

sign Service information officer of the class of career minister for information, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Honduras.

Claude G. Ross, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Republic of Tanzania.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

Henry S. Robinson, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Council for the remainder of the term expiring February 1, 1970.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, October 8, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O give thanks unto the Lord; for He is good; for His mercy endureth forever.—Psalm 106: 1.

With grateful hearts, O God, we acknowledge that Thou art the creator of the world, the sustainer of life, and the rock upon which we can build security. We thank Thee for Thy constant care and Thy abounding goodness which are ours day by day. Truly Thy mercies are everlasting, Thy faithfulness endures through all generations, and Thy love abides forever. Therefore we put our trust in Thee.

Bless our country with Thy guiding spirit and by Thy grace enable her to walk in the way of Thy commandments. May we as a free people always be the champion of peace and justice in our world. Strengthen the ties of fellowship within our borders that we may live together with understanding, respect, and good will and give to every man the opportunity to live a full and a free life. May the love of Thy dear name bless every heart and every home.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. 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 a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1718. An act to provide for the conveyance to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., of certain real property of the United States heretofore donated to the United States by such city.

DR. PHILIP CRANE WINS 13TH DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS PRIMARY

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to offer my congratulations to Philip Crane, a very good friend, who was nominated as Republican candidate for Congress in the 13th District of Illinois yesterday. Dr. Crane, I believe, will be joining us in the Congress next January.

Dr. Crane certainly will add a great deal to our side of the aisle. He is a very intelligent man, and I might point out he is a person with conservative views.

We often have people ask us what di-

rection the country is taking. I hear some say it is going in a moderate direction, some say it is going in a liberal direction, and some say it is going in a conservative direction. I am one of those who believes the country is more conservative, and if our party will nominate conservative candidates, I happen to believe we can win in the elections.

I certainly congratulate Philip Crane for winning the 13th District primary election and the Republican voters there for showing such good judgment. Dr. Crane ran on the issues and took a sound, conservative position which he successfully articulated to his constituency. The result speaks for itself.

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF A SEPARATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to advise my colleagues that I will today put in legislation calling for a separation of the Department of Health from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the establishment of a separate Department of Health within the Federal Government. I call attention to remarks which will be in the body of the RECORD on this subject relating to this proposed legislation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. 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. 208]

Albert	Diggs	Ottinger
Berry	Donohue	Pepper
Blatnik	Foreman	Pike
Brock	Frelinghuysen	Podell
Brooks	Goldwater	Powell
Burton, Utah	Harrington	Rees
Cahill	Hawkins	Relfel
Carey	Howard	Rooney, N.Y.
Chisholm	Johnson, Calif.	St. Onge
Clark	Kirwan	Steed
Clay	McClory	Tunney
Cleveland	McClure	Whalley
Davis, Ga.	Marsh	Whitten
Dawson	Miller, Calif.	Wilson
Denney	Nelsen	Charles H.
Dent	O'Neill, Mass.	Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 11039, PEACE CORPS ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11039) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MORGAN, ZABLOCKI, HAYS, ADAIR, and MAILLIARD.

PERMISSION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on the Robinson-Patman Act of the Small Business Committee may sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

HEARINGS SCHEDULED ON S. 952, TO PROVIDE FOR ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGES

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary will begin several days of hearings on S. 952 which provides for the appointment of additional district judges, another measure relating to the organization and administration of the Federal district courts, beginning on Wednesday, October 29, at 10 a.m. in room 2141 of the Rayburn Building.

THE COURSE ON WHICH THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION IS LEADING OUR NATION

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

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of this body to the headlines in three editorials

of the Washington Post. I think the headlines themselves have a story to tell about the course on which the Nixon administration is leading our Nation.

The headline in the Washington Post Thursday, December 12, 1968: "Nixon Announces His Cabinet." Elsewhere on page 1 was the headline, "Joblessness Hits 15-Year Low Point."

The lead headline in the Washington Post yesterday, October 7, 1969: "Jobless Rate Increases to 2-Year High."

And, if that is not bad enough, the headline on page 1 of the Washington Post today, October 8, reads, "Treasury Predicts More Joblessness."

OUR COUNTRY NEEDS TO BE UNITED

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, for weeks now Member after Member of this body has come to the well from both sides of the aisle to speak about the financial plight of the Nation and the conditions surrounding the war in Vietnam, and what we ought to do to solve these problems.

There are a number of the Members who have been here longer than I have, and perhaps who will stay here longer than I will, but what I am going to say now I say without any fear of contradiction from any one of the Members. It is this:

If we are going to solve the problems having to do with the economy of this country, the problems of the war in Vietnam, provide for a stable economy, and provide for the security of this country, we had better stop coming to the well of this House and talking about partisanship, and we had better start thinking about what this country needs, because if we ever needed to be united we need to be united now, and we are going in exactly the other direction.

When the Nation is in the peril it is in here at home and abroad, there can be only one rational course for rational men to take and that is the avenue that leads to nonpartisan solutions to nonpartisan problems.

The war in Vietnam is not a Republican war; it is not a Democratic war.

The inflation that is tearing this country apart belongs on neither the Republican or Democratic doorstep.

These are American problems.

Too many, both in and out of Government, seem willing to sacrifice this Nation for partisan benefit and for the benefit of their particular social and philosophical leaning. This must be stopped and stopped at once.

Whatever solution we finally and agonizingly come to in Vietnam must be one that will leave this Nation some dignity, some respect in the eyes of Americans, some semblance of national and international honor. If we cannot achieve that, God help us.

I, for one, am sick of partisanship when the life of my country is on the

line and I believe the majority of Americans feel the same.

PUBLIC WORKS FOR WATER, POLLUTION CONTROL, AND POWER DEVELOPMENT AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. 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. 14159) making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS).

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. 14159, with Mr. ASPINALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS).

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we bring you today the public works and Atomic Energy Commission appropriations bill for 1970.

This is an important bill—a significant bill—an all-American bill.

A bill that is vital to the growth and progress of our Nation—vital to the safety, health, and well-being of our citizens.

At the outset let me say that we miss our distinguished and beloved chairman here today, the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE KIRWAN

I have visited MIKE at Bethesda Hospital a couple of times recently, and regret to report that his condition is not encouraging at this time as we would hope. Today he is feeling well. We all

miss him. We miss his great force for building strength for America.

MIKE is "Mr. Public Works" to all of us—a great champion of water research development and progress for America.

I know that I speak for all when I say that we wish him a full recovery, and the best of good luck and success.

COMMEND COLLEAGUES, STAFF, AND REPORT

In the absence of Chairman KIRWAN, all members of the subcommittee have participated in writing this bill—all have made their contribution.

I want to commend all members of the subcommittee—the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS), and the able and genial ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

I want to also commend the able staff of our Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, Gene Wilhelm, George Urian, and Don Richbourg.

These staff specialists know the details of this bill. They have helped to fashion this bill. We relied heavily on their expertise and experience, and we are grateful to them.

Let me commend to you the report of the committee. It is a well-documented report—an excellent summary of the committee's actions.

I commend this report for your reading and information.

OVERALL SUMMARY

By way of overall summary, President Johnson recommended a budget of \$4,454,452,000 for public works for 1970.

The revised Nixon budget was \$4,203,978,000.

We are recommending in the bill \$4,505,446,500—a cut of \$177,538,500 from fiscal year 1969.

This is a cut of 7 percent from the original budget and a cut of 12 percent below the 1969 budget.

It represents an increase of \$301,468,500 over the Nixon budget.

The largest item in the bill is for the Atomic Energy Commission—\$2,227,769,000.

We have made cuts and reductions in the AEC budget of \$131,816,000—\$79,531,000 for operating expenses and \$52,285,000 for plant and capital equipment.

The largest single reduction in the AEC budget was a \$32 million cut for the big Bev. accelerator. The committee has allowed \$64 million for this work.

Actually, this bill represents a cut of \$84,531,500 from the Nixon budget—excluding an increase of \$386 million over the budget recommended for construction of waste treatment works.

I will discuss this item in greater detail, later in my remarks.

EFFECTS OF RECENT ADMINISTRATION REDUCTION

As you know the President on September 4 announced a cutback in Federal public works projects and construction contracts. We have all been concerned over this cutback order.

The President's order directed a 75-

percent reduction in funding new contracts.

A careful and detailed study of the impact of this order shows that only about 10 percent of total construction money in the bill will be affected.

The President's order applied to cutbacks in new construction contracts—it does not apply to ongoing contracts.

So—to repeat—only 10 percent of the construction contracts in Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation budgets will be affected by the President's order.

All funds recommended in this bill are for completing and finishing projects previously funded by the Congress.

That is with the exception of \$8,962,000 for 25 small flood control projects which are urgently needed and considered critical at this time.

Eleven of these "starts" were included in the budget—we have added 14—making a total of 25 in all—and this minimal number of critically needed local flood protection projects will, we feel, have no appreciable effect on the problem of inflation.

We must move ahead—even on a reduced scale—to provide flood protection in these critical areas.

So we have made cuts and reductions to the maximum extent possible in the bill.

The AEC budget was cut and reduced by \$131,816,000. We have made some other reductions.

Total reductions in the bill are \$160 million.

We have added—as I have indicated—\$8,962,000 for the small flood control projects mentioned and we have added \$55 million to the bill for construction.

The increases which we have made are absorbed and offset by the cuts and reductions made in the bill.

These increases were considered necessary to meet critical funding deficiencies in projects under construction.

Overall we have cut \$160 million for the bill and we have added a total of \$63,962,000 for programs of the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation.

I would point out that the budget estimate for 1970 is \$200 million below the appropriation level for 1969, reflecting drastic reductions, in recent years, in water resource development programs.

Extensive testimony before our committee makes clearly evident that some adjustment is needed in these drastic reductions.

This is necessary to avoid increased construction costs, caused by slowdowns, stretchouts, and delay.

Reflecting this great interest, need, and concern, more than 200 Members of Congress testified before our committee in support of 389 projects over the budget.

The appeals and demands for moving forward on public works have been tremendous.

The stretchouts and slowdowns have increased over the years and the resulting costs in projects have mounted.

So, Mr. Chairman, the committee, in its judgment, has made some adjustments.

We have restored about 50 percent of the Nixon cutback on ongoing projects.

Considering the fact that half of the year will have elapsed before this bill has been finally passed and enacted into law, the restoration is justified.

We have restored only 50 percent of the cutback—and only on small projects.

Although public works in this appropriations bill constitutes only about 11 percent of the total Federal public works—public works projects in this bill received the largest cuts by percentage of reduction.

Despite a low and inadequate funding level last year the budget recommendations for 1970 showed 27 percent reductions for Corps of Engineers and 25 percent for Bureau of Reclamation projects.

About 90 percent of the funds recommended in the bill are required to continue ongoing contracts.

All but \$29 million is required for projects under construction.

It is estimated that construction delayed a year will cost from 6 to 8 to 12 percent more than currently estimated.

Delays will mean not only higher construction costs but also substantial losses in benefits.

The loss from electric power and water use in the Bureau of Reclamation alone is estimated at \$98 million.

Higher construction costs, brought on by delays will total an estimated \$182 million—making a total of \$280 million in losses in these two areas.

In addition, losses in benefits from the projects will total an estimated \$350 million—making a total in losses in the Bureau of Reclamation alone of \$630 million.

ASSESSMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

In view of these sharp budget cutbacks, it is interesting to note the results of the latest and current assessment of our water resources.

In this assessment—and I direct your attention to pages 6 and 7 of the report—it is estimated that under the current level of funding of flood control projects, the flood damage potential for the Nation is expected to increase from \$1.7 billion in 1966 to \$5 billion by the year 2000.

Requirements for municipal water systems are expected to triple by the year 2000—increasing from 24 to 74 billion gallons a day.

Industrial water use will increase more than 400 percent.

Steam-electric power requirements will increase water withdrawals from 63 to 411 billion gallons a day by the year 2000.

Shipping tonnage on inland waterways is expected to increase six times in the next 50 years.

Pleasure crafts are expected to increase from 8 million to 30 million by the year 2000.

And the year 2000—I would remind you—is only 30 years hence.

It is also interesting to note that continued slowdowns and unfunding of authorized studies and projects has resulted in a backlog of 731 studies—planning not started—and planning completed, construction not started.

These 731 studies and projects involve \$9,727,045,000—almost a \$10 billion public works backlog, and increasing every year.

In recent years we have leveled off at about 65 new construction starts annually.

In 1968 there were 33 new starts—in 1969 there were eight new starts and in 1970—we are recommending only 11 new starts.

With the Corps of Engineers completing only 23 projects in 1970 at the current rate it will be many decades before we eliminate the current backlog.

At this rate the Nation will enter the 21st century choked with population inadequately served by public works projects and services.

So, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, the committee has provided some modest increases for ongoing construction contracts for next year. We consider they are fully justified.

GRANTS FOR WASTE TREATMENT WORKS

Concerning the vital matter of appropriations for antipollution control measures and waste treatment grants the picture is different.

The committee recognizes the seriousness and gravity of the water pollution problem. The committee is concerned over the budget crisis in recent years which has not permitted adequate funding for waste treatment works—as authorized by the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

And so we are recommending in this bill \$600 million for waste treatment grants to States. All the States will share and participate.

This is almost three times the budget request of \$214 million.

This is where the net increase in this bill develops—excluding the increase for waste treatment grants, there is a reduction—an overall reduction except for the increases for matching grants to the States, and here we go over the budget, \$386 million.

For waste treatment grants, the Johnson budget was \$214 million. The Nixon budget was \$214 million.

The committee recommendation is \$600 million.

In addition to the \$600 million in new money provided in the bill, there is a carryover balance of \$65 million, which will make a total of \$665 million for grants next year—almost three times the amount budgeted—and so we recognize the problem.

We all recognize the importance of restoring our streams and rivers and lakes to their natural unpolluted state.

We all recognize the pollution problem plaguing our States and cities.

Our committee has considered this matter thoroughly and carefully—and we are attempting to do something about it.

We have studied the tables of pending applications.

We have studied the grants formula. We have studied the nature of the backlog.

And we have debated various levels of funding.

The subcommittee initially proposed a funding level of \$450 million.

However, the full committee, on my motion, increased this amount from \$450 to \$600 million.

This amount plus \$65 million in carryover funds will make \$665 million available for funding waste treatment grant applications next year.

I repeat—this is more than a half billion—more than three times the level of funding for last year.

RECOMMEND READING REPORT AND TABLES

I understand an amendment will be offered to increase the appropriation to \$1 billion. We have heard much through this publicity campaign. The committee has been most generous. We have tripled the budget recommendation.

The \$600 million carried in this bill is all that can be efficiently utilized next year. The tables of pending applications show this clearly.

I strongly recommend the reading of the report and an examination of the tables showing the status of applications by State.

These charts show that as of September 1 there were 1,893 pending applications for Federal grants involving \$841 million in State agencies and regional offices.

These tables also show an additional 2,931 applications at the local level.

These applications at the local level are in various stages of preparation.

In some instances eligibility has not been verified.

In other instances local elections on bond issues are required, and voting on local financing has not been held.

In some instances local governments are not prepared to fund their share at this time.

Adding to the problem is the nature of the grant formula which is based on population—rather than need.

There are other causes for delays. There are difficulties in the bond market at this time. There is the matter of capability of design engineers and construction engineers to absorb or handle the workload.

The committee's studies show that a significant portion of grants would be allocated to States that have indicated no need—because of the population formula of allocation.

Under the formula a substantial amount of funds will be distributed to States indicating no need.

Other States will receive more than they need.

And certain States like New York with a backlog of \$1.3 billion—more than half the total backlog—would only get \$83 million even if the entire billion dollar authorization was funded.

Twenty-five States, under the recommended appropriation of \$600 million, would receive more than enough to meet their needs.

And 18 others will receive substantial increases in allocations—all that can be processed and handled efficiently.

And seven additional States could fully fund all applications at State and regional offices. So, Mr. Chairman, all the States would greatly benefit under the committee recommendation.

The committee believes that the \$600 million—plus the \$65 million in carryover funds—will be adequate and prac-

tical funding for this program at this time.

This is the maximum amount that can be efficiently and effectively used—without waste—and so I recommend support for the committee bill—the amounts funded in this bill.

I urge you to vote against the amendment, which I understand will be offered, to further increase this item.

Let us stand by the committee and support this bill—a good bill.

At this point I should like to read a letter from Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Interior:

OCTOBER 7, 1969.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Because of the President's critical effort to contain inflation, we must sustain in fact as well as in spirit, the statutory expenditure ceiling imposed by Congress and the President's expenditure ceiling, as well as protect the budget estimate submitted in April by the Administration. Therefore, I must renew my support of the Waste Treatment Program at the \$214 million level recommended by both President Johnson and President Nixon.

In any event, it is our best estimate that existing capacity of the State, local and private sectors could support no more than \$1.5 billion worth of new municipal waste treatment plant construction during the remainder of Fiscal Year 1970, so that no more than \$600 million in Federal grants effectively could be used.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER J. HICKEL,
Secretary of the Interior.

I would like also to insert a table outlining the committee allowance by State at this point:

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS FOR WASTE TREATMENT WORKS—REPORTED NEED VERSUS AVAILABILITY, AS OF AUG. 31, 1969

States	Total pending applications reporting need	Funds available at \$600,000,000 level	Deficit (-) or surplus (+) funds compared to total reported need	States	Total pending applications reporting need	Funds available at \$600,000,000 level	Deficit (-) or surplus (+) funds compared to total reported need
STATES FULLY COVERED AT \$214,000,000 LEVEL (17)				ADDITIONAL STATES FULLY COVERED ONLY FOR APPLICATIONS AT REGIONAL AND STATE LEVELS UNDER \$600,000,000 LEVEL (7)			
Alabama	\$479,700	\$11,207,710	+\$10,728,010	Alaska	\$2,048,570	\$1,387,100	-\$661,470
Arizona	1,829,080	5,280,697	+3,451,617	Connecticut	29,591,250	10,009,143	-19,582,107
Colorado	1,453,652	6,467,431	+5,013,779	Hawaii	3,041,040	2,699,400	-341,640
Delaware	710,350	2,047,900	+1,337,550	Massachusetts	20,405,845	18,101,700	-2,304,145
Idaho	128,470	4,390,357	+4,261,887	Minnesota	29,382,600	11,361,865	-18,020,735
Kansas	3,892,883	8,876,288	+4,983,405	Rhode Island	9,363,200	4,950,718	-4,412,482
Kentucky	3,062,386	11,055,117	+7,972,731	Vermont	2,377,870	2,178,015	-199,855
Mississippi	1,764,310	10,409,896	+8,645,586	District of Columbia	36,795,000	2,937,600	-33,857,400
Montana	305,040	4,266,669	+3,961,629	Subtotal (7 States)	133,005,375	53,625,541	-79,379,834
Nebraska	3,521,850	6,849,941	+3,328,091	REMAINDER OF STATES (18)			
New Mexico	1,422,423	5,397,670	+3,975,247	California	68,877,448	49,567,670	-19,309,778
North Carolina	5,653,460	15,757,418	+10,103,958	Florida	37,728,978	16,008,652	-21,720,326
North Dakota	134,222	4,281,060	+4,146,838	Illinois	128,862,798	31,307,014	-97,555,784
Oklahoma	1,882,702	8,483,010	+6,600,308	Indiana	34,682,131	15,046,027	-19,636,104
South Dakota	2,485,531	4,400,180	+1,914,649	Maine	19,737,725	4,693,429	-15,044,296
Utah	238,540	4,912,010	+4,673,470	Maryland	46,800,360	12,092,683	-34,707,677
Wyoming	275,732	2,977,320	+2,701,588	Michigan	183,113,623	27,167,385	-155,946,238
Guam		3,043,900	+3,043,900	Missouri	17,907,424	13,833,700	-4,073,724
Puerto Rico	2,622,000	10,291,390	+7,669,390	Nevada	4,959,058	2,075,241	-2,883,817
Virgin Islands		2,571,450	+2,571,450	New Hampshire	11,222,400	3,371,277	-7,851,123
Subtotal (17 States)	31,882,331	132,967,414	+101,085,083	New Jersey	48,201,480	19,059,900	-29,141,580
ADDITIONAL STATES FULLY COVERED AT \$600,000,000 LEVEL (8)				New York	1,290,631,200	52,292,666	-1,238,338,534
Arkansas	4,557,153	6,723,977	+2,166,824	Ohio	44,867,124	31,303,365	-13,563,759
Georgia	8,711,772	13,339,981	+4,628,209	Oregon	16,017,220	6,335,987	-9,681,233
Iowa	6,326,224	9,428,788	+3,102,564	Tennessee	23,818,036	13,233,796	-10,584,240
Louisiana	7,604,570	12,610,927	+5,006,357	Virginia	14,544,880	14,018,670	-526,210
Pennsylvania	28,903,080	38,158,761	+9,255,681	Washington	17,086,410	9,386,300	-7,700,110
South Carolina	6,414,580	8,472,472	+2,057,892	Wisconsin	94,324,180	12,779,700	-81,544,480
Texas	20,327,857	31,593,670	+11,265,813	Subtotal (18 States)	2,103,383,075	333,673,462	-1,769,709,613
West Virginia	5,141,200	8,945,993	+3,804,793	Grand total	2,356,257,217	649,540,986	-1,706,716,231
Subtotal (8 States)	87,986,436	129,274,569	+41,288,133				
Total States fully covered (25)	119,868,767	262,241,983	+142,373,216				

There are many other items in the bill.

In general—to summarize—we have made some cuts—mainly in AEC—and we have provided increases for 25 small flood protection projects.

We have also provided for substantial increases for waste treatment grants—the key factor in the overall increase.

In addition, we have restored about 50 percent of the cutback recommended by the President.

We have made increases only where Corps of Engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation have a “current capability”—and only on small projects.

There have been no increases in big projects—projects of \$10 million and over.

These modest increases provided will not have an appreciable effect on 1970 expenditures—or on the inflation problem.

This is a good bill—an all-America bill—a much-needed bill, a bill which provides an investment in the future growth and strength of our country, and at the same general level of the past few years.

I urge approval of this appropriation bill.

I yield to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

TRIBUTE TO HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, while necessarily—though temporarily—absent from this Chamber, is nonetheless well represented here today. Not only is his name on the front page of the pending bill and on the front page of the accompanying committee report, but his imprint is on the pages that recommend the appropriations and that explain them. The bill, importantly, reflects the work of his hands.

So, Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Ohio were here, he would present the bill on behalf of the committee. In his temporary absence, we present it on his behalf.

And it is no exaggeration to say that MIKE KIRWAN is abundantly represented here in the kindness and the warmth of the hearts of his colleagues.

As others have recalled, MIKE has always regarded this bill, and the Interior bill which he also chaired for so many years, as a bill for America.

President Kennedy once said:

Any man can change the world, and every man should try.

MIKE KIRWAN has not only labored long and mightily and diligently for what he thought was paramount to the best interests of his and our beloved America, he has labored persuasively and successfully. His vision, his work continues to accrue to the benefit of the people of America, and will continue to accrue, even to coming generations.

MIKE KIRWAN is one of America's great champions. His love of America is inspirational and unsurpassed. It burns with the fierceness of a streak of lightning. He is, unquestionably, America's legislative champion of conservation.

Across this vast and beautiful land stand countless and unnumbered monuments to him in the form of conservation and humanitarian projects for which he urged appropriations.

I am certain I bespeak, not only on behalf of all members of the Committee on Appropriations but of the House generally, the warmth of good wishes that all of us harbor in our hearts for this great American. We look forward to his early presence.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I am pleased to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise to ask the gentleman if in his knowledge there is renewed activity at this time for a sea-level canal? I note that the committee is recommending the appropriation of \$917,000 for the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission. Is there, in the gentleman's opinion, any danger that the Congress at this time, the fiscal situation being what it is, will be called upon to finance a sea-level canal? When is this study ever to end? I wonder how much has already been spent on a study of this particular issue.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Certainly I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Iowa. I do not think this is the time for going into a large construction program of this nature. It is not likely and it is certainly not recommended in this bill. This appropriation is only to continue, and largely complete, the study authorized by Congress. The Commission must make its report by December 1, 1970.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I am pleased to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, further, I would like to say to my colleague from Iowa that no such canal has ever been authorized by the Congress for construction. Authorizing legislation would have to be passed by the Congress before proceeding with it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this thing has been studied backward and forward through the years. I am wondering how much more we are entitled to spend on a commission for a study of this particular project.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The committee only granted modest funding for the Commission in order for it to continue its studies. The request was cut back \$420,000 in the April 15 budget revision.

Mr. GROSS. Is this a reduction from last year?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Yes, sir, by \$3,983,000.

Mr. GROSS. It is?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to commend my friend,

the very distinguished gentleman from Tennessee and his colleagues for bringing out what I consider to be a very good bill. Of course, the committee did not and could not allow all of the requests of the Members for unbudgeted items. But I think, on balance, it is a very good bill and I certainly want to thank the gentleman and the committee for the southern Illinois projects totaling \$23.9 million. I know the committee is moving ahead in developing the natural resources of this Nation and we appreciate it.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank my friend from Illinois.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this occasion to commend the gentleman in the well, the dean of the Tennessee delegation and the most able chairman of the subcommittee, for the diligent work which he has put forth, and to commend the other members of the subcommittee as well as the staff for once again bringing to the floor of this House a good bill that will continue this Nation on the road of progress.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank my friend.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time since I have been in Congress that this bill has been brought to the floor without the presence of the great chairman of our subcommittee, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Ohio.

As all of his colleagues know, the gentleman from Ohio has been grievously ill for some time and is now at this very moment in the hospital. I am sure that all of my colleagues join with me in saying to MIKE KIRWAN that we miss him particularly today although we miss him every day. We appreciate all of the great work which he has done through the years in this effort to make the United States of America a better place in which to live and to preserve its environment for posterity.

I am sure also my colleagues will want to join me in wishing MIKE a speedy recovery and assure him that when he does come back here he will indeed be very welcome.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to the members of the subcommittee, both the majority and the minority for the manner in which they have rallied around and got this job of marking up this bill completed without the presence of the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee who preceded me has done a yeoman job. The gentleman from Tennessee is the chairman of one of the most important subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations on a permanent basis but he has extended his activities to be acting chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works also.

In conducting the hearings, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), and the gentleman from Ala-

bama (Mr. ANDREWS), have been all very diligent, and they certainly in my opinion produced a good record, and a record which supports the bill which we have brought out.

I would also like to indicate my personal appreciation to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) for their great support and their diligence as members of the minority on this subcommittee.

It is a good subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, with a top staff, headed by the very capable Gene Wilhelm. I think that the quality of the work that has been produced here is evidence of the fact that it is an effective subcommittee with a fine staff.

This is, as the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, says, the all-American bill. It allocates whatever resources we are able to allocate to develop the natural riches of the United States of America, to preserve it for posterity, to provide a better environment in which our people might live and work. It also provides funds to use the power of the atom not only for the defense of the country and the free world, but also for the betterment of mankind in his peaceful pursuits.

So it is a broad bill, Mr. Chairman. It covers not only the requirements of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers so far as the irrigation and flood control facilities are concerned, but it also covers water pollution and, very particularly, it covers Federal grants for the construction of sewage disposal plants.

I do not think that there is enough money in this bill. If I had my way about it, the bill would be at a much higher level than it now is. However, I certainly recognize the exigencies of the budgetary situation which were felt, not only by the Johnson administration, but which are also felt by the Nixon administration.

I also recognize the fact that this Congress has imposed a spending ceiling both on the previous incumbent of the Presidency and the present incumbent. I recognize that this was a wise act that the Congress did, but also an act which causes the President to have to cut down on many programs which he himself would like to fund, but which he finds he cannot do. But these are the facts of fiscal life, and therefore the bill is brought in at a level which is inadequate for the needs of the country and for the needs of the future.

I only hope, as I am sure most of my colleagues do, that as the budgetary situation rights itself, that in the future we may be able to devote much more of the riches of our country to the greater enjoyment of all individuals and the development of our natural resources so that the people who come after us can live better than we do.

One of the features in this bill is certainly near and dear to my heart because it is the first money to be appropriated for preconstruction planning for the central Arizona project. This is a project which was conceived many years ago. It was moribund through the 1950's because of the fact that there

was a lawsuit in progress in the Supreme Court between the States of the lower basin of the Colorado River to determine their relative rights. Since the suit was completed, it has taken some time to plan a project to do all of the things which are necessary to get a project started, and to get it authorized. In the last Congress the authorization bill became law, so that this year we have been able to proceed with preconstruction planning.

This project is a rescue project which brings water from the Colorado River into the fertile valleys of central Arizona where it will preserve an existing agricultural economy for some years, but in the end I am sure the water will have to be used for municipal and industrial uses of the people who are, in great numbers, coming into those valley and making their homes.

