action on this proposal. I know I voice President Nixon's sentiments when I thank you for this support.

The AFL-CIO has also supported the efforts of our Government to assure the right of self-determination to the people of Vietnam, and this forms a background for my remarks today. This policy now being carried out by the Nixon Administration offers the best hope of ending heavy American involvement within a reasonable time and of making it possible for the people of South Vietnam to chart their own political course in peace and freedom.

Make no mistake about it. To carry out his policy the President needs the support of a united people. The young Americans in Vietnam need that support. Hanoi's strategy is clear: the leaders in Hanoi expect to achieve victory by waiting for us to abandon the conflict as a result of anti-war protest in this country. From their experience with the French and from their reading of events in the United States last year, they are encouraged to believe that they can get all they want if they merely wait long enough. The President will not bow to acts and utterances by these Americans who seek to pressure him into capitulation on Hanoi's terms. Those acts and utterances serve only to encourage the enemy to keep on fighting in South Vietnam and to keep on stalling in Paris.

The Paris talks had made little headway by the time the Nixon Administration assumed office in January. They remain stalemated today. At Paris, the North Vietnamese can endlessly block our efforts to end the war through negotiation by rejecting all proposals. For this reason, the President decided at an early point in his administration that we could not leave all our eggs in the negotiation basket. The President continues to give his full support to our Paris efforts because, clearly, negotiations could provide the speediest resolution to the war. But this course requires a sincere effort by both sides, not by the United States and South Vietnam alone.

In January, the U.S. Government had no

alternative plan to influence the course of events should the continuing efforts at Paris fail. Today, there is an alternative course of action that at the same time complements our efforts at Paris. That program is Vietnamization.

Vietnamization is something new. Those who view it as a mere continuation of the program for modernizing South Vietnam's armed forces are quite mistaken. It is much more than that. The Vietnamization program represents a major change not only in emphasis but also in objectives. Troop modernization until early this year had the negative goal of partially de-Americanizing the war. Vietnamization has the positive goal of "Vietnamizing" the war, of increasing Vietnamese responsibility for all aspects of the war and handling of their own affairs. There is an enormous difference between these two policies.

The previous modernization program was designed to prepare the South Vietnamese to handle only the threat of Viet Cong insurgency that would remain after all North Vietnamese regular forces had returned home. It made sense, therefore, only in the context of success at Paris. It was a companion piece to the Paris talks, not a complement and alternative. Vietnamization, on the other hand, is directed toward preparing the South Vietnamese to handle both Viet Cong insurgency and regular North Vietnamese armed forces regardless of the outcome in Paris.

In other words, we felt we could not stand pat with the past. Vietnamization has put some aces in the Free World's poker hand.

As I noted, Vietnamization embodies much more than merely enabling the South Vietnamese armed forces to assume greater military responsibility. It means, in South Vietnam, building a stronger economy, stronger internal security forces, a stronger government, and stronger military forces.

The American public must understand and support this if it is to be made to work in Vietnam. By making Vietnamization work, we create a powerful incentive for the enemy to negotiate meaningfully in Paris.

The enemy needs to know that time is not on his side, that the passage of time is leading to a stronger, not a weaker South Vietnam.

As the President has said time and again, we hold firmly to a single objective for Vietnam: permitting the people of South Vietnam freely to determine their own destiny. We want peace as speedily as possible, but we cannot acquiesce to a peace that denies self-determination to the South Vietnamese.

The President has also said: "I do not want an American boy to be in Vietnam for one day longer than is necessary for our national interest."

Vietnamization offers us the best prospect for bringing our men home quickly while achieving our objective in Vietnam.

The last thing I want to do is convey false hopes or promises to the American people. I do want to give as full a picture as I can of the situation we face in Vietnam and what we are trying to do about it. I cannot promise a miraculous end to the war. I cannot promise that our losses in combat will remain, as they were last week, at the lowest level in almost three years. But I can say to you that we are on the path that has the best chance of minimizing U.S. casualties while resolving the war in the shortest possible time without abandoning our basic objective.