I would remark in passing also that the water which goes into the city of Tucson, or which will go into the city of Tucson as a result of this project, will serve to take a title away from Tucson which it certainly does not desire to keep. Tucson is the largest city in the world which is completely dependent upon underground water supplies for its municipal and industrial water.

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

Mr. RHODES. I yield to my good colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, who represents Tucson.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) for the excellent statement he is making concerning the central Arizona project. The gentleman is certainly one of the most able and valuable Members of this body. I have been most proud to work with him on the essential and urgent water needs of our State. Without his leadership in prior years, and on the Appropriations Committee this year, this vital project might well have been further delayed, or even abandoned. The entire State is indebted to him and I wanted to add these words of commendation.

He has accurately stated the desperate need for supplemental water in Arizona. The language he has authored and has had approved in the bill and the report will do much to get this project underway.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) was a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at the time the central Arizona project was authorized. Without his great work on that committee, this bill could not have succeeded. He is a very valuable member of the Arizona delegation, appreciated by me, and also appreciated by his fine constituents of the Second District of Arizona, who keep sending him to Congress by large majorities.

I could not speak of the central Arizona project without referring to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), who is also chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. His great efforts on behalf of all of the West in general and certainly his great efforts which led to the passage of the central Arizona project in particular have endeared him to the hearts of all

his colleagues, especially those who represent the State of Arizona.

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

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we in Pennsylvania too support this project because we, like many Members from the West, have problems of too much water and problems of flood control as we had in the Eastern States.

So we in the Eastern States likewise should remember when you gentlemen need something for your citizens, to be sure we will be with you.

Mr. RHODES. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) addressed a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON). Chairman MAHON has given the letter to me and asked that I answer it in the RECORD at this particular time. In order to do this, I think I must read a part of it, but before I do I will make a few remarks in explanation.

In the report on this bill, there is a provision which allows the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget to enter into contract with private power companies for the construction of a powerplant at Page, Ariz. The plant is to be financed in part by prepayment by the Federal Government for power which will be used to lift the water in the central Arizona project so it can flow by gravity into the area to be served.

This is a rather unique situation, but it was brought about by a rather unique set of circumstances.

Always before electric power for reclamation projects was produced as part of the project, and used not only for sale, but also for whatever purpose the project itself required.

As the gentleman from Colorado will remember, the central Arizona project initially had two power dams which would be located in the Colorado River. Because of the great objection on the part of many people to the construction of those dams, they were deleted.

So it became necessary to find some means for the production of power for the project purposes. Rather than have the Federal Government build a powerplant itself, the committee of which the gentleman from Colorado is chairman authorized the Secretary of the Interior to enter into arrangements whereby power could be provided through the joint efforts of a consortium of private companies in the area and the Federal Government.

In order for the private companies to enter into this consortium, it was necessary that they and their bondholders be assured that the Federal portion would be paid and it would be paid as it became due. Therefore, it was necessary that under the contract there would be a provision which would obligate the Federal Government to pay its portion, whether or not the funds were appropriated. The gentleman from Colorado quite properly addressed himself to this

particular portion of our report. In so doing he said these words:

Since Section 303 of the Colorado River Basin Project Act has been used as the basis for giving the Central Arizona Project first call on reclamation program funds, I want to call your attention to another provision of the Act. Section 501(b) reads as follows:

"(b) The Secretary is directed to proceed as nearly as practicable with the construction of the Animas-La Plata, Dolores, Dallas Creek, West Divide, and San Miguel participating Federal reclamation projects concurrently with the construction of the Central Arizona Project, to the end that such projects shall be completed not later than the date of the first delivery of water from said Central Arizona Project:

The chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs continued—

My question, Mr. Chairman—

Speaking of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee—

was whether these Upper Colorado River Basin projects will be given the same treatment from the Appropriations Committee as is being given to the Central Arizona Project.

I say to my good friend from Colorado that as one member of the Appropriations Committee, I do intend that the letter and spirit of the act which authorized the central Arizona project will be lived up to. I intend that there will be funds made available for the Colorado projects, or such of them as are found to be completely feasible. It will be the aim of the Appropriations Committee, as it is the aim of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, that these projects will be completed not later than the date of the first delivery of water from the central Arizona project.

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

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. REIFEL. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arizona. I desire to take this opportunity to express my appreciation first to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was kind enough to authorize or to report out a bill which enables South Dakota to have the Oahe Irrigation Unit. In my concluding term in the Congress this is going to be one of the highlights of my experience here, and to the Congress, to the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), and to the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), we in South Dakota are deeply grateful. If my colleague, Congressman BERRY were here, he would concur in what I have had to say.

I also wish to express my appreciation, and in that Congressman BERRY would join me enthusiastically, for the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee including \$500,000 for planning and design of the Oahe irrigation unit. I think it is important for the House to recognize that the committee has wisely called to our attention in South Dakota that we must do something about lifting our ban on the migratory waterfowl, and there is every indication that this is going to take place at the coming leg-

islature in South Dakota this next January. We will be deeply appreciative of all that this committee has done and will continue to do in the future as we find it necessary to come before you for additional funds.

Mr. RHODES. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota. The gentleman is a great Member of the Congress of the United States, and his State is very much in need of the resources which will be provided by the Oahe project. I congratulate him and his colleague, Congressman BERRY, for their successful efforts in obtaining this project for their people.

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

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank my colleague from Arizona for yielding. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate our colleague from South Dakota on the statement which he has just made. I would like to also compliment the committee for having granted the first money for planning for the Oahe project. I am deeply appreciative of the language which you have included in the report, calling to the attention of the people of South Dakota the need to treat the citizens of other States with equality in every respect. As the people of South Dakota look forward to the development of this great project they can be assured that the people of their 49 sister States wish them well and know that both they and their sister States will be better because of the Oahe irrigation project.

It is because of the assurance that members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have received from our two colleagues from South Dakota we have not placed any limitations in other legislation before us at the present time. Feeling the Members of the Legislature from South Dakota are honorable gentlemen and having been assured by our colleagues, Mr. REIFEL and Mr. BERRY, that the Legislature of South Dakota intends to repeal the law discriminating against residents of the other States we fully expect the Legislature of South Dakota to measure up to its responsibilities.

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

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) for his comments. I assure the gentleman we are going to insist and we will have to insist on changing this situation if we are going to come back to Congress for additional funds for wildlife protection.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes I have remaining, I would like to address myself very briefly to the item in the bill which has to do with construction of facilities for waste treatment plants. This is a very necessary part of the program. I, for one, would support a program of much greater magnitude than the one we have been able to appropriate. However, I am constrained not to do so by various situations which have occurred.

First, of course, is the fact that we are in a budgetary crunch. We are in a period of inflation, we are in a period where the housewife of America is going to the store and many times finding the paycheck which her husband brought home—which is the biggest paycheck he has ever had in dollars—does not go far enough to feed her family properly and provide for their needs.

Also, the \$600 million which is in this bill provides a program which is almost three times the program of last year.

Also, if more funds were added, about one-half would go to States which by the terms of the formula which is in the law, already are provided enough money. Since these States have as much money as they can properly spend or finance their own projects, so that most of it would be going into creating more carry-over, Mr. Chairman.

From the \$214 million appropriation of last year, there was a \$64 million carryover. Why? Not because the money is not needed, but because the formula under which it is distributed has no provision for need as a test. The division formula is by population almost completely and it results in some States becoming entitled to money which the State cannot spend, and other States, which are badly in need and which will provide matching funds and have the projects ready, do not get enough money.

The gentleman from Florida, the ranking minority member on the House Committee on Public Works, has introduced a bill which I hope can be brought to the floor as soon as possible and enacted. That bill provides a new approach and provides a means for going ahead with this program as rapidly as we can, so that we can clean up this country and leave it better than we found it when we came onto this earth.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations has brought out a responsible and supportable measure in H.R. 14159. The committee is to be commended for doing what it has done by way of more adequately providing for the implementation of needed water and land resources development projects throughout the Nation and particularly in the West. I am especially pleased that construction funds for the Bureau of Reclamation have been increased \$16.5 million over the amounts sent up by the administration. The committee, in restoring about 50 percent of the cuts inflicted in the fiscal year 1970 revised budget, has made a constructive step in the right direction and should be, as a minimum, sustained by the House. The construction funds are far from adequate but I recognize the difficulties faced by the Appropriations Committee in increasing items in the administration's budget. However, we should understand that with an unfunded backlog of needed reclamation hardware of \$5 billion and identifiable feasible projects not yet authorized of about twice that much, the increased amount of about \$172 million fall far short of what the country really needs to underwrite this great program's base of economic productivity. In fact, the full needs of western water develop-

ment should be supported at a level at least twice that in H.R. 14159.

Far more significant than the relatively small increase in dollars is the expression of congressional dissatisfaction with Executive usurpation of the public purse strings, at least insofar as the great Committee on Appropriations is concerned. I share and support this expression of dissatisfaction and I join with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee in their efforts to assert the prerogatives of the Congress set forth in article I of the Constitution relative to the powers of the Congress to determine appropriations from the Treasury. I sincerely hope that this bill will be the first of a continuing series of demonstrations of congressional intent to regain total and lasting control of those powers of government that have recently been so substantially eroded away.

Mr. Chairman, there are those who will apologize for the budgetmakers and weep copiously for the difficulty that the Bureau of the Budget has in setting national priorities. I submit that such tears are wasted, for it is not the proper role of the Budget Bureau to set national priorities. It is the constitutional province of the people's representatives to make these judgments, and we are the only body that is properly constituted for that purpose. So let us, by our affirmative votes on H.R. 14159, as reported, affirm our intentions to accept our responsibilities in this field and let this be truly the first step on the long road back to the position of dignity and coequality that is rightfully ours.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to make a detailed commentary on the pluses and minuses of the pending bill. As I have said, the committee has done a fine job in view of the realities of the political and economic environment in which it is working. I would like to comment, however, that I notice a continuing tendency toward the sanctity of planning allowances, despite the lack of proper funds for program implementation. For example, the Bureau of Reclamation continues to request, apparently with the full sanction of the Bureau of the Budget, increases in the level of planning funds that it had down through the years. This despite the fact that this level of planning has resulted in an enormous backlog of authorized projects. While this is not a major item dollarwise, it seems to me to be imprudent if not outright foolish to perpetuate this situation, and I would hope that our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs might work jointly with the Committee on Appropriations in succeeding years to restore a more reasonable balance between the rate of planning and execution. For one, I am committed to try to bring this about.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) and the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) in their usual competent fashion have ably reported and explained the bill that we are now considering. Both the gentleman

from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) have served with distinction on this subcommittee for many years, and their knowledge of the details of the bill is a credit to their labor and industry.

I take this time also, Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS), and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) have already done, to commend the staff of this subcommittee. The Appropriations Committee is blessed with having a competent staff in all its subcommittees.

This subcommittee yields to no other subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for the staff we have in the person of the chief of our staff, Gene Wilhelm, and his assistants George Urian and Don Richbourg.

The bill, and the accompanying report, bear the imprimatur of the chairman of this subcommittee, our beloved colleague from Ohio, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN. MIKE came to the Congress in 1937. He was appointed to the Appropriations Committee in 1943—served as a member of and chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee from 1949 to 1965, when he relinquished that chairmanship, to assume the chair of the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations in 1965 to the present day.

Mr. Chairman, hospitalization keeps him from this floor today. He has undergone a serious physical setback—a setback that would have broken most men long before now. I visited with him last Sunday and am happy to report that he is regaining his strength and is slowly on the mend. I know that all of us in this House, who know and admire him so much, join in a prayerful hope that MIKE's health will continue to improve, and he will be back among us before too long.

As most of you are aware, MIKE KIRWAN has announced his retirement from the labors of this House when the 91st Congress ends. I know that one of his greatest regrets is that he is not with us today to shepherd this bill. I know, too, Mr. Chairman that all us share that regret.

No one believed more deeply, in what the Public Works and Interior appropriations bills sought to accomplish, than MIKE KIRWAN. In his own, truly unique, picturesque language, he painted the meaning of this bill—its significance to the land he loved so much—with a skill that no one could match.

Harken to him Mr. Chairman, as he discussed this bill a couple of years back:

If there is any man or woman on the floor of Congress today who thinks Khrushchev was foolish when he said, "We Will Bury America", let us reflect that we may be contributing to this ourselves, by our failure to adequately prepare our country, *not for defense or war*, but to defend it against floods and other natural disasters, and the incredible waste by not protecting and developing our fantastic resources.

MIKE KIRWAN knew and understood this land as few have. From the coal mines of Pennsylvania, where he was born and raised, he traveled the length and breadth of this land in every con-

ceivable fashion. As an eye witness to its greatness and its potential, he carried his convictions to this House.

And he did something about it. He vowed that this Nation would not be despoiled. He championed the programs that added to the strength of this land, by a constant attention to preserve and develop its resources.

Land, wood and water—

He often proclaimed—

Land, wood and water, these are the basic resources that give America its prosperity and its potential for greatness. Destroy these and you destroy America.

So, Mr. Chairman, he spent practically all of his time and his effort in this body, in pursuit of programs and projects, that protected, and developed our resources and the people of this country. Flood control, recreation, navigation, power supply, water supply, conservation, forest lands, national parks—all of these and many activities—have been the beneficiaries of his spirit and his dedication. This land is the richer and the better because he came this way. All over this country there are monuments to his determination and his foresight.

I know that when he leaves this Congress, he will carry with him the gratitude of Members, past and present, who understand what his service has meant to this country.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to two men who have made great contributions in the field of water resource development; Lt. Gen. William F. Cassidy, who until last August 1 was Chief of Engineers, and Floyd Dominy, who after this session of Congress will retire as Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Since his graduation from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1931, General Cassidy has had a most distinguished military career. He has been a leader in the water resources development field and much of the progress which has been made in this field over the years is the result of his dedicated efforts during his service with the Corps of Engineers. I was glad to learn that since his retirement as Chief of Engineers in August of this year he has been called back by the President to serve as Chairman of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. His experience and training will be of great value in carrying out the important functions of the Board.

Floyd Dominy is, of course, best known by those of you from the reclamation States of the West, but I believe all of us are aware of the great contribution he has made to the development of the entire Nation. Floyd Dominy was appointed Commissioner of Reclamation in May of 1959 and has more than 35 years of Government service.

Both of these gentlemen have appeared before our Public Works Subcommittee on many occasions and have always demonstrated their wide knowledge and ability in the areas under their jurisdiction. I am sure the other members of the committee and Congress join with me in paying recognition to these fine Americans.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts with reference to General Cassidy and Floyd Dominy.

Mr. Chairman, General Cassidy and Floyd Dominy have certainly performed great services to this country in the development of our natural resources which are absolutely incalculable in their value. They have not only been dedicated public servants, but they have also been the type of public servants who have leveled with the committee. They have come before us and given us the picture as it is, and we could always trust what they said.

We shall certainly miss them as they go on to other careers.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the kind remarks of the gentleman from Arizona.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the bill itself, I agree with what has been said by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) and by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES). This bill has my support. It has my support for water pollution control and sewage treatment plants. As has been stated, the sum of \$214 million was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, but this was upped to \$450 million by our subcommittee and to \$600 million by the full committee, with some carryover of \$65 million, for a grand total of \$665 million available in fiscal year 1970.

My support of this amount is based on the fact that the Water Pollution Control Administration insists that this is all that can be used in fiscal year 1970 for this program. Everyone is for clean water. It is like being for the American flag and for motherhood. Everyone in this Chamber has voted for the Clean Water Act and all of us are in favor of it.

As has been stated here, the problem cannot be solved by the amount of money appropriated under this bill. The problem lies with the formula, and when we get to that portion of the bill where amendments will be offered to increase the amount, we can discuss that problem.

Mr. Chairman, let me now turn to an item that is not in the pending bill. That is the Dickey-Lincoln project. I dissented when the subcommittee eliminated the amount of \$807,000 to continue the planning on the Dickey-Lincoln School project. It was deleted without prejudice by the subcommittee. It was deleted over my objection. I dissented from the action of the subcommittee and made an effort to restore the funds for the project in the full committee but lost by a fairly narrow margin.

Mr. Chairman, my support of the Dickey-Lincoln School project has not wavered since the day that the staff of this Subcommittee on Public Works reported that this project was feasible and that it ought to be built. This project was included in the Johnson budget and it was kept in the Nixon budget revision. The amount which was recommended was \$807,000 and would be used to continue planning. It is a project which in my judgment is essential for adequate power sources in New England. During

the past years New England has experienced some severe power shortages.

Mr. Chairman, let me dwell for a moment on the following justification:

Dickey-Lincoln School Reservoirs, Maine:	
Total estimated cost	\$229,000,000
Appropriated to date	2,154,000
Budget estimate, 1969 (to resume planning)	807,000
Benefit to cost ratio—2 to 1	-----
Balance to complete planning after fiscal year 1970	539,000

The committee stated that it "continues to believe the project is fully justified and required to provide urgently needed hydropower in the area."

Testimony presented to the committee this year—pages 393 to 407 of part 1—clearly indicates that the project continues to be economically feasible with a benefit to cost ratio of 2 to 1, and will provide efficient hydroelectric power at reasonable rates for peaking purposes in the New England area as well as firm power to the preference customers in Maine.

The project compares very favorable with similar projects being constructed in other regions throughout the country.

Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis of Maine recently stated, in referring to three recent occasions when New England came seriously close to suffering serious power shortages:

If New England is going to have to suffer through power shortages then the importance of building the Dickey-Lincoln project becomes more evident.

The Governor stated further:

The present situation is a graphic illustration that the planned generating capacity for New England's power needs by the dominating private utilities has been underestimated and inadequate.

Expensive publicity campaigns have told us time and time again that the big Eleven Power loop would take care of all of New England's power needs. We were told that there was no need to build the Dickey-Lincoln Dam—that Dickey-Lincoln's power was not necessary.

The testimony again this year by the Corps of Engineers confirms the following concerning the project in answer to the critics:

1. A complete reanalysis and adjustment of the unit prices for the project has been made providing a current cost estimate of \$229,000,000. The net increase of \$10.6 million since last year includes price increases and pay costs, with offsetting savings, in part, in reduced costs for reservoir clearing, and savings on the siting of embankments.

2. All of the different combinations of plants that might be constructed to meet the regional needs in the area, including Federally funded thermal plants, gas turbines, diesel engines, pump storage, nuclear power, and the studies continue to indicate that there are no more economical alternatives than the Dickey-Lincoln School project.

3. The opponents of the project continue to make erroneous comparisons of the project in relation to the power plants being built by the private utilities. These comparisons pertain to the capital investment alone and disregard operating costs. It is not the initial investment that one should consider, but the power cost at the market.

The economic comparability test, which has been updated to this year's

cost estimates (as shown on page 400 of Part 1 of the hearings) continues to show that the power cost at the market under the Dickey-Lincoln School project is 10.3 mills per kilowatt hour compared with 20.5 mills per kilowatt hour for a pumped storage unit and 25.7 mills for a nuclear-steam plant.

If a hydroelectric project for the generation of peaking power is as uneconomic as the New England utilities claim, why is it that the private utilities in the Northwest strongly support Federal construction of such projects in order that the low-cost peaking power can be integrated into their systems in cooperation with the Bonneville Power Administration.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend the gentleman for his tremendous efforts not only this year, but in years past, in behalf of the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project which, when it is finally constructed—and I am sure it will be, as many other projects that have come before Congress, have taken many years of ups and downs before they finally were fully funded—will be of tremendous benefit not only to the people of Maine, but the people throughout all New England.

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman in the well.

It was with a great deal of interest and no little amount of satisfaction that I read a two-page advertisement in this Monday's New York Times concerning the "power crisis" faced by the United States.

The timely ad was placed by Electrical World, "the leading publication" for the private electric utility interest, because, in the words of the magazine's publisher:

We have watched the power crisis grow to a point where we can no longer stand by.

We all know, Mr. Chairman, that the private electric utilities have long been in the vanguard of opposition to public power projects. Its vehement attacks on enabling legislation for such past enterprises as the Grand Coulee and Hoover Dams and the Tennessee Valley Authority are easily recalled, and its recent relentless opposition to the same kind of Federal project in New England is widely known.

But now, at last, the private utility interests seem to be admitting that they have stood by for too long in the face of the Nation's growing power needs. This is most encouraging.

It is encouraging that the private electric utilities seem finally to have begun to admit that "this country of ours is in the midst of a power crisis." It is encouraging that they are, at long last, facing up to "the chilling prospect of frequent blackouts." Encouraging, that they have finally admitted that "the margin of safety has shrunk 32 percent" since the blackout of November 9, 1965. Encouraging, that they "want to see the problem solved—before the lights go out."

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the private power utilities' ostensible support for the public interest in the matter of electric power—however long overdue—is indeed encouraging. My only regret is that—insofar as the interests of the New England citizenry are concerned—their support may have come too late to undue all of the damage caused by their earlier opposition.

For the past few weeks, Mr. Chairman, I have circulated among the Members of this body soliciting support for inclusion of an \$807,000 appropriation for the Dickey-Lincoln power project in the bill now before us. My efforts were generally successful.

Despite them, however, and despite both the recent change of heart on the part of the private utilities and the fact that our own Appropriations Committee recognized that the project is "fully justified and required," lingering doubts about Dickey's real worth still seem to inhabit the minds of several of our colleagues.

Perhaps a review of the elements of Dickey's promise will help assuage some of these doubts.

Both before and after the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric power project was authorized for construction by the 89th Congress, intense studies of its need and feasibility were conducted by the executive and legislative branches of this Government. There is, in fact, good reason to believe that no other multipurpose hydroelectric project authorized by this Congress has ever received as much close scrutiny.

The project has been approved by all of the Federal agencies concerned with power development—the Interior Department, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal Power Commission, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Bureau of the Budget. It has additionally been justified by the findings of an in-depth study performed by the staff of our own House Appropriations Committee. And it meets all of the criteria for economic feasibility and multipurpose resource development required by the Congress and enunciated in the Senate document entitled "Policies, Standards, and Procedures in the Formulation, Evaluation, and Review of Plans for Use and Development of Water and Related Land Resources."

Dickey-Lincoln is the first Federal multipurpose water resource project authorized by Congress for construction in New England. Its projected generation of 1.2 billion kilowatt-hours of power annually from facilities having an installed capacity of 830 megawatts would provide low-cost, nonpolluting power for all of New England. And it would provide this power at a lower cost than any other means of generation, including the conventional methods, as well as nuclear thermal plants or pumped storage hydroplants. Once constructed, it would save electric power consumers of the Northeast an estimated \$9 million a year.

Studies made by our Appropriations Committee clearly illustrate, Mr. Chairman, that 650,000 kilowatts of peaking power from Dickey could be sold in Boston, Mass., for about \$17.50 per kilowatt-year. A privately built pumped storage

plant, on the other hand, would sell power for about \$23.50 per kilowatt-year. Some 100,000 kilowatts of firm power from Dickey-Lincoln, moreover, could be sold in the State of Maine for a little more than \$28, while private conventional plants and private nuclear facilities would sell the same amount for about \$37 and \$33.50, respectively.

The project will cost American taxpayers an estimated \$229 million—a price viewed as "reasonable" and "sound" by spokesmen for both the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission. Especially reasonable when viewed in light of the fact that its benefit-to-cost ratio in the last year has risen from 1.9 to 1 to 2 to 1. This means, of course, that Dickey promises to return to the taxpayers \$2 for every dollar spent for its planning and construction. Some close observers have even predicted that the entire cost, including the interest, will be paid for in close to 50 years. Surely, the life of this valuable asset will exceed 50 years. And as it does, and as it additionally continues to provide revenue even after its cost is completely recovered, it cannot but help to provide power at an even lower price.

Even the period of project construction will have a major economic impact on the area of New England, Mr. Chairman. More than 11,000 man-years of labor and wages totaling in excess of \$12¼ million will be generated. Nearly 2,000 employees will be put to work for 6 years. Close to 600,000 tons of concrete will be required; 25,000 tons of reinforced steel. The project's powerplant alone will require \$60 million in electrical equipment.

After its construction, its impact will be incalculable—its positive effects on the people, the businesses, and the industry of the New England area will be staggering. For the first time, Mr. Chairman, the Northeast will realize the benefits that Federal water and power resource development can bring. For the first time, New England will have the same "yardstick" of competition by comparison which has meant so much to the many other sections of the country which are served by public power from Federal dams.

There is no question in my mind or in the minds of the great majority of the people of New England but that the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project merits approval by this Congress and that the \$807,000 recommended by President Nixon for fiscal 1970 preconstruction planning should be OK'd by this House.

It is my firm belief, Mr. Chairman, that our conviction will be borne out, and that before the measure now before us is finally enacted, funds to proceed with the planning of this worthwhile project will be made available by this Congress.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY) for his activities on this project. No one has worked harder or with a greater degree of dedication than the gentleman from Maine.

This project is a multiple-purpose project, and it really is about the only

multiple-purpose project that could ever be built in New England. We have them all over the United States. Those of us in New England have supported the projects in the South, the Midwest, the Southwest, the Far West, and the Northwest. This is the only time and perhaps the last time that New England has a chance of getting a sizable multiple-purpose Federal project. Let us build this multiple-purpose project in Maine which is so essential to the power needs of that area.

Maine has the dubious distinction of enjoying the highest power rates in the Nation. This is the one way in which those power rates can be lowered.

So, Mr. Chairman, again I take this time to commend the gentleman from Maine for his efforts in behalf of this project.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding. I take this time simply to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS), and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) for the great job that the committee has done.

I also particularly wish to join the gentleman from Massachusetts in his commendation to a variety of people who have contributed so much to the well-being of America, particularly General Cassidy and Commissioner Floyd Doiny.

Further, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further momentarily, I would like to pay special tribute to our very wonderful friend, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN. This money will continue to make monuments to MIKE's firm belief in America, and what it takes to make America great. Certainly we all do miss MIKE today, and I want at this time to express my personal appreciation on behalf of the State of California for the great contributions that MIKE KIRWAN has made not only to our State, but to all America, and to join with the gentleman from Massachusetts in the many kind things that he has said about this great American.

Mr. BOLAND. I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks.

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

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14159 and congratulate the Committee on Appropriations on the fine job it has done.

H.R. 14159 is a good bill, and will make it possible to keep our essential and urgent water resource development programs moving. While many in this body would understandably like to see more money for a number of worthwhile projects—and I particularly regret the absence of construction funds for several very fine projects in Oklahoma—the bill,

on balance, is a good one. It represents the solid judgment of an excellent subcommittee which has worked long and hard on a very difficult assignment.

I appreciate the eloquent words of the subcommittee's members who have paid tribute to their chairman, our beloved colleague, MIKE KIRWAN.

No man in America has done more to build our country in this century, than MIKE KIRWAN.

His contribution will enrich the Nation for decades to come, and will make possible a better life for the children of all of us.

If MIKE KIRWAN were here today, handling this bill on the floor, I am sure he would tell us: "This is an all-American bill, for all of America. It is a bill you can vote for with pride and with full confidence that your vote will strengthen America."

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose a question to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) regarding the committee's intention in certain language which it used in the report on the bill. This language relates to the Oakley Dam and Reservoir project, and is contained on page 52 of the committee report. I direct the question to the gentleman from Massachusetts because he was the member of the subcommittee who presided when testimony on this subject was heard by the subcommittee.

My question relates to the language on page 52 of the report which reads as follows:

The Committee has allowed \$100,000, which . . . should be adequate to continue land acquisition on the project pending settlement of the Allerton Park controversy.

I was interested and most gratified to note in reading through the hearings on the Oakley project that a memorandum of agreement and a waterways alternative have been concluded by the State of Illinois, the city of Decatur, the University of Illinois—which owns Allerton Park—and has been warmly endorsed by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) in whose district the Oakley project is located. This agreement concluded on May 29, 1969, is printed at pages 546-558 of part 5 of the hearings. It seems to be a fine compromise in which everyone's interests are protected. The gentleman from Massachusetts indicated during the hearing that he was most happy to see that the agreement had been concluded.

Now what I wonder is whether, in light of the specific nature of the May 29 agreement and the waterways alternative and the fact that the Corps of Engineers has not yet accepted that agreement, what I wonder is whether the committee did not intend that whatever expenditures are made on the Oakley project, should be consistent with this May 29 agreement and waterways alternative. In other words, does the committee not contemplate that the corps will accept the May 29 agreement and the alternative subject to the corps finding that it is feasible.

Mr. BOLAND. I agree with the gentleman's interpretation. That is the committee's interpretation.

Let me say that the money we are appropriating for the Oakley Dam is to continue land acquisition, but it is land acquisition in those areas in which I think there is no controversy.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) who has been very close to this project and in whose district the project is located.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I believe the statements made by both gentlemen are in the nature of approximate truth—as true as I think we can put it.

The money was limited to the purchase of land which was not in the area of Allerton Park—that was the limitation which was put on it.

At the present time there is a signed agreement between the State of Illinois, the city of Decatur, and the University of Illinois, and they are the only parties involved in this project before the Corps of Engineers go on with the Oakley Dam and Reservoir project and now being studied by the Corps of Engineers. It is subject to that feasibility study as to whether or not they would go ahead with the project as is, and if not feasible the corps would have to make a restudy of the project. I think in general what has been said is true.

Mr. MIKVA. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) for allowing me to take the time to clarify this matter.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support this bill as it has been reported from the Committee on Appropriations.

I do want to take this occasion to fully support the fine tributes which have been paid to our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KIRWAN), General Cassady, and Commissioner Dominy, by the gentleman from Massachusetts who just preceded me.

It is never a happy experience to find oneself supporting an appropriation bill which is substantially over the budget, and of course this bill is some \$300 million over the budget, but it does appear that the issue here today is not the matter of our exceeding the budget, as much as it appears to be that we did not exceed the budget enough.

We are confronted for the second time in this session with what appears to be described as a full funding campaign. If this is to be the common practice—if authorizations, that is funding ceilings, are to be treated as funding floors, then the budget process and the appropriation process will become nothing but hollow mockeries and the Committee on Ways and Means might as well close up its shop, too, because it simply will find the responsibility of attempting to raise revenue to pay out money as fast as it is possible to be spent an impossible job of performance.

Mr. Chairman, we have marched up the hill twice in the past 2 years in a general way on behalf of fiscal restraint.

Last year it fell to members of the Committee on Ways and Means to take the leadership.

They, I suspect, were rather tired of the onerous burden of attempting to close deficit gaps, a job which had not been accomplished over a period of many years. They simply felt that they could not accept the burden of raising revenue as fast as it was being paid out. And so that was the origin of last year's Expenditure and Control Act of 1968, when a definite and firm ceiling on the expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year was established.

Then that pattern, in a modified form, was repeated this year in the first supplemental appropriation bill that reached the floor. The Appropriations Committee did originate an overall spending ceiling for the fiscal year. But it provided for a flexible limit. It is a limit that goes up and down as a result of the actions or the inactions of the Congress in dealing with requests for various new sources of revenue or in dealing with appropriation requests as they affect expenditures as they came before the Congress. If this were not true, if this year's expenditure ceiling were not a modified one, a flexible one that does go up and down as we take action with respect to appropriations, then, I suppose, we would not need to be quite so much concerned about the efforts to substantially increase appropriation bills. If it read as last year's law, we could in effect say, "Well, go ahead, if you want to look foolish, because you have already legislated that the money cannot be spent." But because our action here in increasing the budget substantially would raise not only appropriations but it would likewise affect the expenditure ceilings which have previously been proposed, we must be concerned with the effect of our actions.

First of all, I think we must be concerned that our self-respect, for repeated increases in appropriations reflected in increases in expenditures will cast a cloud over our self-righteousness when we did approve the spending limitation earlier this year.

But, Mr. Chairman, to claim credit for imposing a spending limitation on the one hand and to become a champion of full funding on the other, such conduct cannot escape the criticism of the people that it is our responsibility to represent.

For those who are interested in the record, the record is clear that the \$600 million provided for the waste treatment program plus the \$64- to \$65-million carryover is all that the administrative machinery—the administrative machinery of the Federal Government and the administrative machinery of our State and local governments, under existing law—that is all that they can absorb, and the Secretary of the Interior is on record to that effect. To increase that amount would be an invitation to waste—not to waste treatment—but to waste.

There have been these two major increases in the bill, one of them \$386 million increase for the waste treatment works program, and I suppose that that can be justified as an action of the committee in attempting to deal with an

emergency situation to the maximum capacity of our three levels of government to deal with. The other is a \$55 million increase in reclamation and civil functions projects, and that increase, too, I believe is justified in avoiding the extra expense and the danger of delay that would otherwise accompany reduced funding on a certain number of projects within those programs.

So, Mr. Chairman, even though this bill is above the budget, I support the bill as is. I hope my colleagues, after examining the record and attempting to be responsible in providing only those funds that can be used and absorbed, will support the bill as is.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues in the many tributes that have been paid to our subcommittee chairman, the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN, and to the other members of the subcommittee who have worked so hard and so long, alternating in handling the work of our beloved friend, the gentleman from Ohio, whose health has been such as to cause him to miss many of the committee hearings. My colleague from Massachusetts beat me to quoting from his all American announcement of his beliefs.

Also, I join in saying I believe the staff of the committee has as hard a job as any staff of any committee, and I take this time to compliment them.

I also pay tribute to the gentleman from Tennessee, who is handling this bill and who has done a fine job through the years on this program, and also to his counterpart on the Republican side, the gentleman from Arizona.

I also take this time to express the hope that some time we will give some attention to the fact that this bill is misnamed and it is inappropriate to refer to it as the public works bill. As we all know, through the years, this bill gets picked up and held out as what the Congress does for itself. May I say nothing could be further from the truth. This bill should be designated as the maintenance and development bill, representing the attention that our great country is being given, the attention that we are giving to protecting the country itself, the base on which everything else depends—that is the natural resources, our rivers and streams and watersheds and, yes, our harbors and rivers.

A few years ago someone said that some small country or other was the only country that had a balanced budget. It was said the country did not owe a dollar and did not have one. On our committee I feel we need to give attention to a balanced budget, but we really need to give attention to balancing the spending we do on those things and taking care of those things on which everything else depends. It is up to us who serve on this committee to promote and up to the membership here to look after our country. Of course, we look after the needs of the different districts, the needs of every section of the United States. As shown by our report this committee heard more than 1,600 witnesses, from every section

of every State. We listened to the testimony of 208 of our colleagues. We were not trying to divide the cake and we were not trying to give everybody something, but we were trying not to overlook any section of the United States in our effort to protect our country, not only for today, but for our children tomorrow.

I could go on and on, but I repeat again: The more serious our problems are, and the greater our debts and the greater our obligations around the world, the more imperative it is that we look after the base on which the cure for all of them depend—our land and our natural resources, our rivers and our harbors.

I shall not try to repeat or add to the words that have been said about our great friend and great chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. MICHAEL KIRWAN, but I say again that all Americans, including those who will follow us for many generations, will be indebted to MIKE KIRWAN for whom we all pitch in today. I hope we may do him proud and that you will back us in our efforts.

This bill is needed today and more important, for tomorrow. Where are we going to put 150 million people, the expected increase in our population during the next 30 years.

I have heard the debate here. I support the committee action. We all agree we have a tremendous problem with respect to pollution.

Due to other assignments I have had, I have been in the older cities of this Nation, which I shall not identify here because they have enough problems without having this condition advertised. As one goes into many of the older cities he sees how much is old and worn out, how the sewerage systems are deteriorated, and sewage disposal systems outmoded or obsolete, leaving their waterfronts likened to open sewers, you know they need help.

We go to the Potomac and other places around the country and we can see that we need to give real attention to reclaiming what we have done in years past to create pollution of air and water.

Then, when one goes to other areas, such as mine, one sees the area is made up of small cities and small towns where, as of today, they do not have the serious pollution problems of our major cities, but, with this growth of population, now is the time to be intelligent enough to keep those areas from ever getting like they have gotten in many other areas of this country.

Even considering all that, there is only a limited amount of work we can get done in a limited amount of time. I say that we do not differ with our friends who talk about the pollution we face today and that which we must protect ourselves from developing tomorrow. But we should be practical about it. We should not inflame the country by going overboard at a time the dollar is getting cheaper and cheaper.

The committee has recommended an appropriation of \$600 million, which is more than half the authorization. I want to say to my friends, many of whom are not here at the moment, I agree with my colleague from Massachusetts. If this

House ever adopts the view that an authorization is a commitment by the Congress to carry it out fully in the shortest possible time we are going to have the bitterest fights every time there is an authorization bill, because if that is where the decision is going to be made on immediate spending there will be precious few authorizations that go through the Congress without the greatest amount of difficulty, since it will be necessary to match the authorization against income, and it will be necessary to match it all along the way with other problems.

It is wise, I believe, to have an authorization much higher than the funding which may be required at the moment. It actually allows us to have advanced planning. It allows us to have plans on the shelf, for the time when we can get out of this Vietnamese war. Authorizations on the shelf are fine for the operations of this country in season and out of season.

But we need them far beyond what we really are going to do now.

The other side of this is, if we were to appropriate the full amount that is authorized we would never get it spent, because they are not able to spend it in the months ahead during this fiscal year. They cannot do it at all.

Certainly it is in line with public opinion which has been whipped up on this subject. I agree that we need to meet this problem, but not to the point of being impractical and not employing common-sense to do the most about it we can in the shortest period of time.

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

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

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding.

I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman for the very clear statement he is making on the subject of pollution. As a fellow member of the Appropriations Committee I should like to advise the committee that it was the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) who joined with others of us on the Appropriations Committee to persuade our committee to support \$600 million instead of the subcommittee figure. As Members know, the original budget request was \$214 million for the water pollution portion of the bill.

I want the Members to know that I support the appropriation of \$600 million which was adopted after much debate in full committee. For myself, it would be very nice to be able to come in and say, "We put a billion dollars in the committee," but I am now convinced it would be unrealistic.

I must say, having listened to the arguments in committee and understanding the problem of the formula, it seems to me that this is the most practical immediate solution to the problem. I am delighted that the committee responded by coming through with the \$600 million, and more particularly I want to congratulate the gentleman in the well for supporting the amendment to increase the subcommittee recommendation to \$600 million.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my colleague from California, and I appreciate his own sound judgment and his effective action in this area.

It is always hard to hold ourselves in line with practicality, especially when the subject is as popular as the one with which we are dealing today, pollution of our streams. But the committee has gone as far as we can and properly spend the money and that is in my opinion as far as we should go.

Mr. Chairman, we dealt with the problems of all sections. Personally, I appreciate the support I had from my colleagues on the committee. Particularly am I pleased that we got funds for beginning work on the Yellow Creek Port on the Mississippi side of the Tennessee River; the amount of \$450,000 represents the Tennessee Valley Authority's capability for the remainder of this fiscal year. The important thing is getting started, since the Budget Bureau has not recommended any funds at this time.

With regard to the port facilities at Yellow Creek in Tishomingo County, this should mean tremendous development for all northeast Mississippi and the expansion of heavy industry into that area.

In its report, our committee pointed out this is in Appalachia and will be helpful in meeting the economic problems of the area.

Other items which are of special benefit and interest to north Mississippi are the Upper Auxiliary Channel, which will prove of real benefit to six of the western counties of the second district, and the Ascalmore-Tippo and Opossum Bayou projects, which are directed to be started and which will benefit three other counties.

Included also are funds for development of facilities at Arkabutla, Enid, Grenada, and Sardis Reservoirs.

With regard to work on the Upper Auxiliary Channel, we pointed out that the work on the upper part of the project for the delta is essential, since this will keep it somewhat on a comparative level with the work being done in the lower delta.

The bill contains \$500,000 which this subcommittee provided for continuation of engineering and design on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, and \$50,000 for continuation of the survey on the Hatchie River in Alcorn and Tippah Counties, Miss., together with \$1 million for flood control on the Bear Creek Watershed, Ala., and Miss.; \$650,000 for flood control work on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Watershed, a substantial increase above the budget.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I have heard some astounding statements made in the well of the House today, ones which I think might bode well for the future of the country. I say this because with due deference to the members of the Appropriations Committee and the other standing committees of the House, it is about time that all of the committees realized that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union is the No. 1 committee in Congress, and that

is the committee that we are in right now.

I was delighted to hear a statement by one of our colleagues that some of the authorizing bills might be looked at more carefully. This is a good sign because this is the way the Congress should act and not expect to rely upon one of the standing committees to bail them out.

Now, let us look at the situation that we are in with reference to this bill and especially with reference to one phase of it. That is the amount that we have provided for the elimination of pollution.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in 1966 the Congress considered the Clean Waters Restoration Act which first passed in the Senate without a dissenting vote and then was sent over to the House, reported out of the Public Works Committee and passed this body without a dissenting vote. Every Member of Congress who was here in 1966 voted for that bill. That bill said, among other things, that the Congress was gravely concerned about pollution in this country and that we realized that the job was bigger than just the Federal Government and that we call upon the States and the local communities to participate. Further, we said if the States would adopt the standards to improve the water quality in their own States and in their own communities the Federal Government would give them a certain proportion of the money necessary to clear up the domestic pollution. Well, we the Congress have never kept our word, but the States have gone ahead relying upon their Congressmen to keep their commitment.

Now, somebody has made a great deal that last year we did not spend that amount of money that was appropriated. I can tell you why we did not spend that amount of money. Because there is not a Representative here in the House who has not had a community in his State or in his own district that has not come down here with an engineer to the departments and asked if there was any money and been told that it is absolutely useless, that we the Congress did not provide enough money—to enable the States and local communities to go ahead with assurance.

We made a commitment to the people of this country, and it is up to the Congress to be as good as its word.

I do not know whether or not you folks kept in touch with what happened in the other body yesterday, but in that body they adopted an amendment, and that amendment said, among other things, that all States and all of the communities who have gone ahead and have not received any money from the Federal Government would be entitled to put in a claim for reimbursement. And if that passes in this body—and I will vote for it when it comes over here—we will already owe the States and the local communities over \$600 million—just to pay for what has already been installed without any concern for those projects that are to be built this year.

Some people talk about the integrity of the budget. Let me tell you about the integrity of the budget. Consistency is apparently not the rule here in the House, because on July 31 of this year

the Members of the House by a vote of 293 to 126 said they did not care what the budget was with regard to education; they voted \$1 billion more.

Let me also say to you—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Let me say to the members of the Committee of the Whole that unless we clean up the waters of this country, do not worry about education, because there will not be any children to educate. It is just that serious. The leading ecologists of our country tell us that by the year 2000 mankind may not survive on this earth because of water pollution and what we have done to cause it.

So the biggest thing that we owe to our own people, and to the world, is to see to it that sufficient money is provided to clean up the waters of this country so that mankind can survive.

Mr. Chairman, when the amendment is offered to increase and to keep the word of Congress, and make the appropriation of clean water \$1 billion, I hope that the amendment will be adopted overwhelmingly.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL).

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my admiration for the subcommittee, and the work that they have done on this bill, in building America in the same tradition of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, who is unable to be with us today. I wish to express my admiration, respect and affection for MIKE KIRWAN, and I hope that the gentleman from Ohio will be back with us before long.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in considering the appropriations which are before us today, we take the future of our Nation's water resources in our hands. As the distinguished Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives has so ably pointed out in its report, there is a truly compelling need for the expansion of the water resource development in this Nation.

Requirements for municipal and industrial water will increase by some 300 percent during the next half century as this Nation, already feeling the pressures of a growing population, faces a projected population of some 468 million people by the year 2020.

In the course of water development, a half century is not very long. It takes time to harness rampaging rivers and to put the flood waters which are devastating our lands and washing out to sea to beneficial work irrigating our crops, serving our homes and industries. It takes time to clean up polluted streams and lakes and to make them habitable for fish, wildlife and for people.

These facts have been recognized over the years by the House of Representatives Appropriations Committee and especially its Subcommittee on Public Works under the outstanding leadership of its dedicated, knowledgeable and far-sighted chairman, MIKE KIRWAN.

The success we have had in the past in meeting the water needs of a growing and expanding Nation can be attributed directly to the efforts of this committee and its chairman.

As the Representative of much of the California region from which its water supplies spring, I want to say that the Congress has been good to the Golden State in providing a timely program of multiple-purpose water development over the years.

The needs continue, however, and I believe that the recommendations brought to the floor of the House of Representatives today for funding of Bureau of Reclamation and Army Corps of Engineers projects represent a sound investment in the future. And, I emphasize the word "investment."

These are projects in which the Federal Government is investing its resources in the future. These are all sound projects, which will yield good returns to the Federal Government. As far as specific construction projects are concerned, the Congress has reviewed them and found them all to have solidly favorable benefit-cost ratios.

As we invest in Bureau of Reclamation construction, we must remember that these are multiple-purpose projects which not only halt floodwaters, but will yield cash benefits to the Treasury through the sale of water and hydroelectric energy. The same can be said for most of the Army Corps of Engineers' multiple-purpose projects.

The sooner we complete them, the sooner we realize the benefits, and the sooner the cash register at the U.S. Treasury starts to ring.

One other point I would like to mention. Earlier this year, California experienced a major storm disaster. Floods hit many of our areas. The damages mounted to hundreds of millions of dollars.

Several millions of Federal dollars, I am most grateful to say, have been spent to rebuild stricken areas. Some of this expense could have been avoided through flood control development. Nowhere is the old saying "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" more applicable than in the development of flood control works.

MIKE KIRWAN knows this. Members of his fine subcommittee know this. The other members of the full Appropriations Committee under the distinguished chairmanship of our colleague, GEORGE MAHON, know this, and I want to commend them for the recommendations they bring to the floor today and urge my colleagues to lend their full support to the appropriations bill which we have before us today.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I want to say that we miss our old friend, MIKE KIRWAN, here today. On behalf of the people of California I want to say we hope he is back with us soon. California has come a long way in meeting the wa-

ter needs of its people under the enlightened leadership of MIKE KIRWAN. We want to say thanks for all that he has done in the past and say we will work with him in the years ahead to continue to meet the water needs of this wonderful Nation of ours.

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

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the members of the Appropriations Committee, and particularly the Public Works Subcommittee, for their efforts to meet the most essential needs in this area at a time of understandable budgetary pressure.

I am especially grateful for the consideration which the subcommittee, under the able leadership that day of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), gave to the testimony which we presented with local officials and civic representatives of the cities of Clinton and Dubuque, Iowa, on behalf of flood protection projects for those two communities.

This is not the easiest time for a committee to come before the House and ask for funds over and above the President's budget, and I recognize the reluctance of some Members of this body to accept those recommendations.

However, I cite the two flood control projects in my own congressional district as examples of the false economy which would result if either flood wall is delayed because of inadequate funding at this time.

Each year, the people of Clinton and Dubuque face the threat of extensive flooding when the Mississippi River thaws, with million-dollar flood fights and recovery efforts, and incalculable costs in terms of human misery and fear, illness, injury, and death.

Every flood season, the possibility of a repetition of the 1965 disaster causes months of apprehension and costly preparation, whether or not a flood actually ever occurs.

Losses in 1965 mounted to \$8 million in Dubuque, a city of 65,000 people, and to \$5.2 million in Clinton, with a population of 35,000.

The Corps of Engineers estimates that past floods have cost Dubuque more than \$15 million since records have been kept, and in Clinton, the annual expenditures over the past 10 years have averaged \$1,250,000.

Those recurrent costs are shared by Federal, State, and local governments as well as by private citizens and business concerns.

Last spring, the early weather predictions anticipated a Mississippi River flood approaching the record levels of 1965, and to avoid another disaster, massive preparations were made with unprecedented financial and technical assistance from the Federal Government.

It is a tribute to this heroic Operation Foresight, and the countless hours spent by the Corps of Engineers, city officials, and local volunteers, that temporary dikes were constructed in time to hold back the floodwaters and to minimize actual damages.

The Federal Government spent more

than half a million dollars in Clinton and Dubuque each, in preparatory work by the corps and disaster relief assistance from the Office of Emergency Preparedness. Local, public, and private costs equaled or exceeded those Federal expenditures.

Although every effort will be made to preserve as much of this temporary work as possible in anticipation of future floods, there is no way to assure against similar annual expenditures until permanent protection is provided.

In the case of Dubuque, construction of that permanent floodwall is already underway, and the corps initially requested \$3 million for fiscal 1970 to continue work on the project. The President reduced that request to \$2.1 million, which would delay completion of the flood wall from the present timetable of November 1972 until after the 1973 flood season.

Appropriations of an additional \$450,000—restoration of half of the President's cut—will enable the corps to complete all essential work before spring of 1973, and thus save the city from exposure to another flood threat, the cost of which would in all probability exceed any savings which we would realize by refusing to appropriate those funds this year.

In Clinton's case, this is the first time that we are seeking funds, for a project which Congress approved in the rivers and harbors bill last year.

The Corps of Engineers has advised us that an initial appropriation of \$30,000 will enable them to meet their full planning capability for the current fiscal year.

We are therefore seeking that amount, which is only one-half of 1 percent of the cost to the Federal Government for temporary assistance to the city this year, so that we can proceed as expeditiously as possible toward actual construction and completion of the permanent floodwall for that city.

The Congress has already committed itself to both of these projects—by repeated support of Dubuque's budget request since 1966 when we approved the first construction funds, and by authorizing the Clinton project last year.

It would be not only false economy, but a rejection of that commitment, to refuse either appropriations request today, and I urge the members of this body to vote for both the \$2,550,000 for Dubuque and the \$30,000 for Clinton.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I especially wish to thank the subcommittee for their consideration of the essential needs of my State of California. We had tremendous amount of flood damage in California from a storm in January and February. There was some \$150 million in damages caused by that storm, but there were \$1.6 billion in damages that were saved by the projects which were Federal projects, and which had already been completed, the Federal contribution cost for which is about \$985 million.

There are 10 projects in this budget which are continuing which, if they had been completed before that storm would have saved some \$16,500,000.

This committee in providing for these ongoing projects is continuing in the same tradition of building America as

our good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KIRWAN), and I commend them all.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

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

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill. I have frequently taken the opportunity of addressing my remarks in the House of Representatives to the need for controlled Federal spending. Yet, the question of the allocation of public tax moneys is not to be viewed as its own entity whereby funds are to be appropriated according to a percentage formula. Spending in one area is not to be balanced by a proportional spending in another area. Likewise, a reduction in one area is not to be balanced by a proportional reduction in another area. Spending by the Federal Government is really a matter of priorities. Where a pressing need exists and where Federal funds are necessary to meet the need, Federal funds and public tax moneys must be forthcoming at any cost. Such an area of pressing need is construction grants for sewage treatment works as provided by the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

Congress' mandate is to legislate on behalf of the public welfare and to provide the maximum number of citizens with the benefits that stem from living in our society. There is no question in my mind that the greatest problem facing this Nation, second only to finding an honorable solution to our involvement in Vietnam, is that posed by the pollution of our environment. By passing the Clean Water Restoration Act, Congress recognized the need to attack head on the major source of water pollution—municipal wastes, and the need to give assistance to the municipalities for the construction of waste treatment facilities. Under this act, appropriations authority was provided in the following amounts: \$150 million in fiscal year 1967, \$450 million in fiscal year 1968, \$700 million in fiscal year 1969, \$1 billion in fiscal year 1970, and \$1.25 billion in fiscal year 1971. However, the actual amounts that have been appropriated in the past have fallen far below these marks: \$203 million in fiscal year 1968, and \$214 million in fiscal year 1969. The request for fiscal year 1970 amounts to only \$214 million, far below the authority of \$1 billion.

Were the need for water pollution abatement not so pressing, and were it possible to delay any solution until a later date, I could defer acting on any increase to the committee proposal until a later date. However, pollution of our lakes and rivers is a problem that will not take a vacation. More and more people are using an ever-increasing amount of space. Technology continues at a rapid rate. If we are to enjoy the bounteous nature of our country, and not be forced to shelter ourselves from nature we are rapidly corrupting, we must act now.

Besides the pressing nature of continu-

ing pollution, there is another reason why the full \$1 billion must be passed. In reliance upon the passage of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, State and local governments have invested millions of dollars for sewer treatment facilities, and in many cases, bonded themselves to their constitutional limit to do so. The States have also made themselves legally liable for water quality standards which must pass Federal inspection. For Congress to fail in our obligation will be to breach the faith that the people of the United States have placed in Congress to meet the problems of pollution, and to destroy a workable Federal-State relationship.

In my district in southern Wisconsin, the people are one in their desire to provide adequately not only for programs of avoiding future pollution, but for existing pollution programs to take immediate steps to clean up the waters. They know that money alone is not enough and so they have gone out on a limb as individuals, as citizens of their respective communities, and of the great State of Wisconsin to provide tax moneys on every level, and human resources and interest, to get the job done. In providing for Federal funding, my constituents know it is their money that is being spent but are stymied in their efforts by a lack of available funds. Wisconsin is one of 18 States which will not have full funding even if the proposed \$1 billion is appropriated. I cannot stand by idly while inadequate funding would make further severe cuts in what is needed.

A billion dollars is a lot of money. I want to be fiscally responsible. I do not, however, buy the argument that it is fiscally irresponsible to seek \$1 billion for full funding of a commitment every Member of this House made to their people when they voted to authorize \$1 billion for pollution abatement during fiscal year 1970. Being fiscally responsible does not mean that we spend no money. It means that we spend as a matter of priority.

A man who allows his family to go in rags; who forces his children to eat out of garbage cans; and who allows his house to become a slum dwelling, and yet boasts \$20,000 in a bank account, is not fiscally responsible. So it is with this Nation. We must not allow the beauty of our land and waterways to deteriorate nor allow our environment to depreciate to a point which, if further neglected, will not sustain life. To do this would be fiscally irresponsible.

If we can spend approximately \$50 billion for foreign giveaways, much of which has ended up in providing little for our people, either in pecuniary returns, friendship, or even self-satisfaction in a job well done; if we can contemplate spending \$662 million for the development of the SST; if we can spend hundreds of millions of dollars for a multiplicity of research programs, some necessary, some unnecessary, some which might well be delayed; and if we can spend \$2 billion a month to wage war in Vietnam, we can afford a billion dollars to fight effectively the pollution of our environment.

It is my understanding that the

Nixon administration will bring before this House a new and exciting approach to the problems posed by pollution. If he indeed does—and he has my wholehearted support in this—the billion dollar funding we seek will still be needed.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a beautiful part of this country. The First District of Wisconsin is an area of beautiful waterways, lakes, and lands. My constituents appreciate our wonderful environment and have taken an active interest in its preservation. Individuals take time out from their work to press for solutions to problems of pollution which threaten our great area. They partake actively in local government in order to abate sources of pollution. Many have taken the opportunity to write me and to sign petitions in support of the full funding which is now under House consideration. It is with pleasure that I include a list of the names of a few of many individuals in my district who have signed the most recent petition in support of the \$1 billion full funding I have received. These represent but a few of literally hundreds of my constituents who have made known their concern to me without solicitation from me.

LIST OF PETITIONERS

BELOIT, WIS.

Mr. and Mrs. Carl G. Balsom.
Mrs. Richard G. Moon.
Mrs. Roy R. Gram.
Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd W. Page.
Mr. and Mrs. R. E. Schoenfeld.
Mrs. William Voss, Jr.
Patricia A. Casucci.
Mrs. Richard Griffith.
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Brown.
Mrs. David Collins.
Mrs. R. E. Synstegard.
Mrs. Edmund Engebretson.
Joyce Ann Davis.
Mrs. Sydelle Popinsky.
Dr. and Mrs. H. Daniel Green.
Audry D. Pataquin.
Karen Prickette.
Mrs. Jane N. Deale.
Mrs. Charles Sequin.
Mrs. James Lamb.

JANESVILLE, WIS.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Krug.
Cecelia A. Howe.
Mrs. J. R. James.
Mrs. Kathryn K. Shebil.
Mary H. Nason.
Frances A. Bailey.
Mrs. Ann A. Harsh.
Mrs. Carolyn Brandeen.
Jean Lovejoy.
Mrs. Nancy Stabb.
Beth Vold.
Mrs. N. E. Simonsen.
Jane Moeller.
Mrs. Betty Joslin.
Mrs. Sally Basting.
Mrs. Bessie Poppas.
Mrs. Lois Partridge.
Mrs. A. W. Anderson.
Mrs. Judy Berg.
Nan Hartung.
Mr. Frank E. Sutherland.
Mrs. Art Siker.
Mrs. R. W. Kitson.
Walter Lindemann.
Otis P. Thorman.
Nancy Holt.
Grace W. Estes.
Ann S. Eckert.
Carol C. Tair.
Janice M. Kinnaman.
Mrs. Earl Fugate.
Mrs. James McNally.
Mrs. Henry Thom.

WHITEWATER, WIS.

Elsie Hilton.
 Patricia Batham.
 Clair C. Henneman.
 Judith M. Beyerl.
 Emily Saunders.
 Ruth Miner.
 Linda Henson.
 Arlene Newhouse.
 Marjorie Young.
 Patricia Townsend.
 Winnifred McDiarmid.
 Susan M. Kunkle.
 Edna C. Sorber.
 Eileen A. Rosen.
 Emma Lou Sederholm.
 Mary Hivener.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment for full funding.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, neither this subcommittee nor probably any of its immediate predecessors has ever had to mark up a public works appropriation bill in the midst of quite the same conflicting pressures as those we felt this year.

Our annual product is always largely a creature of compromise—and that is more than normally true of this year's version.

No matter what the area of concern, the visible list of unmet demands by the individual, his community or State, or the Nation never seems to grow any shorter.

And insofar as certain of those demands fall within our jurisdiction, as our hearings progressed this year we were made keenly aware of them—and of the truly urgent nature of many of them.