In the Vietnamization program, high priority actions are underway. Let's look briefly at the four faces of Vietnamization for just a moment: stronger economy, stronger police for internal security, stronger government, and stronger military forces.

In the economic field, a significant factor is the opening up of waterways and roads for farmers to bring their produce to market and the growing confidence of farmers in

using them. In addition, South Vietnamese have replaced Americans in the operation of the civilian port facilities at Saigon and at supply and warehousing facilities in various parts of the country. In the past three years, South Vietnam has trebled its funding of imports while the amount spent for this purpose by the Agency for International Development has dropped by a third. South Vietnam is moving toward restoration of self-sufficiency in rice production. Of course, progress in an economy distorted by war is bound to be uneven. Vietnam suffers from the chronic wartime malady of steep inflation but the government of Vietnam is attempting to face up to this problem with American help.

In the field of local security, the police force has been expanded and its training strengthened. Partly for this reason, the Viet Cong infrastructures is being weakened and rooted out in many areas. That infrastructure includes the hard-line Communist civilians who control and direct the acts of terrorism, assassination, and kidnappings at the local level—as well as the military activities of the local guerrillas and main force units. One measure of success in local security is the extent of the denial to the enemy of the base of popular support he needs for supplies, concealment, intelligence, and recruits and, more important, the reduction in terrorist activities which intimidate the population.

In the political field, progress is measured by the extent of the peoples' trust in their government. It is at the grass—or "rice"—roots level where we find encouraging signs. Locally elected governments are spreading throughout the country. Self-government has been brought this year to more than 700 villages and hamlets in recently pacified areas, bringing the total with self-government to about 8 out of every 10. There has been a notable increase in the number of citizens willing to seek local office and hence to face the threat of Viet Cong terrorism which has taken such a toll of local officials in past years. However, much remains to be done. The government of South Vietnam is continuing its efforts to strengthen popular support for their elected government officials at all levels, to improve administrative practices, and to provide better services to people in such fields as education and public health.

The success of the whole Vietnamization program would be jeopardized without progress in the political field. The political system and policies of South Vietnam are not our responsibility, but we are anxious to see them succeed.

The military area is where progress in Vietnamization has been most visible. We have begun to replace American with Vietnamese troops. Already this year, in two installments, we are cutting the size of our forces by 60,000 in Vietnam, and, in a related development, by 6,000 in Thailand. Contingent on one or more of the three criteria expressed by the President—progress at Paris, progress in Vietnamization, and reduction in the level of enemy activity—additional numbers of Americans can and will be brought home.

The troop redeployments so far announced have not been made possible by any progress in Paris or by any convincing evidence that Hanoi wants to reduce the level of combat. They have been made possible principally by the improved capability of South Vietnamese military forces. The armed forces of South Vietnam have increased substantially. Since January of this year, fourteen more battalions have been put in the field. They are better trained and better equipped. They are increasingly taking up the burden of combat. For more than a year, their ground forces have not been defeated in any engagement of units of battalion size or larger.

These, then, are some of the encouraging signs. But there remains much to be done, particularly in strengthening the economic and political spheres. I don't want to suggest

for a moment that everything is going our way, for there are still serious problems before us.

But we are not the only side with problems. One might gather from some statements of both our critics and our supporters that the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong are eight feet tall, that they enjoy unreserved popular support, and that victory for them is inevitable. With Vietnamization well underway, I think it is time to pause and view the more balanced perspective of the problems faced by both sides.

Although the controlled press in North Vietnam does not parade criticism of their war effort, we see their problems in other ways. First of all, there are the staggering casualties they have endured, numbering well over a million men lost in combat since 1961. The impact of their casualties on the war effort is compounded by the growing difficulties encountered in recruiting replacements for the Viet Cong in South Vietnam. Add to this recent floods, epidemics, agricultural production difficulties, and a sagging economy. Finally, North Vietnam has lost its tough leader of many years, Ho Chi Minh, who served as a unifying symbol of so-called liberation wars in Southeast Asia. We cannot know what effect such difficulties will have in the future course of the war, but we must keep them in mind in our assessments.