Yet, at the same time, it was impossible for us as a subcommittee—or as individuals—to ignore the continuing fact of inflation running at a disastrous rate for the Nation, and its citizens; and that, traditionally, temporary restraint in so-called public works spending is one of several actions that can be taken by the Federal Government if it is serious about stabilizing its economy.

Thus, we have had to weigh the possibly inflationary impact of new or ongoing public works programs against the rather alarmingly increasing backlog of essential projects providing protection against ravaging flood waters, additional sources of water supply for rapidly growing urban centers, critically needed further capacity for certain deepwater seaports and navigational safety measures, as well as to provide an adequate planning and action base for meeting the future water resource needs of our Nation as the same are now being projected.

That always difficult question of priorities—which is something to which I have always sought to direct our subcommittee's attention during my years of service on it—thus became all important to us.

Accordingly we have wrestled this year over priorities between competing programs and projects in a manner that, not always in the past, was required of us.

That is good—and, as one result though his measure like most of its predecessors will probably be referred to by the news media and in editorial comment as our annual pork-barrel bill, H.R. 14159 clearly does not merit that sort of opprobrium.

But what of the day when our currently severe fiscal problem abates, as it eventually must?

Well, Mr. Chairman, I for one am extremely hopeful that the improved methodology for determining this Nation's true water-resource needs, and for obtaining that kind of coordination between Federal departments and agencies in this field that has for so long been missing—but that this subcommittee has been fostering largely through the efforts of the Water Resources Council—will enable us to continue to bring you public works bills from which all "pork" has been removed.

This is essential—the Council's first assessment of "The Nation's Water Resources," as published in November of 1968, projecting as it does our water and land resources, and their use and management problems, to the year 2020, clearly indicates the need for continuing, close congressional oversight into how those resources are marshaled and those problems met.

If the national goals we are preparing to set for ourselves are to be achieved, we have a tremendous task ahead of us—and there is no room for "pork," and no room for duplication of effort.

At stake is no less than the future of the human race—for I see this as a worldwide problem, extending far beyond our own Nation's borders and concerns, though it is within those limits that we now must deal.

For, as Prof. Richard A. Falk, of the Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral Sciences, says:

The planet and mankind are in grave danger of irreversible catastrophe. . . . Man may be skeptical about following the fight of the dodo into extinction, but evidence points increasingly to just such a pursuit. . . . There are four interconnected threats to the planet—wars of mass destruction, overpopulation, pollution, and the depletion of resources. They have a cumulative effect. A problem in one area renders it more difficult to solve the problem in any other area. . . . The basis of all four problems is the inadequacy of the sovereign states to manage the affairs of mankind in the 20th Century.

Mr. Chairman, thankfully for its members, our subcommittee's responsibilities fall directly into only one of Professor Falk's four areas of concern—that of pollution of our national water supply—though, indirectly and in a longer-ranged context, we must also be concerned with the gradual depletion of our water resources, a fearful thought to man who, since the days of Malthus has chiefly been only worried about running out of fertile soil, fuels, minerals, and other such natural resources.

At one time, this Nation was tempted to view its supplies of clean water as virtually inexhaustible.

That was not a wise thought then; and it is an impossible dream now.

That first national assessment of our remaining water resources made certain facts unmistakably clear. We are shortly to experience a tremendous increase in our population. In the 48 contiguous States, the projection is for a population of about 300 million by 1995 and for 400 million by that year of 2020.

Practically all of this increase will be

in urban centers, which presently contain about 72 percent of our population in a land area of 2 to 3 percent. As we were told, this concentration of the population will bring about many water and related land-use problems. The natural distribution of annual rainfall in this country does not conform to this concentration of population so that, in many areas, it will be necessary to store, divert and redistribute the available waters on a regional basis.

Those waters will also have to be used over and over again—and we are required to decide, now, how this is to be done.

That the American people, at long last, understand this and are willing to support the efforts that have to be made, has been made self-evident in many ways.

A recent Gallup poll indicated that 86 percent of Americans are concerned—over 50 percent "deeply concerned"—about the condition of their natural environment; and, to back that up, three out of every four persons interviewed said they would be willing to pay additional taxes to improve their natural surroundings.

It was as if the people were repeating to themselves these marvelous words from Pogo, the comic-strip character:

We have met the enemy and he is us!

Out of such a background it was almost inevitable that a "Citizens Crusade for Clean Water" would emerge; and it was about as inevitable, if it is true, Mr. Chairman, that some 222 of my colleagues have already committed themselves to what they understand to be "full funding" of Interior's construction grant program for waste treatment plants.

Though this is only one of several programs we fund, all bearing on the same general problem—including some for the Atomic Energy Commission concerning which I shall comment later—naturally enough, this is the program that, this year, gave us the most trouble.

In admitting that, I do not wish to leave the impression that the subcommittee—or the full Committee on Appropriations—in coming to the final recommendation it has for this essential program, was only reacting to the efforts of the Citizens Crusade. They were a factor, of course. We would be less than candid, if we said they were not.

And, yet, it would be my assessment of the thoughts of a solid majority on this subcommittee that this was one Federal program—and a very basic one—in the whole national effort to preserve and improve our environment where performance was lagging far behind promise, and had been, for a number of years.

Thus, we were unhappy—it needs to be said—with the budget request of only \$214 million as made for the purposes of this program by the out-going Johnson administration in January. We could well understand why President Nixon, in view of his overall fiscal problems and budgetary goals, decided not to increase that request but, in the minds of several of us, it was still an unrealistic figure.

What is a "realistic" figure for this

program—in view of the national problem with inflation, and the capabilities of the local municipal entities who in most instances must more than match the Federal grant moneys?

We firmly believe the \$600 million we are suggesting you appropriate for this program, along with an unobligated balance of \$64.9 million—which will make nearly \$665 million available in this fiscal year—to be completely realistic, and we urge you, regardless of the tentative position you may have taken on this issue, to consider it as such.

We know that this year's authorization for this program is for \$1 billion—and that this figure may, in some ways, be regarded as a Federal commitment of sorts; but we urge you to remember that seldom, if ever, are program authorizations considered to be spending floors, only spending ceilings that, periodically, need to be reviewed by the proper legislative committees. If the reverse were true, we suggest there would no longer be any need for an Appropriations Committee, as such.

We also ask many of you who have committed yourselves to the principle of full funding for this program—that we support, even as do you—exactly what it is you had in mind in making that commitment.

Was it full funding for your State?

If so, we ask you to check the information that has been made available to you, now, in table form at the committee desks, which shows the States whose needs under this program are fully funded at the \$600 million recommended level—covering those needs as measured in terms of applications for grant moneys now pending in State or regional offices, and in terms of reported needs at the local level as well, which in most cases may represent applications that will not actually be processed or even filed for some months or years yet to come.

Is your State fully funded on either or both of those bases?

If not, it is quite likely that, just as with my State of New York, there is no possible way, under the present allocation formula as written into law, that it can be.

Why is that?

Well, as the committee report attempts to explain, of the total reported pending applications involving grant estimates of some \$2.4 billion, some \$1.7 billion reflects, for five States, estimates far in excess of the allotments to which they would be entitled even under the full \$1 billion authorization.

That these are the five States with the greater reported need also indicates—at least in great part—that they are also the five States whose citizens have mounted the most vigorous attack on water pollution within their borders.

Herein lies one of the tragedies of the current allocation formula—something that certainly should be reviewed by the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress.

For there is no way, for instance, by which a Representative of the State of New York, like myself, could get full funding under this program at the present time insofar as our reported needs are concerned.

This is because \$1.3 billion of that reported total backlog of \$2.4 billion pertains to New York which, even under the full \$1 billion authorization, could this year receive but \$89.2 million.

So to those of you who, like myself, are from these few short-fall States under the present method of allocating funds for this program, and wish to support full funding for it, I suggest you direct your efforts at the Committees on Public Works of this and the other body. It is there, and there only, that we will obtain relief.

Now, quickly, I know it may be said that I am not quite accurate in that statement—and that, by going for the full \$1 billion now, we may obtain full funding through a sort of back-door approach.

This is, at least, partially true in that, after about a 2-year period, the excess moneys for the States whose needs you would over-fund at a \$1 billion level—or even at a \$600 million level, for that matter—and I suggest you again look at your tables, will then revert into a kitty of sorts from which the Department of Interior can attempt to take care of the needs in the underfunded States.

This is, of course, always a possible "solution" for those of us from States like New York—but I hardly think it a responsible solution.

Within that rough 2-year period, while we wait for that "kitty" to build up in this roundabout fashion, two sessions of Congress will be held, during either one of which this whole problem of proper allocation of funds could be gone into, and two more Public Works Appropriation bills will come along, in either one of which such future adjustments as might be needed for this program, related to our then fiscal situation and the changing pattern of need, could be made.

Now, shortly, when the anticipated amendment to increase this committee recommendation to the full \$1 billion is offered, we will be in one of these pushing and shoving matches we occasionally get into trying to prove we are more "for" clean water, in this instance, than the other fellow.

Well, I understand that urge, Mr. Chairman—it pulls on me, too.

But, if you vote for the \$1 billion, you will be overfunding, under the allocation formula, eight more States than is the case at the committee figure, while still leaving 10 States less than fully funded insofar as applications pending at State or regional offices is concerned; or 18 States when considering reported local needs, as well.

There are two ways of measuring the total amount of such overfunding: It would amount to \$337 million, or thereabouts, if you include in reported local needs, or \$437 million if one just counts the dollar backlog of applications pending at State or regional offices.

It is true that, at the same time, New York for instance would become eligible in this fiscal year for \$89.2 million if a full \$1 billion were appropriated and obligated, as compared to only \$52.3 million under the committee figure of \$600 million in new obligational authority.

That is an increase for New York of \$36.9 million in this fiscal year, and you

may well ask why I am not reaching for it.

There are several reasons.

First, though if we got that much more Federal assistance we could surely use it, this seems to me to be a clumsy and irresponsible way of trying to make the best out of a bad allocation formula that is clearly in need of a rewrite job.

Second, I very much doubt that, even if we appropriate the full \$1 billion, the administration would, in view of the serious fiscal problems it faces and its announced position relative to the need for temporary restraint in public works spending, allocate—or obligate—anywhere near that amount.

I am not even sure we could properly ask it to do so, while at the same time urging it—as some of us are—to agree also to release at least a major portion of the moneys over and above the budget requests we have already tentatively voted for various educational programs.

Certainly, some degree of realism and responsibility is required of us in this connection—no matter how strongly we wish to register our support of clean water.

Now, finally, if you have committed yourself to full funding, did you mean the full \$1 billion authorization or the largest amount—under optimum circumstances—that could probably be used for this program's purposes this fiscal year?

As best I can find out, that figure would be very close to the \$600 million we are recommending.

In round figures, about \$850 million worth in applications for construction grants is now pending in State and regional offices. This is the action backlog, from all States. It is safe to assume that about 30 percent of this backlog—or \$250 million of it—will not come to fruition in this fiscal year for lack of matching funds, engineering-design deficiencies, and like reasons.

This leaves the \$600 million the committee recommends as the largest total that could probably be obligated—even if the administration were of a mind to do so. Of that amount, at a guess, perhaps as much as \$400 million would be used to fund new projects, \$100 million would be applied to reimbursement on those projects that have gone forward in a few States—under another section of the basic law that is also in need of review—without the benefit so far of Federal funds, and the remaining \$100 million would be reallocated under the formula to take care of the needs of previously underfunded States.

This is why—if you have been able to follow all this—that even I, as a Representative from New York, the State with the greatest need under this program, support the committee figure, which is one I have worked hard to be able to bring you.

Now, again, I recognize that this—for New York—is not full funding; but I, for one, am going to work for that principle through asking the Committee on Public Works to give early consideration to a review and revision of the allocation formula under which this program is forced to operate, and asking it, too, to give consideration to such proposals as that

made by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER) and myself, under which construction grant moneys could be advanced to the local municipalities on an installment basis, rather than in a lump sum, which is an alternative approach to full funding at least until our fiscal situation eases.

And, finally, I am going to work for that principle by urging the Congress to give early consideration to the tax-sharing—or revenue-sharing—proposals the administration and many of us have made. I say this because it should be apparent to anyone who really studies this program and its workings, that one of the greatest inhibitors of progress toward clean water thereunder has been the inability of our local governmental units to come up with their share of construction moneys for waste treatment works.

Some years back, in a move I strongly favored, we did write incentives into this program's legislative structure which we hoped would bring the State governments into the national attack on water-pollution sources. This has not worked out as well as we had hoped, since only 14 States—Connecticut, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wisconsin—now supplement local and Federal funds for waste treatment works. One has to assume that this is because the States, with the other demands being made upon them, are hard pressed to do so—and that, therefore revenue sharing would be one way to encourage them to try. In any event, this is one area wherein such articulate proponents of clean water as the League of Women Voters could be helpful, and to which they should direct their attention, for even if we are eventually successful in Congress in obtaining full funding in a real sense of the Federal commitment to clean water, the national challenge we face will never be overcome until local municipalities have the presently disproportionate burden for progress they bear somehow eased.

Mr. Chairman, as so often happens around here, there is much more in this bill that we should talk about than the one major issue—funding of the waste treatment program—that has developed out of it.

The Federal effort to protect and preserve our national supply of clean water has more than one facet to it. Indeed, it has many facets. I have already mentioned the work of the Water Resources Council, one of whose other missions is to strengthen the Federal-State partnership in the water resource field. Then, there is the water quality management planning and study work conducted by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, within the Department of the Interior, and its vital research and training programs, for all of which we have allowed increases over the 1970 budget estimates including, specifically, up to \$2.2 million to begin developing new methods and techniques and preliminary plans for attacking pollution of the Great Lakes, one of our most important national resources. It is very late to

begin such work, especially when one of those bodies of water, Lake Erie, is as near "death" as it is, but a beginning must be made, and this year.

And, then of course, there is the work of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, all bearing in some fashion on the control, management, and protection of our available water resources.

Considering the growing work backlog being experienced by both such agencies, it is unfortunate, of course, that we did not feel able to make more than minor adjustments in the budgetary requests. But, to revert a moment to Professor Falk's words as quoted at the beginning of my remarks, it is here evident that the four threats to mankind's future on this planet as he described them are interconnected—and that a problem in one area, having in mind the continuing cost burden of the war in Vietnam, does render it more difficult to solve problems in all other such areas.

As I have noted, our subcommittee is very conscious of the interrelationship between public works spending programs and inflation. There may be some argument about how direct that relationship is, but there is little argument over the fact that many public works projects, while essential, can be—and perhaps should be—deferred during periods of budgetary stringency without anyone being harmed. Similarly, they can be stretched out during such periods without a great deal of public damage. Of course, this is not always the case and, as I have noted, the subcommittee has carefully sought to determine wherein lay the true priorities on a project-by-project basis in this connection.

At the same time, there comes a point where such deferrals or such stretch-outs represent a "penny wise but pound foolish" approach. As we point out in our report, contracts delayed a year or more now can be expected to cost anywhere from 6 to 12 percent more than the current estimates simply because of the built-in inflation now being experienced by the construction industry. Similarly, it generally costs more to slow down a project that has begun that it does to go ahead and finish it even when money is tight.

Thus, the subcommittee has seen fit to restore some reductions as made during the Nixon revision of the Johnson budget, and in a few instances to fund a number of the smaller but urgently needed studies, planning and construction starts that did not find their way into—or were cut out of—the revised budget. It is important to note that, in so doing, we were able to cover the overall change we thus made in that portion of the budget before us by making offsetting cuts elsewhere—and, in fact, would still have been able to bring you a bill carrying a dollar total below the total budgetary request except for our action, as I have described it, on the waste treatment program where we simply read the national priorities differently than did the President.

I support this action on our part. It is necessary to continue to meet this Nation's needs for flood and hurricane pro-

tection, for the promotion of navigation, for water quality and water supply and related purposes, as for reclamation purposes—albeit on a reduced level—and to continue planning work on the more urgently needed of such projects against the day when they can be begun. We may be involved—overinvolved in my mind—elsewhere in the world, but we can ignore our true national needs only at our own peril. It is never easy to find the proper balancing point in such a time as this—but we have done our best in trying to do so.

Mr. Chairman, before leaving the Corps of Engineers' portion of our bill, I would like to take note—as I did frequently during our hearings—of the distressingly disproportionate share of the corps' construction and planning work being allocated in recent years to my State of New York and, for that matter, to the Northeast in general.

In the January budget, New York's share in such work amounted to only \$11 million, or 1.3 percent of the national total. This figure—and percentage—was then reduced in the revised budget to \$3.3 million and only 0.5 percent.

In view of the fact that the people of New York constitute over 9 percent of the Nation's population—and have some very urgent needs of their own to which attention is long overdue—our share would seem to be an unrealistically small share of the national total. Certainly, some corrective action in future years would seem to be very much in order, especially when one considers such vital projects as the channel-widening work needed for safety purposes in Newark Bay and the deepening of the New York Harbor anchorages. Both projects would serve the Port of New York through which oceanborne foreign trade generated, in 1968, more than \$940 million in customs revenues, and thus nearly one-third of all customs revenues for the entire Nation. As against that \$940 million figure, the \$3.7 million as now recommended for these two vitally needed projects still looks pretty small, though I am, of course, thankful for the fact that these two items did have the cuts made in them by the revised budget partially restored by action of the subcommittee. Still, at this rate, it will take far more years to complete these projects than it should, and it needs to be remembered that the eventual benefits therefrom benefit not just New York but the entire Nation.

There are two other projects in—or affecting—New York that I would also like to mention in discussing the corps' activities.

The first affects Niagara Falls—truly one of the world's "wonders" if not specifically mentioned as such, and surely of lasting importance to honeymooners—where the corps has built a temporary cofferdam that closes off the American side of the falls, leaving that portion of the channel dry so that exploratory work can be undertaken in an effort to determine why our part of the falls has, literally, been falling down. We have allowed the full \$600,000 budgetary request for the purposes of this surely unique study that is being conducted by and with

the cooperation of the Canadian Government. In time, we should know what corrective measures, if any, can be taken to preserve this national monument.

The second relates to the nearly-finished, comprehensive restudy of the Susquehanna River Basin in the tri-State area of New York, Pennsylvania and Maryland. The \$829,000 allowed by our subcommittee for this work will enable the corps, as the lead agency, to complete this project that I had the honor to help start, years ago, as a member of the Public Works legislative committee. This work will, in time, become a pilot for many other basin-type studies of the sort needed if we, as a people, are going to be able to plan and manage the protection and development of our great river systems. I am convinced this is the way in which we should proceed in our national effort to find a workable and acceptable framework within which to ensure against the mismanagement, and eventual exhaustion, of our water resources. Some tentative decisions—and a tentative plan—has emerged from this study of the Susquehanna's problems and potential, and these have been submitted to preliminary public scrutiny. Unfortunately, at some of the public hearings held by the corps in this connection the public got the idea that the corps was telling it what the corps planned to do in their river basin, rather than—as was the case—asking that same interested and concerned public to work with the corps, and the other interested Federal and State agencies, in an effort to decide what ought to be done. It is obvious, I think, that the corps still has a public-relations problem to resolve in this connection, and it ought to carefully reconsider its whole approach to this problem of arousing—and gaining—public interest in, and support of, developmental plans for river basins.

Turning now to some of the other programs in this bill, there is not much to add to what others may have said about the program of the Tennessee Valley Authority. As a more or less independent corporate agency of the Federal Government, we have only oversight authority over what it does, or does not, do; however, as I pointed out at the hearings, I feel the TVA people are going a bit too far when, as in their demonstrations in education and manpower development program, so-called, as for their Sequatchie Valley project, as I believe it is called, they propose to provide the local school districts with at least indirect Federal moneys for construction of school buildings. I would not question the fact that such new buildings are badly needed, or that they cannot perhaps be provided out of an inadequate local school tax base. But I doubt very much we really need a "demonstration" of this sort to prove that grant moneys—which is what TVA is contemplating—for school construction purposes would be a helpful thing anywhere in any of the 50 States, let alone in whatever economically depressed areas still remain within TVA's area of interest and concern.

The taxpayers in school districts all across the State of New York quite properly groan under the burden of school

taxes they now have to pay. They need no one such as the TVA to "demonstrate" for them that Federal construction moneys in grant form—whether directly or indirectly given—would be helpful to them. Of course, they would be, and probably what I am really complaining about is that some of the rest of us outside the TVA area wish we had a TVA to help us with such demonstrations.

However, since this is an issue that Congress has previously marched up and down the hill on several times without coming to any final decision, I will endeavor to satisfy myself with the thought that this item is just one more boost for early congressional consideration of some form of revenue sharing with the States, and let it go at that.

With respect, Mr. Chairman, to the \$917,000 we have recommended, and this is the budget estimate, for the further purposes of the so-called Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission, it should be noted that this body's work is—or was—nearly finished. Mr. RHODES, Mr. DAVIS, and I were all in Panama and Colombia last December to review, and better understand, the work and problems faced by this Commission. We were impressed by the objectivity and thoroughness with which it has approached its mission—a most difficult one, involving engineering, economic, and political problems whose resolution it is difficult to foresee. Its study was supposed to be completed by December 1, of next year—with another \$263,000 required to complete it in the next fiscal year. However, recent newspaper reports of a tentative agreement between Panama and Colombia with reference to a proposed compromise route for a new, sea-level canal partly in Panama and partly in Colombia may now have thrown the timetable for the Commission out of kilter.

In any event, it seems clear that this important work needs to go on during this fiscal year—after which we will just have to wait and see what develops.

This brings me finally, Mr. Chairman, to a discussion of the major portion of our bill that relates to the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission.

We have cut some of the AEC's programs rather severely—but, while there will be some unhappiness about this, I think responsible so in view of our other problems.

At the same time, as encouraged to do by the Joint Committee, we have added an unbudgeted \$800,000—as provided for in this year's authorization bill—to enable the AEC to begin design and fabrication work on a radioisotope engine for an implantable artificial heart. This is under the circulatory support systems program—in the isotopes development program—for which a total of \$1.59 million will now be available.

Mr. Chairman, as the record of our hearings this year and in prior years will show, this is a project that has had my strong backing and support. It is an exciting project—and one that I believe holds forth promise of a dramatic breakthrough on the true frontiers of medicine, today.

The National Heart Institute has an

artificial heart program, on which progress has been made most slowly, largely because their attention has been directed, primarily, to preventive medicine research and to the development of what are called heart "assistant" devices.

But what we are talking about here, and what I firmly believe can be done, is a situation where we would replace the biological heart, itself—which is basically a pump—by inserting into the body a completely implantable, artificial heart which would be powered by nuclear energy. AEC has not yet been permitted to initiate such work but, in view of the promise it holds forth, we believe they should be since heart disease remains the Nation's No. 1 killer, and the problems encountered in finding human donors of biological hearts may never be fully overcome.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to conclude my remarks—though there really are many more items in this bill that deserve comment—by addressing myself to the serious situation we are getting into, in this Nation, with respect to the obvious need to use nuclear energy as a generating source for the tremendous increase in demand for electrical power we have already experienced—a demand that cannot help but go on doubling about every 10 years.

The AEC is charged both with the responsibility of regulating the use of nuclear energy and for promoting its use.

This is a situation that, by itself, seems to invite controversy, and the controversies that have developed across the Nation between those who are trying to help meet the mounting demand for electrical power through use, in part, of nuclear energy, and those who see virtually any domestic use of nuclear energy as presenting a serious environmental threat, have been increasing both in numbers and in intensity.

Unfortunately, the AEC—and often the Congress—finds itself in the middle on such disputes, and what we seem to be heading toward is a national stalemate shrouded, not to make a pun, in far more heat than light.

This is a very urgent matter, demanding our early and full attention in an effort at finding some reasonable accommodation—as the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER), has recently said—"between the demands of the environment and the social benefits of technology."

Without intending to be overly critical, I would have to say that I believe the AEC has been far too slow in recognizing the true dimensions of this problem or, indeed, that it even had a problem.

That problem is at least two-fold in nature—first, relating to the tremendous quantities of cooling water nuclear-powered steam-generating plants require, and to the hot waters that some regard as "thermal pollution" which they thus discharge, and secondly, to that always troubling question of radioactive pollution for it is probably impossible for any such plant to operate with zero release of radioactive elements.

There are, also, great problems to be solved with respect to the proper siting of nuclear-power generating plants. This phase of our problem needs badly to be

further explored, and the preliminary study into this as made about a year ago under the auspices of the Office of Science and Technology picked up and carried forward.

There are available alternative methods for the design and construction of such plants that will help reduce the problem—and the hazards—of thermal pollution but, again, we need to do a great deal more research into this particular problem for we know far too little about it yet.

Finally, in view of the developing battle between conservationists and the AEC over radioactivity—something that, in Minnesota, at least, has become the subject of a court action to determine whether or not that State can prescribe more strict controls over radioactive discharges than does the AEC, as the licensing agency—it appears to me that the Joint Committee should, at an early date, do what it can to probe into the complex and highly technical issues here involved, and to help develop a broader base of public understanding than now exists about the true hazards of peaceful uses of nuclear power so that the "accommodation" of which the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER) spoke can, perhaps, eventually be arrived at.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I had more time to devote to this subject—that I attempted to explore, in part, during our hearings this year, with especial reference being made to pages 58 through 95 of volume 4, thereof—for it is a very serious matter, as I have said, and one to which we must give attention.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Boggs).

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct a question to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. In my part of the country in the past few years we have had one disastrous hurricane after the other. This committee has been very helpful and has appropriated what the Bureau of the Budget has recommended for the past several years, but each year the funds are not spent in their totality, which means that these projects are not moving ahead as fast as they could and as fast as Congress wants them to move ahead.

Just a few months ago, Mr. Chairman, we had a new hurricane, Camille, which devastated the Mississippi gulf coast, and Plaquemines Parish, La. Some projects in those areas are behind schedule. What good does it do us to appropriate these funds if they cannot be spent?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I might point out first that the committee, to expedite construction, has restored, where applicable, 50 percent of the Nixon cutback in the April 15 budget revisions. We have restored funds on 90 projects. Only 50 percent was restored as about one-half of the fiscal year will have expired before this bill can become law. But I share the gentleman's concern about the freezing of funds by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BOGGS. But, Mr. Chairman, 50

percent is still 50 percent of the 100 percent we have appropriated. These projects are all of an emergency nature. It is a great waste to the Government not to be building the projects.

It cost the National Government hundreds of millions of dollars in Louisiana and the southeastern United States 4 years ago after Hurricane Betsy and nobody knows what this latest hurricane will cost—yet it was developed in New Orleans this week at public hearings that \$2 million which we appropriated for fiscal 1969 for hurricane protection was not spent.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. In another bill pending in the Senate we have provided about \$50 million for disaster relief, I will say to my friend.

Mr. BOGGS. But the point I am making to my distinguished chairman is it is costly to have disaster relief every time a disaster hits, when the Public Works Committee and this subcommittee have provided funds to prevent some of that damage, but those funds have not been spent.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I share the concern of the gentleman that these delays result in greatly increased costs as we emphasized in our report. We will continue to do everything we can to get the Bureau of the Budget to make the funds available.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will impress upon the Bureau of the Budget that these are emergency projects and the more we delay them, the more they will cost the Government.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MAY).

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, for many years I have appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington in order to outline the status of water resource development in our region and to identify those items which required the special attention of the committee. I have done this to help assure that our Federal investment is carried out in a manner which serves the orderly requirements of the region, which protects the public investment, and which prevents future crises in the interrelated balances which are always involved in comprehensive regional development.

We have, Mr. Chairman, a crisis in southeastern Washington State. The crisis is on the Columbia Basin project, started after World War II as a 1 million-acre undertaking to turn sagebrush into variety foodcrops. Today, nearly 25 years later, the project is virtually bogged down at the halfway point. We need, and we have needed for a long time, to construct Bacon Siphon and tunnel No. 2. This is the key to our future development and without it the remaining lands cannot receive water.

The committee, in its wisdom, has included \$650,000 for the Bacon Siphon and tunnel No. 2. This action, if sustained, will make it possible for the Bureau of Reclamation to award the con-

struction contract in January 1970. This construction is vitally needed, and the committee is to be congratulated for its concern about the Columbia Basin and its action.

The committee has, in addition, provided an additional \$200,000 for the Wahluke Slope, block 251 of the Columbia Basin project. This is vital, too. Unless these funds are provided and utilized, there would be a break of at least 9 months in the continuity of construction on the Wahluke Slope. This program, as provided by the committee, can advance construction to begin this December.

The crisis to which I referred, Mr. Chairman, also extends to the Snake River in my State. Full use of both the Snake and the Columbia River water resources has again been delayed by slippages in completion of Lower Granite lock and dam on the Snake River. This and other slippages may cause serious power deficits from the Columbia River system, and delay water storage for flood control as well as full and most economical use of the navigation benefits afforded by the series of locks and dams on the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

Lower Granite is the last lock and dam on the Snake River to extend navigation inland. Until this dam is in place and the lock and pool in use, the navigation benefits of the other series of locks and dams—Bonneville, The Dalles, John Day, McNary, Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, and Little Goose—cannot be realized.

The committee, again in its wisdom, has taken a step to avoid further slippages in the timetable for completion of the Lower Granite project, by providing \$1,000,000 for construction. This amount, when added to previously committed but unspent construction funds, should be sufficient to avoid further slippages and prevent a continuation of the heavy costs associated with delay. I am grateful to the committee for this action.

Second. Mr. Chairman, I should like to support the item provided by the committee for construction grants for waste treatment works. I share the committee's concern that the budget crisis in recent years has not permitted more adequate funding of grants for building waste treatment works to help clean up the Nation's streams and waterways.

We have much to do in this area. The committee's provision for \$600 million will allow us to do a little more, and do it without throwing completely out of balance the interrelated activities of our water resources program as provided in this appropriations bill. And when we can bring inflation under control and the budgetary crisis is past, we can devote much greater efforts to water pollution abatement in our total water resources program.

But lest some feel that until that day comes we are making no progress at all, I would like to help dispel such feelings right now. Water quality problems are probably felt most severely in my congressional district in the State of Washington in the Yakima River. As an intrastate stream, the Yakima River is under

the jurisdiction of the Washington Water Pollution Control Commission—WPCC. Irrigation is the major factor affecting the water quality. As with many other "irrigation streams" hot weather and low flows increase the adverse effects of irrigation return flows upon water quality.

The State of Washington is setting water quality standards for its intrastate waters. Public hearings on the proposed standards for the Yakima River were held this July. These hearings were held to, first, identify desired water uses, now and in the future; second, establish numerical criteria to protect water quality for those uses; and, third, to provide the basis for an implementation program to which the desired water quality.

The job of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration—FWPCA—is to support State pollution control programs. The funds provided by FWPCA are for both financial and technical assistance to the States upon request. In the Yakima Basin, the State and FWPCA have helped municipalities finance sewage treatment plants. Snokist Growers in Yakima have an FWPCA research and development grant to demonstrate secondary treatment of fruit processing wastes. Other FWPCA grants are supporting research on controlling pollution caused by irrigation. FWPCA's Robert S. Kerr Laboratory in Ada, Okla., has national responsibility for staff research on the control of pollution from irrigation return flows.

The Bureau of Reclamation's proposal, which is to be transmitted to the Congress at a later date, will include additional storage in Bumping Lake Reservoir near Yakima for fish propagation. The increased flows provided by this storage will satisfy water quality needs in the Yakima Basin to the extent possible with available water supply and prior water use appropriations for irrigation, flood control, and recreation.

Mr. Chairman, the success of pollution control programs depends upon public knowledge and awareness and coordinated pollution control efforts at all levels, both in and out of government.

I am pleased the legislation before us today is designed to move forward in balanced progress.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETTIS).

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding to me.

I wish to express my full support for the public works appropriations report which we are considering today, particularly those programs which provide for flood control. In fact, I would have preferred to see additional funds appropriated for these vitally needed projects. I believe we are entertaining a pennywise, pound-foolish approach in this area because the relatively few dollars we might save on appropriations today will be multiplied many times over in funds we will have to expend later in flood and disaster relief.

The report calls for a modest \$4.5 million, approximately, for proposed and progressing projects in my own particular district, California's 33d, but I know

that these works will ultimately avoid loss of life and save uncountable millions in public and private property damage.

The two big storms of January and February of this year wrought the greatest havoc ever caused by the elements in San Bernardino County's history—in terms of dollar loss. The damage estimate in both the public and private sectors totaled more than \$80 million. No other disaster we have ever experienced comes close to that. The total damage caused by the devastating 1938 flood was \$12 million, although if that were to be adjusted to the present-day value of the dollar, it might approach the impact of the 1969 losses.

Fortunately, the early 1969 floods did not result in a record loss of life. Fourteen deaths were attributed directly to the 1938 flood in San Bernardino County, compared with nine deaths this year, despite the fact that water flows equaled that of 1938 in many streams, and even exceeded them in some. And the population of the county has increased fivefold in that 30-year interval.

The point I would like to make here is that we have had this year storms comparable to those of 1938, yet fewer persons lost their lives although five times as many people were living in the path of the flood. We can attribute this in large measure to the flood control works completed and in operation in my district since 1938. Without those works, it is reasonable to estimate that 70 to 100 persons would have died in the January and February storms. We can talk about the value of flood control works as investments that are quickly repaid in dollar savings, after they handle efficiently the runoff from a couple of storms, and this is very true. But you cannot measure the true value without considering the life-saving aspects of flood control, nor the terrible disruption of the lives of those individuals whose homes are damaged or destroyed without flood control.

The public damage is bad enough, but roads can be repaired, bridges rebuilt, public buildings cleaned up or rebuilt—all it takes is money, and I hope Congress will give us a hand. The real heartache is in the losses suffered by individuals. We had 70 residential dwellings destroyed in San Bernardino County, and another 680 severely damaged. In almost every case, they were the homes of persons of modest means, and limited income. We have cases of persons who have worked all their lives, paying for their homes, finally reaching retirement when they had planned to settle down and try to make a small pension cover their living costs—something that might have been possible because their homes were paid for. Then they lost their homes—wiped out completely, or damaged so severely that they require considerable funds to bring back to livable conditions. The best we can offer them, apparently, is a loan at 3 percent interest, to rebuild. But they have to pay it back. And under present regulations, we cannot even do that, if they can arrange for loans from commercial sources at 7, 8, 9 percent.

Let us not wait for further massive damage totals to get us moving. Let us proceed in the most urgent fashion to build the facilities we need to prevent

this damage, rather than wait until we have another flood and then scratch around for the money to bail ourselves out again.

We will have potentially damaging storms again. The record shows that California—and I am talking about my district in "sunny" southern California—has suffered severe damage from rainwater runoff at least 10 times in this century: In 1910, 1914, 1916—when nearly all the county's newly constructed bridges were wiped out—1938, 1943, two in 1965, 1966, and two so far in 1969. In 1938 and again in 1943, due to wash outs on Lytle Creek, the three major transcontinental rail lines running through San Bernardino Valley were cut and out of service for days. This posed a dire threat in 1943, when the rails were transporting war material for the buildup of supplies needed in the Pacific campaigns. This threat jolted the Federal Government into immediate action on flood works on Lytle Creek. It is worthwhile to note that, although the 1969 storm was comparable to those in 1938 and 1943, those rail lines were not damaged. That is an investment that certainly has paid off.

The San Bernardino County Flood Control District reports that projects totaling about \$220 million in cost are needed to complete the flood control protection we need in the county. The local share of this cost will amount to about 20 to 30 percent. This means that for less than \$200 million in Federal expenditure we can prevent damages of more than \$50 million the next time we have storms such as we have had this year. At least \$50 million. The next time, with the growth we are experiencing, the price would go up.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to do something which I believe most of my colleague already have been informed about; that is, to announce that I will introduce an amendment to increase the funding of our water pollution abatement grant program to the full level authorized by law, \$1 billion.

Before I discuss this matter I should like to sincerely praise the distinguished subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations for having recognized the great and urgent national need which exists in the field of water pollution abatement. I commend them for what they have done. I am proud that they have seen fit to recognize the great need. I say they have done good work in this area which is truly an appropriate and properly appreciated effort by all Americans.

However, I say, without regret, that I shall be compelled to offer an amendment which would increase the level of funding of this great program beyond that which is appropriated by the distinguished Committee on Appropriations. The national need is clear. Public opinion poll after public opinion poll has shown that the American people, while rejecting other kinds of governmental expenditures, and while objecting to taxes, support overwhelmingly the idea that we should clean up our pollution

and that we should restore our environment to a decent, a wholesome and a livable environment, and that we should tax to the level necessary to accomplish that end.

Further, I would point out in election after election which reflect the true attitude of the people that bond issue after bond issue has been approved by overwhelming votes.

Mr. Chairman, my friends on the Appropriations Committee have told us that an authorization is not a commitment and it may be in some cases that they are correct, but in this particular case they are not correct. And, there is a very clear reason before us that we can all see. When we pass legislation setting up a schedule of Federal assistance to the States for the construction of waste treatment works, we require certain things. By law the Congress has required the establishment of water quality standards, and by law the Congress has said that if the States would take certain steps, not only would the Federal Government have a grant program, but that it would have a grant program which would afford certain levels of expenditures, including bonuses for certain kinds of behavior on the part of the States. Law requires that the States participating in the establishment of water quality standards so that the States could receive up to 55 percent of the cost of the abatement programs. In other words, that if the States participated and if they had water quality standards they would receive not only grants but a bonus, for compliance with requirements of Federal law.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very clear that every Member of this House of Representatives at that time voted for that particular bill and was completely and fully aware of the fact that we were making a commitment to the American people, to the States, and communities and the municipalities of this Nation that there would be certain levels of Federal support. As a result of this action on the part of the Congress the States have come forward with bond issues which have been passed in State after State by overwhelming votes based upon the reliance of the promise which was made by this Congress. These votes have been taken in the reliance upon this program by the States and by the elected officials who brought about these referendums that there would be a certain level of Federal participation of funding. For instance, the State of Michigan voted a very large bond issue for this purpose as well as the State of New York and Ohio and any number of other States who have done the same thing in reliance upon our promises.

However, we now find that even with the level of funding authorized by the appropriation before this body today we will be a total of in excess of \$800 million behind what the States and the municipalities had reason to expect.

Mr. Chairman, anyone having the idea that we can just turn our backs on this issue and it is going away or that it can be resolved by appropriating the level that is now pending before us is under a complete misapprehension.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time available on this side to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to express my appreciation for the committee's consideration of the atomic energy authorization and its action on the appropriation.

I want to particularly express my appreciation to Mr. Wilhelm, the director of the subcommittee staff. Mr. Wilhelm was most considerate in granting time to the staff director of the Atomic Energy Joint Committee and aides to present information and data pertaining to the items in the Joint Committee's authorization bill.

The so-called Nixon budget was, as I remember it, something like \$70 million less than the Johnson budget, and the authorizations followed that line pretty closely, and the final result was I think identical with the Nixon request.

Subsequent to that, President Nixon, on September 17 announced that the AEC should receive another \$50 million cut. As I understand the action of the committee, there has been a cut of \$79,531,000 cut by the House in obligation authority, and that is the equivalent to about \$32,250,000 in expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the chairman of the committee if that is correct?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Now, if that be so, I appreciate the committee not cutting as much as the President asked to be cut on September 17, which was an additional \$50 million cut. If the President withholds the balance of the cut he asked for, which is another \$17,750,000, and if he defers, as his order on construction deferrals calls for, another \$93 million, this is going to make a substantial cut in the atomic energy program.

I recognize that there is a difference in philosophy between the Nixon administration and the gentleman who is standing in the well of the House, but I just want to voice a note of warning. The Washington Post of October 7 showed a jobless rate increase of a 2-year high to 3.7 percent, or 4 percent, whichever way you want to figure it. The starts on housing have come down from 130,000 to 123,000 units. We are going to have a depression in this country.

You talk about controlling inflation, we are on the road—not to inflation, and not necessarily to the control of inflation—but to a depression, and a depression may hit this country a lot harder than inflation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would like to affirm the need for the full appropriation of \$96 million for the ongoing construction of the 200-Bev accelerator at the Enrico Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory at Weston, Ill., as authorized by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for fiscal year 1970.

It is most certainly recognized by all concerned that the major portion of

those funds would be obligated for long leadtime items to provide the continuity and orderly progression necessary in a project of this size and importance. It should be noted that not even all of the \$64 million voted by the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations will be spent this year—it will all be obligated, however. Probably somewhere around \$25 to \$30 million will be disbursed.

We frequently find ourselves making pious statements in favor of what we call economy when in reality we are worshipping an idol with clay feet. The cut in appropriations for the construction of the 200-Bev accelerator is false economy, and this is why I consider it false economy.

Dr. Robert Wilson, the project leader, has put together a talented, first-class group of scientists and engineers who are highly motivated to see this project through to completion—on time. As of now, they are on schedule. That means first beam by June 30, 1972 and completion of construction by December 31, 1973. However, a fiscal year 1970 construction appropriation of \$64 million is expected to delay the project 1 year. It is estimated that this delay will cost some \$30 million in increased salaries, services, and cost of materials. Right there we have lost all the economy we have tried to gain. But even worse than this upward creeping of total cost is the impact these delays will have on morale. Failure to provide required resources at this time will inhibit productivity and thwart the initiative and momentum of this group. Because of the reputation this will bring to the project, it will be difficult to hold first-rate people.

If such actions continue, the project will be left in the hands of second-rate people, and second-rate people do second-rate jobs. This is a vicious cycle, which undoubtedly will cost us even more time, talent, and money.

I urge that this House restore the full \$96 million to the Enrico Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory so that the talented, dedicated group so concerned with following a tight, economical and sensible schedule can finish this very important and world renowned project as planned.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that the members of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations were not fully informed by Atomic Energy Commission witnesses on two items. These are the requirement for the full \$8 million for the new high-level waste storage tank construction at Hanford and the need to keep both K-reactors in full operation, not just in sequential operation as the Appropriations Subcommittee recommends. I have reviewed the record of the May 19, 1969, hearing of the subcommittee and regret to find that some of the answers did not present sufficient information to enable the members to make a sound decision.

The Atomic Energy Commission is an extremely conservative agency. This philosophy stems primarily from the necessity of having to crawl before we learn to walk. Let us recall that when the first

high-level waste storage tanks were designed and constructed at Hanford. Nobody, but nobody, could even guess what the future might bring in terms of high-level, self-boiling wastes. Building these tanks was one of the cautious steps that eventually led to bigger ones. It should be noted that almost all of these tanks were built in 1955 and prior years. These tanks emulate human beings, too, since they suffer from senescence.

You may recall that four tanks were authorized in 1968, but that because of new construction methods, methods which guarantee no leaks, only two tanks could be built.

I contend that, contrary to incomplete testimony presented to the subcommittee, all four of the high-level waste tanks authorized by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for fiscal year 1970 are required, regardless of the on-line time of the K-reactors. They are required to provide a much needed back-up capability until such time as an agreed-to waste solidification program is established.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to that other item, the operation of the K-reactors themselves.

Current AEC planning for the production of special nuclear materials and other special materials begins with providing for firm requirements as well as for contingent requirements associated with uncertainties. No basis has been defined on which to determine specifically how much constitutes an adequate production contingency. However, general guidance is and has been available from AEC statutory authority, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, from Department of Defense and other agencies, as well as historical performance and records of supply-demand patterns.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recognized the need for establishing reserve stocks of special nuclear material as early as 1956. In addition, uncertainties in requirements and the long leadtime needed for production of plutonium, particularly if shutdown reactors have to be restarted, were recognized by the Joint Committee in their report on authorizing appropriations for the AEC for fiscal years 1968 and 1969. The following statement for fiscal year 1969 is taken from page 13 of that report:

Since lead times for production of special nuclear materials are generally greater than those for the production of nuclear weapons, the committee believes cutbacks in production of these materials should not be too closely gaged to current weapons production rates or the conservative estimates of requirements for peaceful application. Ample quantities of special nuclear materials should be maintained in stock to provide for contingencies—both for the weapons program and for peaceful uses. The Joint Committee will be observing closely the Commission's performance in meeting requirements for special nuclear materials.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the substantial uncertainties existing in the projection of future requirements for reactor products, I advocate the provision of an ample quantity of reactor products above currently firm requirements so that we do not have to resort to crash programs and incur heavy costs in the restart of existing standby reactors.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in acting on the fiscal year 1970 authorization bill, analyzed the supply-demand picture for reactor products and has concluded that continued operation of six reactors is necessary. Production commitments can be adjusted as changes occur to minimize costs yet still assure a response that is adequate to meet future changes that may occur through the planning period.

Mr. Chairman, under these conditions it is quite clear that the Nation has a heavy responsibility to insure that an adequate supply of reactor products is available. Let us not be in accord with the old axiom—pennywise and pound-foolish. It would be very shortsighted to plan the breeder programs and then find that there is an artificially created tight situation because not enough plutonium was available to get the program going. And the K-reactors are being used to test prototype fuel elements using uranium carbide and plutonium carbide for the fast breeder program. Sequential operation of the reactors, as provided in the bill before us, will slow down the program as well as increase hazards if the fuel must be shifted between reactors.

It would seem to me that \$3 million to provide plutonium and to test new fuel concepts for the breeder programs is indeed a bargain price.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the chairman and members of the Appropriations Committee for their long months of dedicated work on this vital legislation. We all are aware of the stringencies placed on them by the current national effort to combat inflation through reduced spending, and we all realize that there were hundreds of worthwhile programs that simply could not be funded this year.

The committee was faced with the almost impossible task of sorting through a huge backlog of projects and choosing those of only the utmost national importance for approval this year.

Each of us, in every State, has had the unhappy experience of seeing projects which were considered crucial at the local level being postponed or drastically reduced because of lack of money. Yet the result, as contained in this measure just passed, is recognized by all of us as a wise and prudent selection in the best overall national interest.

I wish particularly to commend the outstanding efforts of the Subcommittee on Public Works, which bore the brunt of this task. While many projects in my district were reduced along with the many hundreds of other projects across the Nation. The members of this subcommittee were responsive to an emergency flood situation that existed in Albuquerque and took time to study the matter most carefully. I join the stricken and endangered people in Albuquerque's flood section in thanking the subcommittee for its thoughtful and timely adjustment in the appropriation for the south diversion channel project. While we are very disappointed that the appropriation was not returned to its original requested amount, I am assured that the restoration made by the committee will enable us to proceed with this crucial flood-control construction, and I am

certain the committee will recommend full funding as soon as the present fiscal emergency passes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, it is most fitting that we Members of Congress express our appreciation to one of the most distinguished and able colleagues, MIKE KIRWAN. His effective work in this body on behalf of the welfare of the people of this great Nation is almost immeasurable.

I am certain that we all hope for his recovery and look forward to having his genial personality in our midst soon.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, on April 16, I rose to support an amendment offered by my distinguished Ohio colleague (Mr. VANIK) which would have earmarked \$100 million in authorization to combat pollution of the Great Lakes. I pointed out that Lake Erie was in grave danger of being murdered by polluters and that the Cuyahoga River was considered a fire hazard.

The major developments since that date are three: The Cuyahoga River has again caught on fire; Lake Erie has been proclaimed dead on a national television show; and the House Appropriations Committee has appropriated \$600 million for pollution control, \$2.2 million of which is earmarked for the Great Lakes. Naturally, only the third item provides much consolation to those of us in the Cleveland area who do not wish to end up as laboratory specimens in a formaldehyde of our own creation. For substantially raising the appropriation level, and for the earmarking, the first legislative recognition of the dire pollution problems of the Great Lakes, I applaud the distinguished chairman of the committee (Mr. MAHON).

But even the bill in its present status is not adequate. Grave difficulties must beget grave solutions or become insoluble difficulties. Certainly, such is the case with water pollution. Unless stringent measures are adopted forthwith, two-thirds of all the water in this country will be poisoned by the end of the next decade—and we will have made a substantial beginning on the ocean. The technology is available, the money is obtainable. All that is lacking is the necessary political courage.

Lewis Mumford, renowned expert on urbanology, stated in commenting on the relationship between environmental dissolution and urban decay in former civilizations:

The displacement of Nature in the city rested, in part, upon an illusion—or indeed a series of illusions—as to the nature of man and his institutions: the illusions of self-sufficiency and independence, and the possibility of physical continuity without conscious renewal. Under the protective mantle of the city, seemingly so permanent, these illusions encouraged habits of predation and parasitism that eventually undermined the whole social and economic structure.

Those are frightening words, Mr. Chairman, when one considers how Americans have responded—or rather not responded—to the pollution of their environment. We must heed Mr. Mumford's warning or his words could well become our epitaph.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, last night, Douglas Kiker's presen-

tation on pollution in the environment on NBC's "From Here to the 70's" was both timely and frightening. Timely because it came on the eve of our debate here today on the funding for the Clean Water Restoration Act, frightening because of what Mr. Kiker had to say about our chances for survival in a world which we are very rapidly contaminating. Quite frankly, we are running out of time. Our efforts to preserve and clean up our environment are running behind our country's reckless pollution of the air, pollution of the water, dumping of solid waste garbage on our land, and uncontrolled urban growth.

The experts quoted last night in the NBC report gave us 10 years to solve the problem—10 years and that's all. After that the bitter satire contained in the recent issue of the Harvard Crimson may very well be true. It foresaw a land of silent springs, oceans of dark and deadly waters, a poisoned atmosphere that strangles what life might have survived on the exhausted earth.

If we do not reverse present trends by the end of this century, two-thirds of our water supply will be polluted by hundreds of chemicals being dumped into the water.

If we do not reverse the trend, the 3½ billion tons of solid waste that we dump onto the land each year will soon be towering over us.

If we do not reverse the trend, the 140,000 tons of fumes that are pumped each year into the air over our urban areas will pull a black and smelly shroud over our Nation's cities.

If we do not insist on quality as we plan our urban growth, our cities by the 1980's may very well be concentration camps created by advanced technology.

It is estimated that by the end of the 1970's, 85 percent of the population in the United States will be living in urban areas, but look what our urban growth is doing to the land in our country.

The United States has approximately 3,600,000 square miles of land, but we have already built 3,600,000 miles of roads.

There are 2,313,000,000 acres of land in the United States but each year 1 million acres of land are irretrievably given over to urban purposes. Half of this amount each year is taken from crop land, and at least 50,000 acres of our agricultural land each year is covered over with asphalt and concrete. The Agriculture Department reports that they are not overly concerned at this time at the rapid rate of urbanization of agricultural land because of our Nation's demonstrated capacity to produce an abundance of food.

But what is alarming is that as we add to the urbanization of the land and add to man's ability to contaminate his environment, we are also subtracting from nature's ability to clean up our countrysides. Every tree or field of green grass or crops contributes oxygen to the air and absorbs a number of other chemicals whose concentration would be dangerous.

For instance, if airports handling jet planes could be surrounded by acres of trees, the pollutant effects of jet exhaust

into the atmosphere could be minimized. But the prospects of this happening are not encouraging. The Federal Aviation Administration estimates that on a typical day some 35 tons of pollutants are spewed over the National Capital area from planes landing and taking off from Washington's National Airport. To satisfactorily absorb this pollution at National Airport, it would be necessary to plant 125 acres of trees. It is even more discouraging to learn as cited in a recent HEW report on air quality that the amount of solid waste thrown onto our Nation's burnpiles from residential, commercial, and industrial sources is increasing at a compound rate of 3 percent per year.

The elimination of water pollution which is the purpose of this bill is of as great concern to the West, to my State of Oregon, as it is to the East. The horror stories of eastern rivers that have become fire hazards, as did one of the rivers which runs into Lake Erie, and of rivers which have become cesspools and give life support only to scavenger eels, as has parts of the Hudson in New York State, are not things which we wish to come true in our area. But the West may soon have its own horror story to tell. Portland, Oreg., has about 450,000 people and the Portland metropolitan area has about one million, however, the total daily effect of the pollution on the Willamette River and the Columbia River in the Portland area coming from municipal, industrial, and commercial sources is equal to the pollution caused by a large populated city of almost 4½ million. Local and State authorities are doing all they can with the money they have to put a stop to it.

The Federal Government has indeed taken the lead in fighting water pollution, its efforts date back to the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, in which the Congress prohibited the dumping of garbage and trash into any navigable waters. Important legislation passed in 1948 and 1956 established and strengthened the Federal water pollution control efforts. Under these laws and subsequent legislation, the Federal Government has aided in the construction of 9,251 waste treatment projects costing \$5.7 billion, of this the Federal share was \$1.3 billion. These projects have improved the water in about 74,000 miles of stream and have served an estimated 74 million people. Under the Clean Water Restoration Act which was passed in 1966, there are 4,525 State and local projects that are now being developed at a total cost of \$5.1 billion. The Federal share for these projects would be \$2.3 billion. The State and local governments have done an admirable job in allocating their own tax revenues for the purpose of water pollution abatement. A recent poll by the Gallop organization showed that 73 percent of the people answering their questionnaire were willing to pay additional taxes to improve their natural surroundings, including water pollution control. The Congress can be assured of wide support for efforts in this area.

It would simply be false economy at this time to approve anything less than the \$1 billion which has been previously authorized by this Congress for Federal

support for water pollution abatement programs. It is estimated that it already costs the United States of America \$13 billion a year in economic losses due to the effects of pollution. To help retrieve this loss the expenditure of \$1 billion of Federal tax moneys seems to me to be a very sound investment indeed.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Committee on Appropriations' recommended allocation of \$5,350,000 for the Snettisham power project in southeastern Alaska.

The critical importance of this project to the people and industry of the southeastern region cannot be overemphasized. Located near Juneau, Snettisham will be capable of supplying much-needed electric power to Alaska's capital city. In addition, Snettisham will substantially increase the level of industrial activity in the entire southeastern area of Alaska. Companies which have already located in the area will expand their operations, and new firms will be attracted. Several large companies have already expressed their interest in building new plants near Snettisham. However, these plans are necessarily contingent on a dependable and low-cost supply of electric power.

Mr. Chairman, of the 34 public works projects included in the Corps of Engineers' civil works program for Alaska, only one—Snettisham—is presently under construction, and any reduction in funding for this project will jeopardize its future completion. In 1961, when Snettisham was first proposed, it was estimated that the entire project would cost \$41.6 million. Today, the total cost is expected to be \$52.6 million. In 1961, the estimated cost to the consumer of hydroelectric power produced at Snettisham was 7.1 mills per kilowatt-hour. The present predicted price is 12 mills. A reduced appropriation for Snettisham will further delay the project's completion, and costs will skyrocket still further.

I could understand the reluctance of some House Members to appropriate the full \$5,350,000 if it were not for one crucial fact. The entire Federal investment of \$52.6 million for Snettisham will be fully repaid to the Treasury from revenues to be derived from the sale of hydroelectric power produced by the project.

Mr. Chairman, southeastern Alaska is confronted with a critical shortage of hydroelectric power. The people of this region are not asking the Federal Government to pay the bill to eliminate this power deficit. All that they ask is that the Congress help to make the Snettisham power project self-supporting. Once this status is achieved, the Government will be able to recoup its investment, and the people of southeastern Alaska will no longer be plagued by a severe shortage of dependable, low-cost electric power. My distinguished colleagues, I urge you not to pare any funds for Snettisham from the moneys recommended by the Committee on Appropriations in its carefully considered report.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14159, the public works appropriation bill especially as it appropriates funds for the construction

and planning of flood control and water pollution abatement facilities.

Three flood control projects in the Fifth District of Connecticut, which I represent, are provided for in this bill. Of the \$6,636,000 for Connecticut flood control projects in this bill, \$4,955,000 is earmarked for Fifth District planning and construction. These flood control projects are sorely needed and I can personally attest to the importance of the Derby, Trumbull Pond Reservoir, and Ansonia-Derby projects to the people in my district.

These projects are part of a Connecticut complex of flood control dams, reservoirs, dikes, levies, and pumping stations for which I have worked and in which I have had the cooperation of the Public Works and Appropriations Committees, and my colleagues in the House, during the past 10 years. We are on the threshold of the completion of this complex which was designed for the safety of our people and the protection of our industry and property.

I have been an early advocate of the national endeavor to curb water pollution. I was a sponsor of the Clean Water Restoration Act. I, therefore, support the amendment to authorize \$1 billion for fiscal year 1970, for implementation of the Clean Water Restoration Act.

For too long we have deferred full dedication of Federal endeavor to meet our responsibilities in this field. Many States have gone into debt in anticipation of receiving Federal funds under the Clean Water Restoration Act and one of these is my own State of Connecticut which has prefinanced from State funds the pledged Federal contribution. We must honor our pledges.

To date, Connecticut has prefinanced approximately \$40 million in promised Federal funds and has received only \$5.8 million. It is for this reason that I support the \$1 billion authorization, for if Federal funds are not forthcoming promptly Connecticut will be embarrassed not only by inability to carry out its immediate water pollution control commitments but also by a situation of deficit financing caused by our failure to act.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in the construction of the 200-Bev accelerator at the Enrico Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory at Weston, Ill., it is extremely important that the full \$96 million for construction, as recommended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, be appropriated to permit keeping the entire \$250 million project on schedule. I would like to call to your attention the fact that the difference between the \$96 million authorized and the \$64 million voted by the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations for construction does not represent a savings of \$32 million for fiscal year 1970. Let us, if you please, consider these funds in their true perspective.

There are many extremely long lead-time items associated with the 200-Bev accelerator. In order to keep to the planned 5-year construction schedule it becomes necessary to order, well in advance of delivery, some very expensive

pieces of equipment. If the AEC has the obligatory authority in fiscal year 1970, it can order this equipment at today's prices, but payment will not be made until the items are delivered. Without the full obligation authority, the AEC cannot order on a timely, orderly basis.