I have explained to you today what this Administration is seeking to do in Vietnam, and why we believe our dual approach of Vietnamization and negotiation is the best path to follow.

There are those who claim that the United States should establish a formal and fixed timetable for U.S. troop reductions in Vietnam. On May 14th, President Nixon offered to withdraw our forces from South Vietnam by a fixed timetable if North Vietnam would do the same. The place to establish a fixed timetable is in Paris or in some other mutual context, rather than by unilateral action in the United States. The President's offer has received no response from Hanoi, and from some statements I have read, seems to have been ignored by many in this country.

We believe there are other reasons why the unilateral setting of a fixed timetable would be unwise at this time.

First, the readiness of South Vietnamese forces to supplant American forces may not coincide with a predetermined timetable. We have achieved a momentum behind Vietnamization. It is of the greatest importance that this momentum be maintained. An arbitrary timetable could disrupt this momentum.

Second, any hope of progress in the Paris talks would evaporate. Knowing that American troops would be removed by a certain day, the Communist negotiators would be even more inclined to yield nothing and more encouraged to wait us out.

Third—and this is particularly important—we cannot at any stage of this process subject the American troops left in Vietnam to the danger of being overwhelmed by an enemy force. Any timetable set now could work out so as to leave a small band of Americans as a sacrifice to illusion, impatience, or frustration.

A timetable set now might prove to be too slow or too fast. We are not setting one because it would not be fair to our men in Vietnam or to our allies, and it certainly would retard progress toward ending the war.

I cannot tell you how or when the war in Vietnam will end. It has been my policy in office not to make optimistic forecasts; there have been too many of those in the Department of Defense. We are now embarked on a new course that we believe has the best prospect for ending American combat involvement. We shall persist in assisting the South Vietnamese to attain self-determination. We will not abandon South Vietnam. As President Nixon has said,

"Abandoning the South Vietnamese people would jeopardize more than lives in South Vietnam. It would bring peace now but it would enormously increase the danger of a bigger war later.

"If we simply abandoned our efforts in Vietnam, the cause of peace might not survive the damage that would be done to other nations' confidence in our reliability."

I am sure of one thing. The day that we all hope and pray for when there are no more American troops in combat will be speeded if the American people make it clear that they are united behind their President's policy.

As we press toward a resolution of the situation in Vietnam, we must not lose sight of the larger world stage. We must be vigilant in the face of a continuing threat from abroad to our security and a growing challenge here at home to the military foundation so vitally needed for a policy of peace.

The President has said we are entering an era of negotiations. We are trying to make negotiation work in Paris. We would like to see it work in arms limitation talks. We hope to make it work in all areas of contention as we approach the decade of the 70's.

You men of labor know a great deal about negotiation. Two things in particular you have learned and applied in your long history. The first is to persist and persevere, regardless of how difficult the course, because the goal is worthy. The second is to negotiate from strength.

On Vietnam, we are persevering in negotiating for peace and we are strengthening our hand through Vietnamization.

On the larger front, we have a strong military base that we must maintain so that we can always negotiate from strength while assuring our ability to defend our interests should negotiation fail.

We need your continuing help in keeping America aware of the need for strength and perseverance in building a policy of peace. We know we will get it.

Thank you very much.

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. MICHEL, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho); to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McCLOSKEY, for 60 minutes, on October 8.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 60 minutes, on October 14.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MILLER of California in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, to extend his remarks immediately following the remarks of Mr. RYAN yesterday on H.R. 5968.

Mr. CELLER, to extend his remarks in the RECORD today following the remarks of others on the passing of Congressman Resnick.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.

Mr. BOW his remarks today during Mr. MICHEL's special order.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN of Idaho) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. BROCK.