If the obligatory authority is not there, it will cause a delay in ordering, it will cause a delay in the time the first beam is available, and most certainly will cause a significant increase in the total price of the facility. To replace these words with numbers, I would like to state specifically that a reduction of \$32 million in obligatory authority for fiscal year 1970 will most likely result in a year's delay and in an overall increase in cost for the facility of \$30 million.

The planning and design for this accelerator have progressed very satisfactorily and are on schedule, but the momentum and efficiency of this operation must be maintained. If the rate of funding is uncertain or insufficient on a large construction project of this kind, it will be subject to increases in cost, managerial inefficiencies, morale problems, and delayed schedules, with the result that the usefulness of the completed facility may be impaired. It is urgent that the budgetary allocations for construction of this facility follow the schedule that has been established to meet the goal of its first beam operation by June 30, 1972.

I strongly recommend that the full \$96 million in new obligation authority be given the AEC to proceed with the Enrico Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, today we have before the House for its consideration, the 1970 appropriation bill for public works for water, pollution control, and power development and Atomic Energy Commission.

On page 1 of House Report 91-548, which accompanies H.R. 14159, there is the phrase "Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following report." Although the report contains 107 pages to describe the funding provided in this bill, I am sure those of us who have had the great privilege to know the gentleman from Ohio, could paraphrase any report he might make in this connection in three words—"invest in America."

Although our beloved colleague is not able to be on the floor today to guide this bill through the legislative procedure as he has done for many years, he has put much time and effort in the bill which is before you today for your consideration.

While it might be difficult to choose one individual as the "greatest American," I am sure there are many in this House today who would join me in proclaiming MIKE KIRWAN as one of our greatest Americans.

I am speaking of a man who started as a young boy in the coal mines of Pennsylvania and by the dint of his own efforts worked himself up through the various levels until it was commonplace for him to sit with and counsel the leaders of our country. In the course of doing this, he gained a knowledge of and

appreciation for this Nation which few have attained.

I am speaking of a man who first came to this Congress in 1937 from the 19th District of Ohio and who has been a member of the House Committee on Appropriations during the past 26 years, during which time he has served successively from 1949 as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies and the Subcommittee on Public Works. In his role as the chairman of these subcommittees, MIKE KIRWAN has had one philosophy—protect the natural resources of this Nation and make America a better place in which to live.

During our lifetime we are blessed with many pleasant experiences and privileges. For me, one of the greatest of these is the association I have had during the past several years with the "Irishman from Ohio." I deeply regret that he is not able to be with us today and I earnestly trust he will soon be back in this Chamber once again exhorting all of us to "invest in America."

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, increasingly over the past 3 years, we have heard the cry of State and municipal governments for Federal funds to carry out their waste treatment projects begun in response to congressional promises of funds back in 1966. Not only are the States and local governments plagued by the lack of Federal funds, but they are also having to face a threat of legislation which may alter existing programs. The time has now come for the Federal-State partnership to put up the authorized funds. This is the challenge we face today. We must accept the fact that this funding effort is not an isolated drive, and that in funding in full the Clean Water Restoration Act, we are fulfilling a promise we made—by unanimous vote—to the States and municipalities over 3 years ago, and that this drive has been carried on, virtually alone, largely by the municipalities with increasing help from State governments ever since that promise. They just cannot be forced to carry on alone any longer. Therein lies the challenge.

The irony of the challenge we face today is that it comes from ourselves. It seems, curiously, that we Americans have always been at odds with our environment. When the environment was a thing to be overcome, to be conquered, it was like a third person to us, or an object. We never identified the land we devoured as part of ourselves, until now. And even now, perhaps, we do not realize the full implications of that identity. What we have converted to our own uses becomes irretrievably ours as our bodies are ours. And as we are dependent on our bodies for our continued existence, so we are dependent on the land and the air and the water which sustain those bodies. I quote from an editorial by Charles Ogburn, Jr., which appeared in the Washington Post:

Thanks to our vaulting technology, the fate of the continent . . . and of the life it supports, our own and that of the infinite variety of . . . plants and animals, is now largely in our hands. To the extent that we can desolate the earth or glorify it, we have displaced the rule of nature, or, as

Jefferson had it nature's God: At least we have made ourselves the surrogates of the Supreme Power.

Along with attaining . . . breathtaking possibilities we have shouldered awful possibilities . . . supplant a king, and the functions of a king inescapably devolve upon you. Supplant a God, and his equally are yours to discharge.

In truth, we have supplanted nature herself, now we must take up her responsibilities.

We have ignored the symbiotic balance between ourselves and our environment. We have (see State legislative speech), devoured the magnificent forests, gouged greedily from the earth the abundant minerals, ravaged the agricultural lands.

Today we continue to torture this good land by—

Pouring some 130 million tons of dangerous pollutants into the air each year. We find that every major metropolitan airshed in the country is polluted, to one degree or another;

Continuing to savagely pollute all of our water systems, seriously threatening this Nation's supply of fresh water. Many of the major rivers and one of the Great Lakes are for all practical purposes denuded of the free oxygen needed to support marine life. In the Appalachian region, about 10,500 miles of streams in eight States are affected by mine drainage. About 5,700 miles of streams are continually polluted, mostly from acid. Eighty percent of the acid mine drainage in Appalachia comes from abandoned mines, whose former owners are not going to pay the bill; and

We continue to pollute our environment with harmful pesticides. We find the earth's biosphere—that thin, fragile envelope of air, water and land that sustains all life—we find it laden with 500 million pounds of DDT, a persistent and nearly immortal pesticide.

A recently released 2-year study by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife shockingly revealed that DDT was found in 584 samples of fish taken from 45 rivers and lakes across the United States.

Study results showed DDT ranging up to 45.27 parts per million in whole fish. A count more than twice as high as that found in the thousands of pounds of Lake Michigan coho salmon seized recently by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration as being unfit for human consumption, and nine times higher than the FDA interim tolerance level for fish.

The study also found dieldrin, a pesticide even more toxic to humans than DDT, in fish from 15 of the rivers and lakes reaching levels higher than the 0.3 part per million FDA guideline limit for this pesticide in fish.

And what about the problem of the thermal and radiological pollution rising from the increase in nuclear powerplants across the country. Heat from atomic power generation plants and industrial cooling sources is raising the temperature of many streams and estuaries and a few lakes up to several degrees, enough to drive out or kill aquatic organisms.

Industrial and household wastes, soaps and detergents are hard on stream ani-

mals, creamery wastes, pickling liquors from steel mills, ore tailings from mines, and a hundred other types of wastes, including that from paper mills, are changing aquatic environments.

And we have the growing problem of solid wastes. From one end of this country to the other, the American people are piling up refuse at a staggering rate. Each day, each American gets rid of about five pounds of refuse—paper, garbage, ashes, metal, glass—you name it. This amounts to nearly a ton of trash per person per year—360 billion pounds of solid wastes annually for the country. And what of the tons of scrap automobiles that are discarded on the landscape. Odd that the automotive industry spends millions to market its product, but refuses to spend a dime to help the Nation rid itself of the ugly, worn-out vehicles.

We could go on and on pointing out the methods we are using to choke out our very existence, but there is really no need to do that. The point is that the U.S. Congress has recognized the seriousness of the pollution problem for a good many years, and despite much opposition and what at times seemed insurmountable opposition and executive apathy, has passed meaningful legislation to fight the growing pollution.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act, legislation which I had the privilege to author and introduce, was enacted in 1956. This was the first permanent national law for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution.

The importance of the act was that it brought the U.S. Government into full partnership with the States and localities in the clean water fight.

Since 1956, the bill has been strengthened in 1961, 1965 and 1966. With the expected enactment of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969. This legislation will become an even more effective instrument for the management of water quality in the Nation's lakes and rivers, estuaries, and coastal waters.

The water pollution control legislation is a monument to the dedication, knowledge and leadership of the U.S. Congress. Back in the early days it was a pretty lonely fight. There was no national commitment to cleaning up the dirty water. The interest in Congress was only mediocre, and there was downright stiff opposition from many of this Nation's industrial giants.

But the Congress finally realized its obligation in the field of the water pollution control, and passed sweeping legislation as proof of its commitment.

But now I think it is high time we take a good look at the Federal water pollution control program for what it really is—long on promises of financial aid and extremely short of actual funds. What we have done is to leave the States, localities and private operators with a bag full of Federal regulations with relatively little financial aid to implement them.

Sure, we can be commended for taking the lead in the early days. We raised the water pollution control program from a minor agency within the Public Health Service to sub-Cabinet depart-

mental level under an Under Secretary of Interior with direct contact with a Cabinet member.

However, twice, both under this administration and the last, we have pulled the rug from under the water pollution control program by inadequately funding it.

The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1969 authorized \$700 million for fiscal year 1969, but only \$214 million was actually appropriated. For 1970, the act authorized \$1 billion, but the administration's appropriation request was \$214 million. The Appropriations Committee has raised that figure to \$600 million, but, gentlemen, that is nowhere nearly enough, and we know it.

Currently there are 1,445 applications on file in the State agencies requesting more than a half-billion dollars in Federal construction grant funds. In addition, there are 448 applications in the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration's regional offices, requesting \$287.9 million, and almost 3,000 applications at the municipal level for a total amount of \$1.5 billion. The combined total is about 4,800 applications, pending and in preparation, involving \$2.3 billion in Federal funds.

In addition to the pending applications, there are 726 projects which have proceeded with a lesser amount of Federal aid than authorized by law, representing additional Federal fund needs of \$792 million.

On the basis of the President's budget request of \$214 million for construction grants, only one-fourth of the communities in the Nation could be assisted.

If we can spend billions on ABM, if we can afford a multi-billion dollar program to get man to the moon, if we can spend \$25 billion annually in Vietnam, then the Federal Government can and must appropriate the full \$1 billion for water pollution control as authorized by Congress without a single dissenting vote.

We have ignored our identity with our environment long enough. We cannot continue to do so. We dare not.

This \$1 billion we ask today is itself still not enough, but it is a start, and it will continue the momentum built up over the past 2 years among the States in response to our promise.

Let us accept the challenge we have made for ourselves. Let us appropriate the money we promised 2 years ago, and go on to save our waters for the future and for ourselves.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, the low level of Federal support provided for clean water over the past 3 years has forced many local governments to borrow substantial amounts of money to pay for completion of projects for which they thought Federal aid would be available.

The greater level of local borrowing for water pollution facilities is forcing localities to pay higher interest costs which would have been avoided if Federal grants were available and has increased severe strains on the general municipal bond market.

In addition, the increased borrowing has added to the inflationary pressures our economy faces nationally. Each dollar of local government borrowing is a

new dollar pumped into the economy. It is these borrowed dollars on which inflation is built. Federal aid dollars are for the most part dollars that go from taxpayers back to local government. Though they constitute the same facility, Federal aid dollars do not have the same inflationary push as locally borrowed dollars.

We cannot continue to rely on local borrowing ability to maintain momentum of the water pollution program. In many States and localities borrowing capacity is exhausted. For nearly 2 months now the index of municipal bond interest rates has been in excess of 6 percent. But local general obligation bonds in 24 States and revenue bonds in 20 States have statutory interest ceilings of 6 percent or less. Thus new bonds cannot be issued.

Many localities have also issued as many bonds as they can within bonded indebtedness ceilings, and the tightness of available bonds financing is preventing other municipalities from marketing bonds even if they could within interest and bond indebtedness limits.

If we are to keep the water pollution control effort going and avoid inflationary pressures and increasingly exorbitant interest rates which result from local borrowing, we must provide the full \$1 billion authorized for the program. Appropriation of the full authorization is needed and needed now to carry this program for the next year.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to reaffirm my strong support for the appropriation of the full \$1 billion authorized for the Federal fight against water pollution.

There are few issues facing the Congress and the Nation, and indeed the world, today more important than the quality of our environment. Man has been so careless and thoughtless that our water and air have become befouled, our wildlife killed, and our supply of fresh water and air seriously limited. We have discussed this great problem for many years in this body and time after time we have made paper commitments to solve it. We have sanctimoniously approved legislation committing the Federal Government to major expenditures to halt water pollution.

But year after year we have not lived up to our commitments. Year after year we have appropriated funds at a level far below that which, through our authorization, we have admitted are necessary.

As I indicated in my speech in support of full funding on August 13, I believe it is high time that we live up to our commitments and I intend to express that belief in my vote here today.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, a total clear water restoration appropriation, if passed, could provide us with one of the most effective means of restoring a healthful environment to the United States. Moreover, it would also stand as a vote of confidence to our States, that have been fighting the scourge of pollution by spending as much as they can to build essential sewage treatment plants and other pollution control facilities.

Our action in this area, in the past, has not been very meritorious, I am sad to

say. Although we have acknowledged the imminent dangers of pollution which has been creeping throughout our lakes and streams, we have done little to act upon these warnings. Out of the \$2.3 billion authorized for clean water restoration in the past 4 years, Congress has appropriated only \$567 million in the first 3 of these years and the administration has asked for only \$214 million for fiscal 1970. This is a far cry from meeting the Federal responsibility to control water pollution.

Mr. Chairman, I have joined with more than 220 of my colleagues, a significant number of citizens, and such groups as the League of Women Voters and the National League of Cities in taking this cause to heart. I have pledged to vote for the full \$1 billion funding of this program because I am convinced that a massive attack on water pollution is the only way we can insure that our generation and the generations to come will have clean water for their needs.

This morning's Washington Post editorial on clean water restoration summed up my feelings when it said:

It is a matter of such vital concern to the country Congress cannot afford to put itself in the position of withdrawing from an obligation it has assumed and sought to impose on the states and cities.

Should we fail to reach into the congressional purse to supplement this essential and well-planned attack, we will be permitting the pollution problem to spread.

What good will it do to horde funds with the intention of financing other domestic programs if we are setting the stage for the real possibility that one day we will awaken to a land without water resources for its population needs?

Mr. Chairman, I trust that we will accept our duty and vote for the billion dollars authorized. All of us deserve clean water to take with our aspirins as we tackle the congressional headaches that still lie ahead.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, there is much in the appropriation bill before us that is essential and significant, but there is probably no single item as absolutely vital to the national well-being as the funding for the water pollution control program.

The Congress has wisely committed itself to a massive effort, not only to clean up the pollution that exists, but to prevent its increase in future years. I know we are confronted with difficult choices in priorities, but we have been confronted with the same kinds of difficult choices throughout our history and presumably will continue to be in that situation.

In this case, if we continue to talk but fail to act, we may find ourselves facing, not a choice, but a national disaster.

I have worked side by side with the members of the Public Works Committee and other Members of this body for the enactment of legislation that will make it possible for us to do an effective job of water pollution control. I will continue to do so, not only for the benefit of the people of my own area, but for the good of the entire country. I therefore support, without reservation, the maximum ap-

propriation for water pollution control. And when the appropriation is granted, I will continue to work with my fellow Members to insure that the money is put to effective, well-planned use.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I know I speak for the Members of the House when I say that we all miss the presence today of the distinguished chairman on Public Works, the Honorable MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, who has been hospitalized.

Some of the Members may not know that MIKE was born in my congressional district and we have always been honored to call him one of our most outstanding native sons. What a career he has had. At a very early age, something like 8 or 9 years of age, he went to work in the coal mines. That, of course, was before the enactment of child labor laws. He was so small in stature that he had to carry his lunch pail on his shoulders when it snowed and the walking was tiring and difficult to and from work. Anyone who has ever worked in or around the coal mines, especially in those days, knows what I am talking about. It was never easy. MIKE later became a streetcar conductor and subsequently held jobs that were physically hard. He was never afraid of work and it was this characteristic that brought him to the high positions which he has held in our Government.

I know all the Members join with me in wishing MIKE the very best. He has been a valued Member of this body and we truly miss his wise counsel and great experience. He has always been most kind and thoughtful to me personally. I recall, clearly, how he took the time from an extremely busy schedule to come to Wilkes-Barre and, along with the late Speaker Sam Rayburn and Senator Paul Douglas, joined with my constituents in tendering me a testimonial. That was an evening I shall long cherish and remember. And MIKE KIRWAN helped to make it a most memorable evening. That is the kind of man he is. Never too busy to be a true friend.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14159, the public works appropriations bill for water pollution control, power development, and Atomic Energy Commission. Also, I express my appreciation to the subcommittee and the full committee for the diligent work in the preparation of this bill. I know that the members of the subcommittee gave special consideration for projects warranted on facts and merits. I was particularly pleased to see some of the smaller projects get some planning funds so they could move ahead with the work that eventually must be done, such as the Palmetto project in my district. The committee also carried forward funds for land acquisition for the San Gabriel Reservoirs, a much needed development in central Texas.

Each of us, I am certain, would have wanted more money for his State and his district—but the Nation is in a belt-tightening period. Congress, with this bill prepared by the committee, has exercised its fiscal responsibility. There was no mad dash for spending and this is recognition of the inflationary times. Government spending in this instance

has been kept at a minimum, yet needed projects have not suffered greatly in the process.

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending legislation and the significant increase for water pollution control. I am greatly concerned over the crisis facing our Nation with respect to clean water—and indeed clean air and a clean environment.

Twenty, 30, 40 years from now, Americans will need more of everything, but especially, we will need to depend on our natural resources—water, air, minerals, and land. No doubt we are making some progress in protecting or restoring this whole range of resources—but not enough. The problems are growing faster than our current efforts to meet them.

Conservative predictions estimate that by the year 2000, we will need 215 percent more land for homes, schools, and factories. We will need 125 percent more land for transportation. We will need 180 percent more land for reservoirs. We will need 133 percent more land for wildlife refuges, and we will need 300 percent more land for recreation and other outdoor pursuits. Municipal water use will more than double; manufacturing use of water may quadruple.

And this is just to stay even with the quality of life which we now have.

The problems associated with this pending crisis are staggering to the imagination. The differing demands for our resources become evermore competitive and, in addition, it is imperative that we worry about quality as well as quantity.

I do not want my children and grandchildren in the year 2000 to be confronted with water pollution, air pollution and, really, when you get right down to it, the pollution of our entire environment which exists at the present time.

I want my children and grandchildren to be able to enjoy nature—to be able to go hunting and fishing, or water skiing, or merely for a walk in the woods without of the stench of sulfur fumes and automobile exhaust filling every breath they take—without the fear of what dangerous substance may be contained in the streams and rivers around them.

After many years of inaction, most levels of government are finally beginning to meet the challenges laid before them. The Congress, State legislatures, and municipal governing bodies are enacting an ever-increasing number of water pollution and air pollution measures; yet, there are problems involved here which cannot be solved by Government alone—which cannot be dealt with by passing a prohibitory law.

As we all know, there is a present crisis with respect to electrical power supplies up and down the east coast. New York City operated on reduced power for over 30 days this past summer. The power company which serves the Washington area made repeated public appeals for its customers to cut off the air conditioning during some of the hottest days in August.

Yet, the most feasible method of increasing our power supply—nuclear gen-

erators—may possibly have serious side effects. A nuclear reactor uses vast quantities of water—you might even say a whole river—in making electricity. The water is circulated through the reactor as a coolant and then returned to its source. There is no danger from radioactivity, but the “used” water is several degrees higher in temperature and this temperature change may adversely affect the ecology of the entire area.

This is a classic example of competing demands on our resources. On the one hand, the demonstrated need for electricity is increasing between 10 and 20 percent per year. On the other hand, an obvious solution results in a new, and possibly more disastrous, pollution.

The answer here is better technology. In order to prepare ourselves for the conservation crisis, the human resources of this Nation must be marshaled and coordinated so that a vast effort can be maintained and this bill under consideration today is certainly a step in the right direction.

It is no longer enough to establish criteria for determining what is an acceptable level of pollution in our water. Positive action must be initiated in order that the technological problems associated with reducing the level of pollution can be solved. I hope that most of us will still be here in the year 2000 and I do not want to look around and say to one another, “Oh, if only we had acted 30 years ago!”

As we look toward that future—hopefully, a time when we will all be wiser in the ways of dealing with our rich resources—let us remember the only sure way to bring it about is by fostering better understanding between Government and industry, conservationists, and those who think of themselves as just plain, but vitally interested citizens.

It is our environment, it belongs to all of us together—and together we must manage it.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am votin gagaingst the public works appropriations bill today as a protest.

First, I protest the inadequacy of the funds allocated to water pollution abatement. While I appreciate the substantial increase made by the committee, it is so grossly inadequate to meet the crying needs of the country to clean up its polluted water as to be unconscionable.

The Nation has a true crisis on its hands. It is a further distortion of our national priorities to provide billions for ABM's, SST's and even ships neither the Pentagon nor the President ever requested, and yet to turn down these vitally needed funds.

Second, I protest that part of the AEC appropriations allocated to weapons development and testing in connection with ABM and MIRV development and to nonmilitary testing of weapons that pose threats to the environment as was the case with the recent tests on Amchitka Island in the Aleutian Islands.

Third, I protest the continuation of very large public works appropriations for reclamation and dam building projects at a time of such heavy inflation.

This simply is not the time for such expenditures.

Thus the bill in many ways represents to me an example of distorted priorities that I feel it is imperative that we reverse, if we are to tackle meaningfully our pressing domestic needs.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill we are today considering contains many increases in unbudgeted items, for which I am very grateful, since many of them directly benefit the Second Congressional District of Virginia.

However, there is one item not included in this bill that I feel should be—\$35,000 to begin a study to find a replacement for the Craney Island disposal area.

Craney Island was a unique experiment, which provided a convenient place for the disposition of spoil from harbor dredging projects in Hampton Roads, and thereby saved the U.S. Government hundreds of thousands of dollars.

If Craney Island continues to be filled at the current rate, it will be beyond use within the next 5 to 8 years. Since it took 14 years from proposal to completion for Craney Island to become a reality, the time to begin a study on its successor is at hand.

Thus, it is not only for my constituents, but also for efficiency, economy, and reason that I hope some way can be found to include these funds in this year's appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair and cleaning of uniforms; official entertainment expenses (not to exceed \$30,000); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$1,884,269,000 and any moneys (except sums received from disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2301)) received by the Commission, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount \$100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in ex-

cess of \$90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of \$45,000 per annum.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the 3 minutes I had before was not quite adequate to say what I wanted to say, and therefore I have asked for this time under the 5-minute rule.

As I said, our jobless rate is increasing very rapidly; it is at a 2-year high, and I pointed out that the housing starts have come down from 130,000 to 123,000.

In California the construction business is just about ended because of the high interest rate. There has been no effort on the part of the Nixon administration to handle the high interest rate problem.

There has been no appeal to the banks and no appeal to the wage earners who are striking for higher wages.

There has been no attempt on the part of the President to influence this highly inflationary trend which is cutting the heart out of our economy.

I want to direct my remarks at this time particularly to the members of the Committee on Appropriations and offer a little information. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the subcommittee will give me their attention because I want to give you some information, because I am afraid you do not have the information.

From 1960 to 1968 inclusive, U.S. corporate profits after taxes have gone up from \$26.7 billion to \$49.8 billion. That is an 86-percent increase in corporate profits.

The individual Americans savings in banks and institutions from 1960 to 1968 inclusive have gone up from \$165 billion to \$356 billion. That is a 115-percent increase. Our public debt—the public Federal debt has gone down from 57 percent to 38 percent in relation to the gross national product and the gross national product has gone up from \$506 billion to \$932 billion during that 8-year period.

The figures I am giving you have one purpose, to illustrate that America is not in a position of fiscal crisis. We are not in a position where we cannot do the things we need to do in America, to enrich the life of America and to correct the deficits in America.

I am afraid that the philosophy of this House and the philosophy of the Committee on Appropriations is a philosophy of fear of the fiscal situation in this country. I would have them consider the figures I have given to them as being evidence that we are not in a fiscal crisis where we have to cut the guts out of everything in America that is for America.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I share the concern the gentleman has expressed. As the gentleman knows, we did not follow the Bureau of the Budget. We restored on many projects 50 percent of the reductions made in the April 15 budget revision.

More than that, we did follow, to the extent we could, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the committee which the distinguished gentleman serves as chairman. We allowed three items carried in the authorization bill which were not in the budget.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say to the gentleman, I am not directing my complaints to the subcommittee's action on the atomic energy bill. I want that to be very plain because I know exactly what the pressure was from the President to make this extra \$50 million cut.

The complaint I am directing is to the philosophy of denying the things we need to build America. I say we are rich enough in America to afford it. The figures I have given you have come from the Bureau of the Budget and from the Congressional Library Reference Service and proves that we are a strong nation, a productive nation with a high degree of employment and we can go ahead and do those things that need to be done in America. We do not have to run under the bed because somebody yells "fiscal crisis."

Mr. Chairman, I include with my remarks a series of figures which I have compiled. They illustrate beyond challenge the great economic strength of our country.

Those who decry recent deficits may compare them with the annual and cumulative deficits of the 1941-49 figures.

I trust they will note that the Federal public debt today is 38 percent when it is offset against the gross national product. This is the lowest figure percentage-wise in more than 25 years. It has decreased in the 1961-69 period from 57.1 percent to 38 percent.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics confirms that the seasonally adjusted figure for unemployment was increased from 3.5 in August 1969 to 4.0 in September 1969. Comparison from previous years set forth below.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT

	Employed ¹	Unemployed ¹	Yearly average ²	Unemployed rate ¹
December 1968.....	76,765,000	2,603,000	3.6	3.3
September 1969....	78,127,000	3,232,000	3.6	4.0

¹ Adjusted.
² Unadjusted.

During the 3-month period of June to August 1969, the number of active duty personnel in the Armed Forces increased by 9,175, while the civilian employees of the Federal Government decreased by 48,000. It does not appear this is a factor.

It is noted that agriculture employees dropped from 3,842,000 in December 1968, to 3,634,000 at the end of August 1968. A decrease of 208,000. Over the same period, nonagricultural employees changed from 72,923,000 to 74,553,000. An increase of 1,630,000.

U.S. housing starts—total private and public in units (including farm) nonseasonally adjusted

	[In thousands]
August 1967.....	130.2
August 1968.....	141.0
August 1969.....	123.6

U.S. CORPORATE PROFITS 1960-68

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Total corporate profits after taxes			
	Total before taxes	Profits after taxes	Dividends paid	Total reinvested in business
1960.....	49.7	26.7	13.4	13.2
1964.....	66.8	38.4	17.8	20.6
1968.....	91.1	49.8	23.1	26.7

PERCENTAGE INCREASE

Year:	Total profits (percent)	
	Before taxes	After taxes
1960-64.....	34.4	43.8
1964-68.....	36.4	29.6
1960-68.....	84.3	86.5

INDIVIDUAL AMERICAN CUMULATED SAVINGS IN BANKS AND SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS, 1960-68

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Banks	Institutions	Total
1960.....	62	103	165
1964.....	94	158	252
1968.....	149	207	356

PERCENTAGE INCREASES

1960-64.....	53
1960-68.....	115
1964-68.....	41

I have appended some charts which portray on an annual and cumulative basis the figures I have presented:

CHART (A).—CUMULATIVE DEFICITS FOR 1941-49 OF \$203,200,000,000 AMOUNTED TO 11.4 PERCENT OF THE CUMULATIVE TOTAL GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT FOR THOSE 9 YEARS OF \$1,780,300,000,000

Year	Calendar years—gross national product (billions)	Fiscal years—public debt year end	Percent of gross national product
1941.....	109.4	55.3	50.5
1942.....	139.2	77.0	55.3
1943.....	177.5	140.8	79.3
1944.....	201.9	202.6	100.4
1945.....	216.8	259.1	119.5
1946.....	201.6	269.9	133.9
1947.....	219.8	258.4	117.5
1948.....	257.6	252.4	98.0
1949.....	256.5	252.8	98.0
Total.....	1,780.3		

¹ Cumulative.

CHART (B).—CUMULATIVE DEFICITS FOR 1961-69 OF \$62,500,000,000 AMOUNTED TO LESS THAN .9 PERCENT OF THE CUMULATIVE TOTAL GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT OF \$6,162,200,000 FOR THOSE 9 YEARS

Year	Gross national product (billions)	Public debt year end	Percent of gross national product
1961.....	506.5	289.2	57.1
1962.....	542.1	298.6	55.1
1963.....	573.4	306.5	53.4
1964.....	612.2	312.5	51.0
1965.....	653.5	317.9	48.7
1966.....	718.7	320.4	44.6
1967.....	763.1	326.7	42.8
1968.....	860.7	348.1	40.4
1969 (estimate).....	932.0	345.3	38.0
Total.....	6,162.2		

¹ Cumulative.

ANNUAL DEFICITS FOR 2, 9-YEAR PERIODS IN OUR HISTORY
[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Amount
1941	6.2
1942	21.5
1943	57.4
1944	51.4
1945	53.9
1946	20.7
1947	1.8
1948	18.9
1949	1.8
Net cumulative deficits	203.2
1961	3.9
1962	6.4
1963	6.3
1964	8.2
1965	3.4
1966	2.3
1967	9.9
1968	25.2
1969	13.1
Net cumulative deficits	62.5

¹ Surplus.

ANNUAL DEFENSE EXPENDITURES (ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET)
[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Amount
1941	6.1
1942	24.0
1943	63.2
1944	76.8
1945	81.3
1946	43.2
1947	14.4
1948	11.8
1949	12.9
Cumulative expenditures	333.7
1961	47.5
1962	51.1
1963	52.8
1964	54.2
1965	50.2
1966	57.7
1967	70.8
1968	80.5
1969	81.1
Cumulative expenditures	546.6

The figures in these charts completely refute the claims of the people who continually state that the United States is in a "fiscal crisis."

I state that we are not in a "fiscal crisis" based on the economic facts as portrayed in these chart figures which are taken from the U.S. budgets and from figures supplied by the Library of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred and five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with great attention and great interest to the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD). He has some figures which certainly tend to indicate that this is a prosperous country. I do not think anybody would doubt that it is a prosperous country. We have had great growth in this country. We intend to continue great growth in the country. As I said in my prepared remarks, I think this particular bill is much too low. It is

much too low for the needs of the country. But I would point out to my good friend from California that while he has some very impressive figures, he did not use some figures which are also impressive and which have to be used in considering the total overall fiscal considerations as they affect the country today. The figures which the gentleman has referred to for the last 10 years do indicate we can expect the next 10 years to be even more prosperous. But at the same time today, on the 8th day of October, this Government has found itself the victim of many years of deficits in the public sector which have caused our people in the Treasury to have real difficulty in actually defending the dollar.

Here is what has happened abroad, and the gentleman from California, I am sure, will recognize this. The German Government allowed the mark to drift for some time, and as soon as the mark was allowed to drift, the dollar went down in value as compared to the mark, which indicates that, insofar as the monetary markets of the world are concerned, the dollar is not as strong as the gentleman from California and I would like to have it. This has been caused by one situation and one situation only, and that has been the deficits which we had here in the Federal Government, year after year, in the Kennedy-Johnson years. In one year alone, we had a \$25 billion deficit. No wonder the dollar became suspect.

What I am saying and what the gentleman from California said are both true, and they point out anachronism. This is a wealthy country. We can do most of these things. But the anachronism probably has more to do with the timing of the acts than with the acts themselves.

But at this particular day and time, believe me, the bill which we have brought out here is every penny which this Government, I feel, with the Vietnam war going on, every penny which we can afford to obligate for these purposes. I wish it were otherwise. The gentleman knows I do. But at the present time I think it is up to us to think of the housewives of America, the people whose income does not prove to be adequate to meet the needs of their families, and to give them a break by spending less money through the public sector and keeping the purchasing power of the dollar up. This is the only argument which the gentleman and I have, and I think it is an argument of timing rather than of aim, because I am sure the gentleman and I have the same aim so far as desiring a better country is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction): \$671,982,000,

to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That in connection with the rehabilitation of the Snake Creek Embankment of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir Project, North Dakota, the Corps of Engineers is authorized to participate with the State of North Dakota to the extent of one-half the cost of widening the present embankment to provide a four-lane right-of-way for U.S. Highway 83 in lieu of the present two-lane highway: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for the Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam, Oklahoma, shall be available to provide a 9-foot deep auxiliary navigation channel and 1,000-foot-long turning basin along Sans Bois Creek, with appropriate widths and an overall length of approximately ten miles: *Provided further*, That \$600,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STAFFORD

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: On page 6, line 16, strike the figures "\$671,982,000" and substitute therefor the figure "\$671,482,000".

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offer today is a very simple one. It simply reduces the total available for general construction, on page 6 of the bill, from \$671,982,000 to \$671,482,000, or a reduction in total of \$500,000.

If the committee will accept the amendment which I offer today, it will save the taxpayers of this country \$500,000 this afternoon, and eventually, over the next 4 years, \$27 million, which still is a substantial sum of money.

Here are the reasons for the amendment which I have offered to this bill:

As can be noted on page 49 of the committee report, the Army Corps of Engineers proposes in the line item for the Gaysville Reservoir an amount of \$500,000. It is proposed to spend \$500,000 in fiscal year 1970 for planning and design of a flood control dam in the Gaysville area in Vermont.

For the taxpayers of Vermont, let me say, Mr. Chairman, we would rather the taxpayers of the United States have this \$500,000 than that it be spent by the Corps of Engineers to plan and design some more on a dam which they first began planning and designing on in 1936. Let us relieve them of this responsibility.

As is known, Vermont is small and is a very mountainous State for the most part. Someone once said if it were flattened, it might be almost as big as Texas, but it is small, it is mountainous, the valleys are few, they are verdant and highly productive when used for farming, and they are beautiful, and to us they are precious.

If we go ahead with a \$500,000 expenditure this year for planning and de-

sign and construction beginning next year, or the year after, 110 homes will have to be razed, 30 farms will have to be taken out of production, six public buildings will have to be razed, and one industry will have to be torn down and removed. In place of these lost homes, farms, and businesses, we will get a pile of dirt 195 feet high and 750 feet long at a cost of \$27 million. In addition to this, we will get a 1,000-acre pond in the summer and a 300-acre pond in the winter surrounded by 700 acres of mud.

The people in the towns affected, in Rochester, in Stockbridge, and in Pittsfield, have voted 8 to 1 not to have this dam built.

I believe the present Governor of my State has already asked or will ask the Army Corps of Engineers not to build a dam in this location in Vermont.

We are not insensible to the needs of our neighboring States below us on the Connecticut River watershed. There are already five major flood control dams in Vermont, and 18 other locations in the State are under consideration for possible construction by the Army Corps of Engineers. But I repeat there are five dams now, almost as many as there are in Massachusetts, and more than there are in Connecticut. Indeed, there are more than there are in New Hampshire.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, let us today save the taxpayers \$500,000 in fiscal year 1970, let us suggest the Army look at some of the alternative sites by denying this \$500,000 this year, and thereby let us save the taxpayers \$27 million over the next 4 years and also save one of Vermont's most beautiful valleys.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Vermont. He is one of the nicest Members of the Congress and a very effective Member, too. He does represent a very beautiful State, perhaps one of the finest scenic States in all this great land of ours. The gentleman does indicate if the \$500,000 is eliminated, we would save the \$500,000 this year, and it is true we would in the end save \$27 million for the total cost of the dam—but this would be done at the expense perhaps of jeopardizing the lives and property of the people who live in New England.

This dam, Mr. Chairman, is one of the most important dams in the comprehensive flood control for the entire Connecticut River Basin. The \$500,000 in this bill is, as the gentleman has said, to continue the planning on this project. There will be additional funds next year perhaps, to complete the planning, and then, on the completion of planning, the Corps of Engineers, I assume, would ask for construction funds.

The Corps of Engineers has testified, Mr. Chairman, that from studies it has conducted in the Connecticut River Basin, in order to have an effective flood control program for that area, this dam is essential. I need not repeat the history of floods that have been visited on New England, devastating floods. This area has suffered a great deal of damage to lives and property over the 33 years that the U.S. Government has been engaged

in the matter of building dams to protect the people and their property.

So, Mr. Chairman, because this is an appropriation which will continue the planning, there will be an opportunity for the Corps of Engineers to get a look at the other sites.

As the gentleman said, there may be 18 other sites. There may be, but some of the other sites may be useless in the comprehensive plan the Corps of Engineers envisions for adequate protection not only for Massachusetts and Connecticut, but also Vermont, in the overall flood control program for this basin. So, Mr. Chairman, reluctantly, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont. I can understand his problem. This is the problem of any Member who has a dam built in any area of the United States. The people who live in the area do not want the dam built there.

My colleagues know as well as I do we cannot have an adequate and proper flood control program unless we have dams. The dams have to go somewhere. Some people have to move and some property has to be taken. We could not have a flood control program unless we had dams and reservoirs.

In the judgment of the experts this is a dam which is one of the most important in the comprehensive plan for New England. Consequently, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were—ayes 26, noes 39.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCOTT: On page 6, line 16, after "Government to construction)" strike out "\$671,982,000" and insert "\$672,097,000".

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, my amendment adds \$115,000 to the committee recommendation to restore funds for preconstruction planning for the Salem Church Dam and Reservoir on the Rappahannock River within my congressional district.

While this is a Corps of Engineers project, the committee apparently yielded to a suggestion of the Department of the Interior that the matter be further studied to determine whether the plan should be modified to minimize the adverse effects on natural values in the area.

The Department of the Army, in a reply to Interior's suggestion, stated that it had no objection to a study of natural environment but saw no need to stop advanced engineering work on the project during the period Interior was conducting a study.

As is true of most projects of this nature, the matter has been studied for many years. In fact, because of recorded floods dating back to 1889, the Corps of Engineers made a comprehensive study of the Rappahannock River in 1933 and concluded that the Salem Church Dam

was economically sound. That was 36 years ago. The Congress authorized this project in 1946, with a 220-foot above sea level limitation but, in a further preconstruction study in 1952, the corps indicated that the cost-benefit ratio at his level was marginal. Thereafter, in 1955, the House struck the 220-foot elevation limitation to meet the objection of the Department of the Army and authorized a higher dam, but the Senate requested further study. This most recent study lasted for 12 years and resulted in a voluminous report being furnished the Congress in 1967 by the Corps of Engineers. Thereafter the authorization for a 240-foot dam was included in last year's public works authorization bill.

Frankly, I am concerned that this measure will be studied to death. Even with two authorizations of the Congress, one at a 220-foot level in 1946 and one at a 240-foot level in 1968, the people who do not want any dam may ultimately prevail through a process of attrition.

Mr. Chairman, this project is to meet the long-range water needs of the fastest growing area of Virginia, Prince William County, which lies directly below Fairfax County, and other counties in the urban corridor between Washington and Richmond need water. It will also reduce the hazards of flooding from the Rappahannock River, particularly in the general area of Fredericksburg. The lake created by the dam will help meet the recreational needs of people along the eastern seacoast.

Mr. Chairman, the initial preconstruction planning funds for this fiscal year are only \$150,000 as recommended by the President in his budget. I submit that it should be restored by the House and ask the cooperation of the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle in obtaining this restoration.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to take this time to say to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), that the Salem Church Reservoir in my opinion is a good project and one which should be built. I am sure the gentleman realizes that the subcommittee has supported the project and hopes to continue to do so.

The problem involved, of course, is that the Secretary of the Interior has advised the committee that he intends to initiate a study to reevaluate the recreational aspects of the Salem Church project, and since this has been done, the subcommittee felt that it was constrained to act as it did. However, I assure the gentleman from Virginia that this does not mean that the subcommittee has lost interest in the project or has given up the idea of building it at some time in the immediate future.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I share in the views as expressed by the gentleman from Arizona with reference to the Salem Church project. It is controversial. More than 40 percent of the project's benefits are for recreational

purposes. There are many conservation groups opposed to it. We heard considerable testimony before the committee in opposition to it. We allowed \$35,000 to restudy the project because the Secretary of Interior insisted upon restudying the conservation and recreational potentials of the area. So, I think the committee has done the proper thing and I urge the defeat of the amendment.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. The \$35,000 that the committee is retaining in the bill; is that for the Department of the Army or the Department of the Interior?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. For the Department of the Army to restudy and cooperate with Interior on the matter. In light of this, the committee has recommended that funds be limited to the restudy and not be utilized to initiate planning.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MYERS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MYERS: On page 7, line 16, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That the sum of \$35,000 appropriated herein for the Big Walnut Reservoir shall be available for pre-construction planning."

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will not add a single dollar to this appropriation bill, somewhat like the previous amendment. This amendment has to do with the Big Walnut Reservoir situated in my congressional district in Indiana, which is a multiple-purpose reservoir with a cost-benefit ratio of 2.3 to 1.

Big Walnut is in the President's budget recommended for \$50,000 for pre-construction planning. This reservoir would be restudied again according to the present bill, and according to the committee print. I would like to advise the Committee at this particular time that this reservoir has been studied, studied, and restudied since 1938, and every study has come up with the same conclusion recommending the Big Walnut Reservoir be constructed as a multiple-purpose reservoir. It would have a cost to the Federal Government of \$21,871,000, non-Federal of \$14,729,000, or a total of \$36,600,000. This has an estimated flood control benefit in the lower reaches of approximately \$1.5 million annually.

This area happens also to contain a particular area which has now been designated as possibly for a national landmark. It is said to be unique, and I quite agree from personal experience, as well as the studies, and I have gone quite extensively into this; I have visited the particular area. It is unique to the rest of the United States, but not unique to Indiana. It has been designated as a possible national landmark, but none of the owners at the present time, even after

a year and a half, has requested registration as a national landmark.

The area to be designated as a possible national landmark is in the upper reaches of the reservoir, and the particular areas that are of national significance and uniqueness are the areas that contain Canadian yew, which is not at all a foreign or unique vegetation to Indiana.

There are a number of areas around that part of the country that have large inhabitations of Canadian yew. There is also hemlock and there are some other flowers.

But I want to advise the House that in my experience in visiting out there and through contacting the Corps of Engineers, as for the area that has the Canadian yew there would be one small inhabitation of Canadian yew taken by the normal pool. None of the hemlock and only one small area of Canadian yew would be taken. The flood pool would touch part of another area of Canadian yew, but this would only happen, the Corps of Engineers advises me, once in every 20 years.

Now, I am a naturalist also, and I love nature, if this were going to destroy an area that was unusually unique to that area I certainly would not be in the well today asking that these funds be transferred from a restudy into actual pre-construction planning.

A similar area in the last year has been designated as a national landmark, Pine Hills, just 25 miles from this site, and exactly like the area in interest here. Big Wilmat Reservoir is not going to destroy a unique area, but it may complement it. Some of the witnesses who testified in the subcommittee admitted that they did not know the effects of water on some of the vegetation.

Let me also tell you that there is another lake within 20 miles of this site where there are hemlock, in controversy here, growing out of the water, which have been growing out of the water for 20 years, and they are thriving.

So I say today that I agree that this is a beautiful part of the country, but this project is needed for flood control, and it is going to save the people living in the lower reaches a million and a half dollars each year. It has been suggested, possibly, a Federal fish hatchery, might be added. It is going to give quality control of water downstream to a city of 8,700 people. It also will be a possible supply of water to the city of Indianapolis in the next 25 years, as the need for water and normal growth continue to expand.

Again I say it is not going to cost the taxpayers any more, in fact, it is going to save this country money, because the \$35,000 would not be spent for a restudy which we do not need. I appreciate the committee keeping it alive by the restudy, but I say today that we do not need any more study.

Of the more than 2,500 pieces of correspondence that I have received, 98 percent favor the construction of this reservoir and only 2 percent do not favor it.

I think that is pretty favorable. I feel the subcommittee did not have the information pertaining to these extra facts so I am only asking the Committee this

afternoon that this \$35,000 be transferred to preconstruction planning. I think it is a legitimate request.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I oppose any water resource project. The issue here is similar to that on the Salem Church project. The problem has not yet been solved, so it is not appropriate to institute planning at this time.

The real controversy is between the conservationists and the proponents of the project. Members of Congress are also divided on the matter.

We heard extensive testimony before our committee against it. They do not want further study, they want to solve the problem.

Here is what the Chief of Engineers testified. He said:

The objections still remained in spite of the modifications that were done in the planning.

He also testified and said:

The District Engineer had tried to overcome those problems by planning the development of the project to include some rather special features. For instance, a nature center and arboretum were planned, so that students could use the area to study this unusual ecology.

Then he was asked what the 1970 funds were required for, and he said, "To solve the problem."

So the Chief of Engineers and the division engineer recognize the need to first find a solution to protection of this area. The people of the area are divided about the matter.

We have left some money here to try to solve the problem so the project will be eligible for engineering and design funds. I trust the members of the committee will stand with your committee.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee, spoke of the Chief of Engineers who had earlier also recommended this. It was recommended in the Wabash River Basin comprehensive report.

In the final report the construction was recommended. Every governmental agency recommended this with the exception of a few conservationist groups. I very honestly do not understand the opinion that the conservation area will be destroyed. As I explained earlier, the yews and hemlocks in these areas are not to be covered by this.

True, it is going to change the ecology, but would not the national landmark that these conservation groups are also interested in; would not that also change the ecology of the area? Lightning could strike out there and change it all.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield, we are providing funds in a hope this controversy can be worked out.

The division engineer testified that the 1970 funds would be utilized solely for the following:

To establish coordination with the appropriate State and Federal agencies to consider the details of forming a task group to seek a mutually satisfactory resolution of the diverse views held on this project.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would call the attention of my colleagues to a speech in the RECORD by one of our colleagues who said:

An ill-conceived and poorly justified proposal of the Army Corps of Engineers threatens to destroy the Big Walnut Valley. The valley has been declared as a national natural landmark, one of only 130 sites in the entire United States to be declared of that quality and one of only two sites in Indiana now eligible for this nationally significant designation.

He then went on to list several reasons why he could not agree with the Corps of Engineers concerning the justification for the project. He then stated:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that my opposition to the Corps' plan is shared by every major conservation group in the State of Indiana.

He also stated that he "would urge that instead of using the budget request to initiate advance engineering and design that the Army Corps of Engineers be instructed to study and select one of the many alternate sites for the proposed reservoir."

He said this is valid. So I would say to my friends that there is controversy and there is opposition. I believe the money should be retained in the bill, as inserted by the committee, to solve the matter.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MYERS. If I may make just one comment. I have letters from De Pauw University where—the geology department and other departments there recommend the construction of this reservoir. They are the people closest to it. They know better than anyone the situation—better than any association outside that area.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I would say, as I said earlier, that I am reluctant to oppose this project. We have a policy in committee where there is diversity in the area, every effort should be made to find a satisfactory solution before we proceed with the project. That is what we are proposing here.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. ZION. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my district is just downstream from the gentleman from Indiana, and I have received a lot of correspondence on this project.

There are a lot more arguments, mostly sound, in opposition to going ahead with this—and sound in the sense of noise.

My area would be adversely affected were we not to proceed.

It is the No. 1 project in which the Wabash Valley Association has an interest. They have been promoting this for many years. There is little question but that the dollars saved because of this project should prompt us to begin construction soon.

I would urge my friends to assist us here and adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were—ayes 22, noes 36.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g-1), \$74,600,000, to remain available until expended, including funds for completion of the construction of road crossings of the Panola-Quitman Floodway at Crowder and Paducah Wells, Mississippi.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to convey my personal gratitude and the gratitude of my constituents in the Fourth District of Kentucky to you, my colleagues of the House, and to those on the subcommittees and committees of the House who all were instrumental in bringing a process which should rectify many long-standing ills in northern Kentucky.

You have today made possible several projects of utmost necessity and importance to the people of the Fourth District. But of these, I would especially like to single out the salutary nature of the proposed Falmouth Dam.

Two years ago we had no flood control projects of any consequence in the upper bluegrass—the fastest growing area of Kentucky. The Falmouth Dam, of the flood control projects which this body has today approved, should do the most good.

It has been 32 years since the Falmouth Dam project was first approved. It was reactivated in 1964, as a result of flood damages along the Licking and Ohio Rivers. But during this long period of waiting, the area suffered many severe floods and untold damage as the result of them. Floods of a serious nature have occurred in this area in 1937, 1939, 1948, 1950, 1961, and 1964. Had this same Falmouth project been completed prior to the 1964 flood, it would have reduced the flood stage by 2½ feet and lowered the damages at least \$3 million in Cincinnati alone. It is readily apparent what a beneficial step this assembly has taken today for the people and the general Economic health of the northern Kentucky—and Cincinnati—area.

What I have mentioned so far certainly is good reason to have approved the project. But let me cite you several more reasons why what we have done is so justified:

Three-fourths of the city of Falmouth was under water in 1964. When constructed, the Falmouth Dam will provide full protection and/or reduction of flood damage along the 60-odd miles of the Ohio River after its confluence with the Licking.

Another feature recommending it is the 1.4 to 1 benefit-cost ratio. This ratio finds

Falmouth an economically justifiable flood control project—but as I have said, the money for the project is not the sole consideration.

Situated as it is, it will provide the benefits of water conservation, water quality control, and recreation facilities for the entire metropolitan area of Cincinnati, and for northern Kentucky.

The Kentucky Department of Natural Resources not only has listed this as a "must" in their water resources program, but the Kentucky Water Resources Authority has gone on record by announcing its intention to purchase storage from this for industrial purposes.

The Licking River is one of the major unpolluted streams in this part of the country. The quality of its water is far superior to that of the Ohio River as was substantiated by the Secretary of the Interior.

The cities of Cincinnati, Covington, and Newport presently draw water from the Ohio River. On the basis of water quality, these cities find the development of the Licking River as a future water supply essential. Furthermore, this project will give Cincinnati and northern Kentucky the assurance of a future water supply needed for long-range planning of industry and industrial parks essential to sustain increases in employment and productivity. Thus, the development of an adequate reservoir of clean water through the Falmouth Dam is integral to the development of the entire area.

Further delay in this project would have meant more property destruction and, in addition, this vast reservoir of clean water would have been wasted.

The House today has prevented enormous losses and assured continued development of the area.

For these reasons, humanitarian and pecuniary, I wish to express the sincere and grateful appreciation of myself and my constituents for this most beneficial and urgently needed project.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; activities of the California Debris Commission; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navigable waters; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; and removal of obstructions to navigation; \$245,700,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question about the California Debris Commission.

I must confess that this is the first time I have ever heard of a debris commission whether in the State of California or elsewhere.

Will someone explain what a debris commission does? Apparently, this commission is funded to a certain extent out of money appropriated in this particular item.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. This is a part of the operation and maintenance appropriation of the Corps of Engineers and concerns cooperation with the local agencies that participate in maintenance on completed projects.

Mr. GROSS. What kind of debris does this commission administer or collect.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. It involves the control of silt primarily I believe in the Sacramento River.

Mr. GROSS. Does it take a commission to do that?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. It participates in study and control work.

Mr. GROSS. To study debris? How do you study debris?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I believe the study would be directed to the question of how to better control and alleviate the problem.

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

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

Mr. BOLAND. I believe California has a special control problem in this regard. That is the reason.

Mr. GROSS. If that is the reason, it occurs to me that there might well be such a commission in New York or Massachusetts. I know there is none in Iowa. Perhaps the State should have one.

Mr. BOLAND. I believe siltation is more of a problem in California than in Iowa, Massachusetts, or New York because of certain mining operations. I would think that maybe one of the gentlemen from California could answer the question.

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

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We do have debris dams in California. They were the result of hydraulic mining. Whether this commission is set up to study that phase of it or not, we still have two of those dams in place at this time, one on the Yuba River and one on the American River.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will understand that never before in my short life had I heard of a debris commission. It fascinated me. I thought I had heard of every kind of commission known to mankind.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Due to hydraulic mining in California these debris dams were built to halt the silt that was being washed off the mountains.

Mr. GROSS. More power to the California Debris Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary cemeterial expenses as authorized by law, including maintenance, operation, and improvement of national cemeteries, and purchase of headstones and markers for unmarked graves; purchase of seven passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; maintenance of that portion of Congressional Cemetery to which the United

States has title, Confederate burial places under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, and graves used by the Army in commercial cemeteries, to remain available until expended, \$15,125,000, together with \$991,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Cemeterial Expenses" contained in the Public Works and Atomic Energy Commission Appropriation Act, 1968: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be used to repair more than a single approach road to any national cemetery: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be obligated for construction of a superintendent's lodge or family quarters at a cost per unit in excess of \$17,000, but such limitation may be increased by such additional amounts as may be required to provide office space, public comfort rooms, or space for the storage of Government property within the same structure: *Provided further*, That reimbursement shall be made to the applicable military appropriation for the pay and allowances of any military personnel performing services primarily for the purposes of this appropriation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHERLE

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHERLE: On page 10, line 21, strike the period and insert in lieu thereof: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this section shall be available for use in connection with the proposed permanent gravesite or memorial for Robert F. Kennedy at Arlington National Cemetery."

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment states simply that no Federal funds will be used to construct and maintain a memorial to the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy in Arlington National Cemetery.

Plans for the proposed memorial consist of a reflecting pool surrounded by a granite wall. This bill would appropriate \$181,000 hard-earned tax dollars for visitor access, approach walk, exit stairways, related landscaping, and relocations.

My sole objection to this project is that the expenditure of public funds for this purpose is contrary to the existing policy for erecting memorials in national cemeteries. No one buried in Arlington Cemetery is presently entitled to anything more than that accorded any American serviceman who died in World War I, II, Korea, Vietnam, or any other war. The Government provides the family of every veteran with a headstone costing between \$22 to \$34. If they wish something more elaborate, they are free to finance it themselves. This established principle has been strictly adhered to by all families of deceased veterans.

The American people are aroused over this proposal for a Federal subsidy. Since my objection appeared in the distinguished Allen-Goldsmith Washington Report, I received over 100 letters from all over the country—from New Hampshire to California, from Minnesota to Florida, and from Massachusetts to Texas, urging that the Congress not establish a precedent—where would this stop?

However, time does not permit me to read all these letters. I would like to share with you a few excerpts.

A lady from Dewitt, N.Y., writes:

Perhaps this letter is but a small voice against the loud roar of the very important

and influential people but as this great and wonderful country affords me the opportunity of having my say. I wish to state my opinion about a matter in which you have taken a stand for which you have my deep appreciation.

I, too, raise the question of the necessity for the very hard-working taxpayers to contribute to a proposed memorial for the late Senator Kennedy. Not only is it unfair when there is untold wealth in this family, but he was a Senator, not a President, and there is no sound reason for the citizens to foot part of the bill for a reflecting pool and granite wall near the grave.

Perhaps to people of great wealth, this figure . . . to be raised seems a drop in the bucket, believe me it certainly is far from that. If the federal government realized how many tax dollars could be saved by a bit of economy, the hard-working tax-paying citizens would be more inclined to cooperate in more ways than we are presently doing. I am a housewife who budgets and I don't care if you operate on a small household budget or a large government budget, all levels of our government could stand to pinch pennies.

From Tyler, Tex.:

I am a young man with a wife and child and I am just about to go under from being taxed. I don't mind paying my share for living in this great country but when the elected leaders, who are supposed to be looking out for my interest, start spending money in this manner, I am just about ready to rebel.

From Sanborn, Iowa:

I feel they should have the same type grave any veteran has if they are buried in a National Cemetery.

From Mount Pleasant, Mich.:

I approve of your stand against the government giving a contribution to the Robert Kennedy Memorial fund (Arlington National Cemetery.) While I admired Mr. Kennedy, this is not the business of our government.

From Woodbine, Iowa:

Using . . . federal funds for any senator or representative is ridiculous!

From St. Petersburg, Fla.:

In this era of inflation, when so many of us are struggling to meet high taxes and living costs, it is indeed inappropriate to spend tax money in this manner.

From St. Paul, Minn.:

I also feel it is a waste of taxpayers' money, especially at a time when other priorities are so pressing.

From Ypsilanti, Mich.:

There is no precedent for federal(ly) funding memorials to U.S. Senators.

From Council Bluffs, Iowa:

Although I am only 20 years old and not old enough to vote, I support your position against the use of federal funds for a Robert Kennedy Memorial in Arlington National Cemetery.

From Tyler, Tex.:

I have sympathy for the Kennedy family but I do not think I owe them a memorial any more than I expect one from them.

From Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.:

Robert Kennedy has a fine memorial in the Washington, D.C. Stadium.

From Detroit, Mich.:

If the Kennedys want a memorial let them build it with the Kennedy millions.

From Lubbock, Tex.:

The Kennedy family is financially able to place any memorial they desire there, but we do hope taxpayers money will not be used.

From Clovis, N. Mex.:

I congratulate you for opposing the government's helping to pay for the Kennedy Memorial.

Warwick, R.I.:

I am in complete agreement with your stand against the proposed allotment of \$250,000 in federal funds for a memorial for Robert Kennedy.

The Montana chapter of the Veterans of World War I opposes this proposal and the National Convention of World War I Veterans which recently concluded their meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., went on record as opposed to Federal support for the Kennedy Memorial.

The Veterans of World War I point out that General of the Army John J. Pershing "rests in that small plot with the usual headstone." Furthermore, they can see no justice in the "allotment of the larger plots, depriving 50, 100, or 150 veterans of the U.S. military service from burial there."

The issue is clear: whether this Congress is going to allow Federal dollars to be spent for a memorial which could result in denying many other veterans their hard-won resting place in Arlington National Cemetery.

It must be remembered that a million-dollar memorial to the late Senator Robert Taft of Ohio, who three times was a serious contender for the Republican nomination for President, was built entirely from private funds.

My amendment should be adopted so that the Congress will make it clear that all American veterans will be treated equally and honored equally by their country.

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

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, the money which is in this bill which pertains to the Kennedy gravesite is for access walks and stairs. I wonder if the gentleman from Iowa is aware of that? The original plan did provide for the Federal Government to pay for a certain portion of the plaza which was to be built over the gravesite, so the public could stand and view the gravesite. This is no longer in the plan.