Mr. LUKENS.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. SCHWENGLER.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. WYMAN.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. REID of New York in two instances.

Mr. SCOTT in two instances.

Mr. DELLENBACK.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. WEICKER in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. TAFT in two instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. FASCELL in three instances.

Mr. BIAGGI.

Mrs. SULLIVAN in two instances.

Mr. ULLMAN in 10 instances.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. KASTENMEIER in two instances.

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. HANNA in five instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN in two instances.

Mr. FRASER in five instances.

Mr. ROYBAL in six instances.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 476. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Zuck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 533. An act for the relief of Barbara Rogerson Marmor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 981. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland shall sit at one additional place; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1775. An act for the relief of Cora S. Villaruel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1797. An act for the relief of Dr. Waghul Mohamed Abdel Bari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2096. An act for the relief of Dr. George Alexander Karadimos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2231. An act for the relief of Dr. In Bae Yoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2443. An act for the relief of Dr. Silvio Mejia Millan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3165. An act for the relief of Martin H. Loeffler;

H.R. 3560. An act for the relief of Arle Rudolf Busch (also known as Harry Bush); and

H.R. 11249. An act to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds for such Center.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1836. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), amended; and

S. 2462. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 8, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

1231. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need to revise fees for services provided by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and U.S. marshals, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

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. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Ninth report of the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 91-550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3247. A bill to amend the act of December 11, 1963 (77 Stat. 349); with amendments (Rept. No. 91-551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3334. A bill to place in trust status certain lands on the Standing Rock Sioux Indian Reservation in North Dakota and South Dakota; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and

Insular Affairs, H.R. 4226. A bill to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, H.R. 9424. A bill to declare that certain federally owned lands are held by the United States in trust for the Indians of the pueblo of Laguna; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, S. 775 An act to declare that the United States shall hold certain lands in trust for the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak. (Rept. No. 91-555). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS (for himself, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SISK, Mr. WEICKER, and Mr. WOLD):

H.R. 14214. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe minimum standards for railroad passenger service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 14215. A bill to authorize the transfer of a vessel to the Los Angeles Unified School District for nontransportation use in the training of qualified applicants as ship repair and shipbuilding personnel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 14216. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Weber River project to the Weber River Water Users' Association, Ogden, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 14217. A bill to authorize the Small Business Administration to guarantee any bid, payment or performance bond under an agreement entered into by a small business concern which is a construction contractor or a subcontractor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LATTI, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. SHIPLEY, and Mr. WHITE):

H.R. 14218. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that medal of honor winners be presented with United States and service unit flags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 14219. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 14220. A bill to provide additional benefits for optometry officers of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 14221. A bill to amend section 6 of title 35, United States Code, "Patents," to authorize domestic and international studies and programs relating to patents and trademarks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTI:

H.R. 14222. A bill to change the name of

the Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial National Monument, to provide for the acquisition of certain lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FARSTEIN, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mrs. MINK, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.R. 14223. A bill to control the use of hypnosis in criminal proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (for himself, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. BLANTON, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 14224. A bill to amend chapter 23 of title 16 of the District of Columbia Code to revise proceedings regarding juvenile delinquency and related matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 14225. A bill to provide that the fiscal year of the United States shall coincide with the calendar year; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 14226. A bill to prohibit the sale or shipment for use in the United States of the chemical compound known as DDT; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 14227. A bill to amend section 1401 a(b) of title 10, United States Code, relating to adjustments of retired pay to reflect changes in consumer price index; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (by request):

H.R. 14228. A bill to provide conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in real property situated in Florida to the record owners of the surface of that property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER (for himself and GERALD R. FORD):

H.R. 14229. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce," approved August 2, 1956; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 14230. A bill to protect interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting the movement in such commerce of horses which are "sored," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 14231. A bill to amend the retirement of judges provision of section 371 of title 28 of the United States Code by changing the age provisions thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14232. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in monthly benefits, with subsequent cost-of-living increases in such benefits and a minimum primary benefit of \$80; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 14233. A bill to modify ammunition recordkeeping requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 14234. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through technical assistance and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. KOCH, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr.

ANDERSON of California, Mr. HICKS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MEEDS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MINISH, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, and Mr. JOHNSON of California):

H.J. Res. 924. Joint resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payments to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education and other educational agencies and organizations, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 13111, which passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. RYAN, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. McFALL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. WATTS, Mr. GUDE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. SISK, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. CHAPPEL, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. FLOWERS, and Mr. ROUDEBUSH):

H.J. Res. 925. Joint resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payments to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education and other educational agencies and organizations, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 13111, which passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. CAREY, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania):

H.J. Res. 926. Joint resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payments to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education and other educational agencies and organizations, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 13111, which passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BARING, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CULVER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. ANDER-

SON of Tennessee, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. KARTH, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. QUIE, Mr. TEAGUE of California, and Mr. CAHILL):

H.J. Res. 927. Joint resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payments to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education and other educational agencies and organizations, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 13111, which passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. FOREMAN, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WHITE, Mr. ZABLOCKI, and Mr. PIRNIE):

H.J. Res. 928. Joint resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payments to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education and other educational agencies and organizations, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 13111, which passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. SIKES, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. STEED, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. REES, Mr. FRASER, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. EDMONDSON, and Mr. TALLCOTT):

H.J. Res. 929. Joint resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payments to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education and other educational agencies and organizations, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 13111, which passed the House of

Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. DORN, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. ALBERT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. HANNA, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. GRAY):

H.J. Res. 930. Joint resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payments to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education and other educational agencies and organizations, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 13111, which passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. OBEY, Mr. LENNON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. YATES, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. VANIK, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. PATTEN, and Mr. BOLAND):

H.J. Res. 931. Joint resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payment to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education and other educational agencies and organizations, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 13111, which passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself and Mr. LOWENSTEIN):

H.J. Res. 932. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the food stamp program for fiscal 1970 to \$750 million; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.J. Res. 933. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period November 2 through November 8, 1969, as "Na-

tional Zero Defects Week" to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE (for himself, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SISK, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. MELCHER, Mrs. MAY, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. MCKNEALLY, and Mr. MIZELL):

H.J. Res. 934. Joint resolution to increase the appropriation authorization for the food stamp program for fiscal 1970 to \$610 million; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.J. Res. 935. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the month of January of each year as "National Blood Donor Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEBELIUS:

H.J. Res. 936. Joint resolution to designate Route 70 of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways as the Eisenhower Memorial Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. Con. Res. 399. Concurrent resolution protesting the treatment of American servicemen held prisoner by the Government of North Vietnam and backing the administration in its efforts on behalf of these servicemen held captive by the North Vietnamese Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. Res. 572. Resolution amending House Resolution 200, 91st Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 14235. A bill for the relief of Capt. Claire E. Brou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 14236. A bill for the relief of the estate of Luther A. Ihrig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

282. By the SPEAKER: Petition of George L. Carnage, Jr., Atlanta, Ga., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

283. Also, petition of Allan Feinblum, New York, N.Y., relative to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Tuesday, October 7, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee for this good land, for the diverse peoples who live in it and love it, for the strength of our institutions, and for our liberty under Thy rulership.

At this midday pause in the day's duties we ask Thee to cross the inner

threshold of our hearts, lay hold upon our faith, and make us equal to the demands of high office. We confess that on the lower levels of life, without Thee, we find ourselves surprised and trapped by unworthy compromises, by cowardly concessions, by weak acquiescence, by disobedience to the heavenly vision. When we would do good, evil is present with us. We need Thee, O God. Every hour we need Thee.

So wilt Thou give us steadfast hearts, resolute wills, sensitive consciences, and

enduring faith that we may quit ourselves as men of that kingdom whose Builder and Maker is God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 6, 1969, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.