Mr. SCHERLE. I do. However, I also realize that this bill still calls for \$181,000 of taxpayers' money. I know of no other veteran buried in Arlington Cemetery, even the three astronauts, who were granted this preferential treatment at taxpayers' expense.

Second, I question the precedent that might be set at this time. It is very important that we be very cautious and not establish a policy that is irreversible.

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

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Is it not still true that depending upon which predeceases the other, space is so limited in the Arlington National Cemetery that man must be

buried above wife in the same grave plot, or the reverse?

Mr. SCHERLE. That is true. The gentleman from Missouri serves on the Committee on Armed Services, and I understand that in recent years has looked into this problem, building of Fort Myer, and additional land acquisition for the memorial cemetery. I welcome his succinct question.

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

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for his amendment. There is no reason whatever for the expenditure of \$181,000 of the taxpayers' money for this purpose. There is no justification whatever for the singling out of this gravesite for any such expenditure. The Appropriations Committee ought to have rejected this request out of hand.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I do not know of any particular monument which has been surrounded with more misinformation than the Robert F. Kennedy gravesite in Arlington National Cemetery.

Mr. Chairman, the item for the site was submitted by President Nixon through the Bureau of the Budget to the Congress, for \$258,000 for access walks and exit stairways to the Robert F. Kennedy gravesite. The access walks and exit walks tie in with the present gravesite of the late beloved President John F. Kennedy.

The amount of money appropriated in this bill is not for the Kennedy family. It is for the convenience of the public—purely, simply, solely, and only for the convenience of the public.

Last year 5 million visitors went to Arlington National Cemetery and visited the gravesite of President Kennedy and the gravesite of Robert F. Kennedy.

This is an unusual circumstance. I know every Member in this body, including the Member from Iowa, would hope that the incidents that gave rise to these sites would never occur in the history of this land again. And they probably never will, because of the circumstances—the incredible circumstances that surrounded the lives of President John F. Kennedy and Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

What is provided in this proposal is for the access walks and exits from the gravesite. We are not providing for the memorial at all. The monument is being paid for by the Kennedy family, \$496,000.

The site is located in an area that would not be used for any other purpose. It does not lend itself to a great number of gravesites because of the slope of the land and the particular makeup of the land and the soil. Use of this site does not affect the number of veterans that can be buried in Arlington.

This does not provide for a reflecting pool. It does not provide for the monument itself. It provides only for easy access for the handicapped, for the millions of visitors who go there—better than 5 million this year, and probably more next year.

This is a fact we have to face. Because

of it the Congress ought to provide ingress and exit to and from the site.

I noted the gentleman from Iowa talked about the site which was provided for General Pershing and indicated that the World War I veterans were concerned because General Pershing does not have as large a site. The fact of the matter is that he does. He is welcome to it. I have no quarrel with this.

All I am saying is that in these circumstances this particular item was submitted not by the past administration, let me say—and it should have done so—but by this administration. This came as an amendment to the budget, and the committee acted favorably. It resulted in a reduction of \$77,000, as the gentleman from Iowa indicated, doing away with that part of the walk which actually traversed the monument itself.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope this would not become an issue and it ought not to become an issue. All we are doing here is providing access and egress for the people who use the cemetery. That is all.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be resoundingly defeated.

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

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

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

This is an item that gave many of us considerable difficulty. The subcommittee looked into it carefully. We came to the conclusion that this was a necessary project and that it had to be done and that a limited amount of Federal money was necessary and appropriate for the limited purposes described in our report.

Mr. Chairman, I might add to the comments that have already been made by the gentleman from Massachusetts that the gravesite is within the reservation set aside for the late President Kennedy. So, there is no elimination by virtue of this plan of gravesites for other veterans.

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted that the gentleman made reference to that fact. As was indicated, the Robert F. Kennedy gravesite is within the area reserved for former President John F. Kennedy.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the correspondence I receive indicates that the people of my district are not interested in spending Federal money for the walkways to the Kennedy gravesite.

I would call to the attention of this House the fact that very severe limitations were placed by the Department of the Army, in February 1967, upon burials in Arlington National Cemetery. Even under the severe limitations which now exist, 70 percent of our veterans cannot be buried in this cemetery.

I think it would be unwise when this committee refuses to fund a project that is desired by the people, at least my congressional district, and then to appro-

priate funds that the people do not want. In my opinion, this is a private, not public, project and the funds should be raised from private sources and the Kennedy family.

I hope this amendment should be adopted.

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

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

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that the esteemed gentleman from Massachusetts would try to confuse and cloud the issue by expressing indignation and consider my amendment a personal affront to anyone. This is not the case. We are discussing the expenditure of \$181,000 of the taxpayers' money. That is the issue, nothing else. There is no precedent in Congress where taxpayers' dollars have been spent for one particular individual buried in Arlington Cemetery.

We all respect the late Senator. We are all humbled by the tragic assassination that took his life. We have a great many veterans in this country who I think are equally entitled to the same consideration as is allowed the late Senator Kennedy in this bill. Only they will not get it. This is no personal attack upon anyone and the gentleman from Massachusetts knows it.

I still insist and hope that the House will adopt my amendment and not "open the door" for future raids on the Treasury. The public has expressed strong resentment against such a policy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, it has been said that the amendment ought to be defeated because President Nixon has approved this unnecessary expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for the amendment to save the President from his liberality in this case.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strongest opposition to the Scherle amendment.

To attack funds for the gravesite of our late Senator, Robert F. Kennedy, on the grounds of hate mail by those who passionately disagreed with him, seems to me to be in the poorest of taste.

The gentleman says he holds the late Senator in esteem, but his amendment is hardly any way to demonstrate that esteem.

The gentleman says it is a question of precedent. If we provide such funds for the late Senator Kennedy, we might be called upon to do so for every other Member of Congress. The argument is patently ludicrous. There is no parallel in our history nor is there likely to be one.

Senator Robert F. Kennedy was not just a Senator who passed away in the course of his service. He was a candidate for President of the United States, assassinated in the midst of his campaign. And all of this was on top of the assassination of his brother, the late President. He was the idol of millions of Americans.

To cater to the base emotions of those who passionately disagreed with him by opposing the funds needed to permit the hundreds of thousands who come to pay him homage to have access to his gravesite would be demagoguery at its worst.

I hope the amendment will be soundly defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHERLE) there were—ayes 27, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS FOR WASTE TREATMENT WORKS

For grants for construction of waste treatment works pursuant to section 8 of the Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to remain available until expended, \$600,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MINSHALL

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MINSHALL: On page 14, line 17, strike out "\$600,000,000." and insert "\$1,000,000,000."

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, it was after some great thought that I, a member of the esteemed Committee on Appropriations, offer this amendment.

We are going to hear a lot of debate this afternoon over this amendment, but the issue is very clear and very simply it is clean water versus dirty water. That is what today's debate will be all about: clean water versus dirty water, and you have your choice.

This Congress made a commitment back in 1966 when we established by unanimous vote the Clean Waters Restoration Act. I was one of its most enthusiastic supporters. I still am. I said then, and honestly believed we were taking a significant step forward in the nationwide campaign against water pollution. Apparently the oratory that resounded in this Chamber some 3 years ago in behalf of cleaning up our streams, rivers, and lakes, was simply that, a lot of talk. Congress has failed to live up to the obligations we assumed 3 years ago. The Nation is still waiting for the action we promised. The American people are being shortchanged on probably the only American major domestic issue in which all America is united; the need to do something, and to do something now, about water pollution.

Here we are again today with an appropriation bill which will not properly fund our municipalities in the construction of the treatment plants they need. And so the water that comes from Cleveland taps will continue to be Lake Erie yellow, unappetizing, unpalatable, and so unwholesome that some health experts are linking it to a virus-caused illness, and, yes, even death. Yet Clevelanders are expected to drink it, cook with it, bathe in it. A simple drink of water will continue to be a health hazard in many areas, fish and wildlife will go on dying, our beaches will remain off limits for recreational purposes because of contamination.

Now, I hear a lot of talk about economy, and over the years Congress has spent billions of dollars to put a man on the moon, to finance far-out and often silly research programs, to pay farmers for not growing crops, even to finance cultural centers which originally were

supposed to be paid for by public subscription. Yet we balk at giving our State and local governments the funds we promised them, funds that they must have if they are to eliminate pollution problems associated with solid waste disposal practices and inadequacies.

Nearly 12 million people live in the Lake Erie Basin. They are under the constant threat from pollution to their economic vitality, their environment, and their very health.

The "Report to the International Joint Commission on the Pollution of Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, and the International Section of the St. Lawrence River" arrived in my office this morning. It underscores the hazardous conditions of which I speak.

I would like to read, in part, from that report as follows:

There is a large volume of evidence to indicate that many of the treatments afforded sewage are not adequate with respect to viruses; viable viruses have been isolated in effluents from sewage plants. Some sewage enters the lake untreated and most probably would contain viruses. Such conditions of pollution prevail in many areas of Lake Erie. Approximately one-third of the United States shoreline is either continuously or intermittently fouled with bacterial contamination, in particular Michigan beaches near the mouth of the Detroit River and those near Cleveland.

The report further states that the viruses which have been most intensively studied in connection with water supplies are of the enteric group—poliomyelitis, echo, coxsackie, and so forth—which are pathogenic to humans. The report recommends an all-out effort to install a new sewer system and to update existing ones no later than 1972.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. MINSHALL asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MINSHALL. I have fought long and hard for adequate antipollution funds during the years I have served in Congress. I have frequently spoken out on this floor calling for Congress to give more than lipservice to its pledge. I have even investigated the possibility of obtaining disaster funds to clean up Lake Erie.

I do not propose to go home to the people I represent in the 23d District and tell them they have been shortchanged again, that Congress once more has refused to honor its promise to help clean up the mess they must live with every day of their lives.

The State of Ohio's reported need for sewage treatment and water treatment facilities, as of August, was nearly \$45 million. Undoubtedly, eligible communities have applied for funds since then. But the \$600 million appropriation proposed today would give Ohio only \$31 million to meet its needs. This is more than \$13 million less than its requirements 2 months ago.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is not supporting the \$214 million in the budget for this proposition, I gather?

Mr. MINSHALL. I am supporting the amendment I have just offered.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Would the gentleman tell us how he voted in committee?

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, I have checked the RECORD on the vote taken in this House on October 17, 1966. It was 247-0 and I would point out to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Evins) that he was one recorded as voting in favor of the Clean Water Restoration Act which authorized \$3.9 billion for fiscal years 1967-71—247 to 0.

Live up to your promise. Not one of you dissented when you voted for that legislation 3 years ago. I urge you to join me in appropriating the full billion authorized by the House Committee on Public Works. There is no economy in permitting these desperately needed programs to go by the board.

It is wrong, ethically wrong and economically wrong, to turn your back on the pledge we made to our fellow citizens in 1966. All of you who know me are aware that my record stands toward the top of the list among congressional economists. I work hard every day in committee toward eliminating waste from Federal spending. But you are looking for economy in the wrong place if you gentlemen do not vote for the full \$1 billion authorization. The price America will pay if you do not will be far greater than the so-called economy move would achieve. I urge you to support me in supporting this amendment.

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

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

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment to increase the funding for water pollution control programs deserves, indeed requires, our support.

Originally, it was my intention to endorse the committee's recommendation for \$600 million but late-breaking developments have prompted me to reassess the situation and join in the request for additional funding.

I share our Nation's commitment to the elimination of pollution from one of our most vital natural resources. This commitment is widely supported by the people of my State and the district I am privileged to represent.

Nearly 4 years ago, a \$1 billion bond issue for water pollution control was approved by 80.9 percent of the voters of New York State and now this widely acclaimed pure waters program is universally accepted as a model for the entire country.

This program, in addition to providing substantial amounts of State funds for water pollution control projects, also makes available more than \$150 million for prefinancing an anticipated Federal share of the cost for these projects. New York took the lead in this effort and yet, rather than receiving financial encouragement for its foresight, the State, in effect, is being penalized for being so progressive. Seven States and 25 communities in other States have followed New York's example, although on a

more modest scale, and now along with us find themselves in the paradoxical position of being penalized for their progressiveness.

Yesterday, during Senate consideration of the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, the distinguished senior Senator from New York, Senator JAVRS, was successful in securing approval of an amendment having particular relevance to this discussion. As the Senator explained his amendment, it would "allow the Secretary of Interior to make available for reimbursement payments to States and local governments, those unobligated construction grant funds which the Secretary is now entitled to reallocate to States merely having approved projects."

This amendment is of great significance. It would allow the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse States and cities which heretofore have advanced the Federal portion of water pollution control projects.

I wish to reemphasize that the only funds which would be available under this amendment would be those which had not been spent during the fiscal year. If \$1 billion were appropriated for water pollution control for fiscal year 1970 and only \$800 million were actually spent by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the remaining \$200 million could, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be used to reimburse States and cities which have been moving ahead on their own.

There is another important feature of this amendment worthy of special mention. Such a provision in the law should serve as an incentive to more States and localities to advance the Federal share for these important water pollution control projects.

In the past, with the exception of New York State, the other jurisdictions which have launched prefinancing programs for water pollution control projects have done so on a limited basis. They have been reluctant to move too far ahead because of the uncertainty of reimbursement. Favorable action on the Javits amendment would lay to rest that fear and serve as a springboard for new ventures.

It is recognized that pollution is in the process of destroying the greatness of our Great Lakes. It is acknowledged that two-thirds of our Nation's waterways are polluted. It is admitted that the situation is steadily deteriorating. And it is a hard and real fact of life that State and local governments across the country are finding it nearly impossible to fund necessary water pollution control facilities—facilities that must be constructed in compliance with the law.

There should be no hesitancy about the direction in which we must proceed. We should approve \$1 billion for water pollution control during fiscal year 1970 and solidify with deeds rather than words our commitment to clear water in this great Nation.

Mr. MINSHALL. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the pending amendment. Earlier this year, before a regional conference of the United Auto Workers, I told it like it is and said that the Federal Government is not living up to its end of the bargain. My vote today will be cast for living up to the bargain; for the first time to appropriate the entire funds authorized.

The citizens of this great and prosperous Nation have been expressing with increasing volume and frequency a concern over what they feel is a failure of the Federal Government to "keep the faith." There is before us on this day a shining example of such a failure. No one has risen to deny that a critical situation exists with an increasingly polluted environment, particularly water pollution.

The Congress of the United States created the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. The Congress of the United States introduced the concept of water quality standards. The Congress of the United States asked that each State set water quality standards, with final approval thereof resting with the Federal agency. Well, Illinois established water quality criteria and plans of implementation covering interstate and waters within its borders. In effect, these standards have created a State-Federal partnership to protect the quality of our waters. The Federal Government has imposed very strict requirements on sewage treatment on both State and local governments. Illinois was one of the first States to comply with the Federal requirements, but Illinois has found it exceedingly difficult to obtain the funds necessary to meet those demands. For example, in 1967, Illinois received 133 applications for Federal grants totaling \$20 million. Of the \$6 million authorized for this purpose to Illinois, \$5.3 million was appropriated. In 1968, 181 applications for Federal grants were received totaling \$34 million. Of the \$22.8 million authorized, Illinois received \$10 million. In 1969, 218 applications totaling \$50 million were made, and Illinois received only \$9.5 million, although \$53 million was authorized. For fiscal 1970, the Illinois allotment under the budgeted proposals would have been only approximately \$9.8 million as compared with the \$53.3 million under the authorized \$1 billion total. The Committee on Appropriations has recommended a total of \$31.2 million, which is an improvement over the past treatment. However, continued breaches of faith by the Federal Government should be put to an end. The time is now.

If we are ever to regain the faith of the States and those dedicated professionals working so hard at saving us from a slow death by pollution poison, we must live up to our promises. The Central States Water Pollution Control Association has called for an end to lipservice. They report that since the 1966 passage of the Clean Waters Restoration Act, appropriations have lagged a monstrous \$773 million behind the authorizations. I have met with many mayors of local communities in my district. They have been forced by the Federal-State partnership to improve water quality and sewage

treatment. They have asked the logical question, "With what funds are we to do all this?" Well, once again we are asked to go back home and mumble our platitudes about budgetary problems and the like. When I go home, I do not intend to mumble excuses, I will have fought the fight. I do not intend to disappoint the mayors and the Leagues of Women Voters and all the other citizens who have asked me to vote for full funding.

Mr. MINSHALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Chairman, at the November 1968 election the citizens of the State of Michigan by a 1,906,385 to 796,079 vote, 70.5 percent in favor, amended the Michigan constitution to allow bonds totaling \$335 million to be sold for water pollution control facilities. These bonds represent the State share of a total program costing \$1.2 billion in Michigan. Local governments would provide 25 percent of this cost.

The Federal Government, in 1966, in the Clean Water Restoration Act, agreed to provide 50 percent of the costs of approved sewage treatment works in a State if acceptable water quality standards were adopted by that State. The Congress, in its great wisdom, provided the incentive to States and local governments to proceed to establish programs for the elimination of water pollution. Not only did it offer Federal funds to match State and local dollars, but it obviously implied that the States had not been doing the job up to that time which was certainly the case.

The States have met this challenge. Most have adopted accepted water quality standards. Many have begun substantial sewage treatment programs based on these new standards.

Michigan, for example, passed its bond issue in 1968 and only yesterday sold the first \$30 million of bonds for this purpose.

There can be no doubt in the mind of anyone that the need is great. In western Michigan we are doubly aware of the acute need for an all-out war on water pollution because we are witnesses to the accelerating degradation of Lake Michigan, one of the greatest natural resource assets with which any people could be blessed. The entire shoreline of the lake provides evidence of accelerating eutrophication which I am told is aging the lake at a rate 350 times what could be expected without man's direct contribution to the process. One river alone contributes more than 15,000 pounds per day of phosphate fertilizer to the lake, a key element in the growth of certain types of algae that mass and die and smell and breed flies on our beaches, clog our water supply intakes and are the precursors of total destruction of the lake as a recreational asset.

Many beaches on Lake Michigan are closed to swimming. The water is unsafe for human use because of high bacteria and virus levels. The sediments of many harbors now support only sludge worms

and other pollution tolerant forms of life. The life forms which support desirable species of fish in the lake are beginning to disappear.

What we are faced with is an ecological catastrophe. It is a catastrophe being brought about by human irresponsibility and irresolution.

There may have been an excuse many years ago for tolerating human activities causing these problems, but today there can be no excuse. We know what we are bringing on ourselves. We know what can be done to prevent this catastrophe. It is imperative that we take such corrective action.

In Michigan alone there are 54 communities which applied for funds for water pollution control projects for fiscal 1969 totaling \$85 million. The Michigan Water Resources Commission has received 192 applications for projects for fiscal 1970 totaling \$363 million.

The Johnson administration made available \$203 million in 1967 and \$214 million for this purpose in fiscal 1968. The Nixon administration has proposed a like amount for fiscal 1970. The Clean Water Restoration Act called for \$400 million in fiscal 1968, \$700 million in fiscal 1969, and \$1 billion in fiscal 1970. We are \$683 million behind the carefully considered need and will fall further behind if we do not vote to appropriate \$1 billion today for this fiscal year.

If we can by an overwhelming vote indicate our resolve in this effort, and thereby encourage the expenditure of these funds, Michigan would receive \$42 million. This is the Federal share called for by those projects in the 54 communities for fiscal 1969. We would be 1 year behind in our programs. Can we possibly tolerate falling even further behind by appropriating less?

The citizens of my district and of the State of Michigan have indicated their overwhelming sentiments. I implore the Congress and the administration to recognize the disaster which faces our great natural resources if we do not today accept our human responsibilities and provide those funds which will get us back on the right side with the people on this great issue.

Mr. MINSHALL. I thank the gentleman.

I should be glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio, if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. BOW. I expect to ask for time on my own.

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

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. LATTI).

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the gentleman's amendment and speak in support of it.

Mr. MINSHALL. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) to increase the appropriation for construction grants for waste treatment works under the Clean Water Act.

I have come to this decision after very careful thought and study of the arguments on both sides of this critical issue. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I have given careful thought to the entire subject of Federal grants to supplement local and State contributions to water pollution control facilities. On the subject of water pollution, there can be no question about the need for Federal leadership, Federal financial support, and substantial enforcement authority—particularly with respect to interstate waters.

In my 12th District of Illinois, there are a number of bodies of water which have these interstate characteristics—including the Fox River, the Des Plaines River, and more particularly, Lake Michigan.

Let me add that the waters in Lake Michigan are a vital resource which affect more than my congressional district, or even my State of Illinois. Residents along the shores of Wisconsin, Indiana, and Michigan are as equally concerned as are the residents of Illinois about the continuing deterioration of Lake Michigan.

Under the Clean Water Restoration Act, the State of Illinois has applications for Federal grants as of May 31, 1969, totaling \$120 million. Only \$9,800,000 of these grant applications could be served by holding to the budget figure of \$214 million—or 8 percent of the recognized need. Even with an appropriation of \$60 million, Illinois would be entitled to receive only \$21 million or 26 percent of its requirement. A full funding of the amount authorized by the Public Works Committee would make available \$53,376,000, or 44 percent of the amount needed.

Giving particular attention to the requests for funds in my 12th Congressional District, I find that there are 56 applications pending, with a total need of about \$30 million to complete these sewage treatment works.

The local and State officials who are urging support for this amendment are not alone. The overwhelming sentiment in my congressional district is wholeheartedly in support of funds for this vital human need. There are actions pending against industries and against municipalities to reduce or eliminate water pollution. The North Shore Sanitary District which covers the entire lakefront of my district has voted funds totaling \$75 million—the limit of its bonding authority—in order to provide sewage treatment works. Leaders in conservation have joined with municipal and county officials in behalf of this amendment.

The influential Chicago Tribune, which is not known for its advocacy of wild spending schemes, has taken a strong and convincing editorial stand in favor of an appropriation of \$1 billion for pollution-control purposes.

It has been argued that \$600 million is all that can be used for these purposes. If that is so, the Federal spending will not be affected by the larger appropriation. On the other hand, if the need does exist—as I believe it does—and the additional funds are used, then the public itself will benefit from cleaner water, from

the advantages of healthier marine life, greater recreational opportunities, better quality water for domestic purposes, and the many other benefits which flow from cleaner water.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. Furthermore, I further urge the President and the Secretary of the Interior to support a policy of water pollution control consistent with this action which I believe the House will take today.

Mr. MINSHALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in my many years in the Congress that I have opposed an amendment offered by one of my friends from Ohio, and he is a dear friend of mine. But I think it would be utterly irresponsible to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. I recognize that he lives on Lake Erie. But I am not so sure that the amendment he offered is going to clean up pollution in the lake.

The gentleman from Tennessee has asked the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) how he voted in committee, and I would say the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL), who offered this amendment did vote against the item which we have, and he is consistent in that. But may I say to my colleague that last year, as I recall, there was \$225 million in the Johnson budget, and we appropriated \$214 million. Now this committee comes in today with a request for \$600 million. We have tripled the 1969 appropriation. But when it was \$214 million last year, I did not hear much complaint on the floor of the House. Now we have tripled it to \$600 million. We have been told by the Secretary of the Interior that that is all they can spend. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to be responsible we ought to defeat this amendment.

Six hundred million dollars will do the job, and we will move forward from there on. But let us not fool ourselves by grandstanding this matter, implying that for \$1 billion we will be able to clean up all the pollution. This is silly.

I have gone to this committee with others and asked for projects in my district—and I am sure other Members have done the same thing. But the mere fact that we are going to increase this to \$1 billion does not mean we are going to have \$1 billion to spend. This committee has given \$600 million. I urge we support the committee on this, because I think they have done a magnificent job. I favor this committee report. Unfortunately, I will say, I think the gentleman from Ohio has been misled. He has gone down the garden path some place.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow), that with the appropriation of \$600 million, it is estimated there will be \$100 million more than can be obligated this fiscal year. The Department advised us only about

\$500 million can be committed because of the many problems and delays involved in administering the program.

Mr. BOW. That is correct. I am from Ohio, from northern Ohio, and I am close to the Great Lakes. I know of the pollution in Lake Erie, but I will say if my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) could get the people there to cut out the pollution that comes out of Detroit, our lake would not be so bad. But unfortunately we have this bad situation, and there is bad pollution in Lake Erie and the other lakes, but we are moving from \$214 million to \$600 million. Now that is supposed to be crippling?

Mr. Chairman, I think the committee has done a good job on this. I hope we will support the committee on this.

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

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KIRWAN), was not able to be active in the concluding phase of the hearings this year, I kept in especially close touch with the details of this bill this year.

Members of the House almost without number during the year have expressed their interest in certain projects that involve their districts. I have been in touch with the staff and the members of the subcommittee in regard to the needs of the individual Members. I spent most of a Saturday not long ago going through these various projects in which Members are interested. I told the Members who talked to me that I would seek, insofar as I could, to be reasonably helpful to the Members with the projects in which they are interested.

However, we must remember that all legislation is a matter of compromise, and there were some things we could do logically and there were some things we could not do logically, but we did the best we could under all the circumstances. In dealing with the problems of individual Members which affect them directly in their districts and have political implications, we did the best we could, and there was no partisan flavor to what was done. The pleas of those in the minority party and of those in the majority party were equally well considered.

I think the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations did a good job with this bill. Several Members have expressed their gratitude in regard to this matter. I hope their gratitude will be exhibited, if I may be plain about it, in trying to hold this bill together.

We were troubled about the clean water matter. I do not know one Member who is against clean water. President Johnson had asked for \$214 million, and President Nixon had asked for the same sum, \$214 million. We thought we could not live with that.

We thought this was too low, so we agreed in the subcommittee on \$450 million, but when the full committee met—and I think I divulge no confidences—we tried to estimate the situation, the needs, the temper of the House, and what ought to be done, and after a great deal of discussion and controversy, we almost unanimously—I say almost unanimously—agreed that, if we put \$600 mil-

lion in the bill, that would satisfy most Members. The increase to \$600 million was sponsored by the subcommittee.

It seems to me now, as it seemed to me then, that the \$600 million is a reasonable compromise of a very difficult problem.

I should like to see the country devote billions to this problem as rapidly as it can reasonably be done, because the pollution problem is very acute. Nobody can be more outspoken in favor of doing something about our environment than I can be, but this seems to be a reasonable action to take at this time.

Some have previously committed themselves to the \$1 billion, thinking at the time it was a choice between \$1 billion and \$214 million. But that is not now the case. The pending bill provides \$600 million, not \$214 million.

Under all the circumstances, I believe it would be more responsible for us to settle on this compromise figure of \$600 million which has been thoroughly weighed in the light of the technicalities involved. Just appropriating \$1 billion will not necessarily get the money spent in the way Members may desire, because of guidelines and the legislation itself.

I would hope we could all agree on the \$600 million figure. While it is not as much as I would like—I would like more than this—and others would like more, this is all that can reasonably be utilized at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MAHON. So, Mr. Chairman, we go from \$214 million last year to \$600 million this year plus a carryover of about \$65 million. I can defend this in my district, and I believe any Member can defend this action in his district.

We talk about economy, yet we are exceeding the budget by nearly \$400 million in this item of appropriation. I believe we are justified under the circumstances. But let us stick together on this and feel, as I believe the Members will, that we have done a reasonably good job of handling a very difficult issue.

Thank you.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important subjects and one of the most serious problems with which the House has had to wrestle.

I should like to emphasize the fact that for focusing attention on this problem we should give fullest credit to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, my good friend JOHN DINGELL. He is one of the great conservationists, one of the leaders in the fight for the preservation of America. I believe he, more than anybody else, is responsible for the fact that we are at long last facing up to the problem of pollution control in a realistic way.

Having said this, Mr. Chairman, I am also going to state that I believe the amendment should be defeated. I believe it is unrealistic from a number of standpoints. Certainly there is no assurance or even likelihood the money would be spent

if voted. I do not believe it could be considered an exercise of responsibility for the House to appropriate nearly five times as much as the \$214 million which was recommended by the President's budget. No plans have been developed for expenditures even remotely approaching a billion dollars in scope.

Please remember the figure in the committee bill is almost three times as much as the budget recommends.

It very probably is more than can actually be spent. It is not a question of what is needed. We know there is serious need for additional pollution control measures. But we should be practical, not political. The fiscal year is far along. It is going to require an almost superhuman planning effort to make preparations to properly expend \$600 million if that amount finally is approved.

If the House approves the committee figure of \$600 million we will have taken one of the most significant and one of the most meaningful steps in history to combat pollution in a thoroughgoing way and to begin a realistic fight to insure clean water for America.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to increase the amount for construction grants for waste treatment facilities to the \$1 billion as authorized. I wish to commend the gentleman from Ohio for offering it and also to compliment the gentleman from Michigan for all of his efforts in this area. I further wish to commend all those Americans who have recognized that we do have a pollution problem in these great United States and want to do something about it.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of the good wisdom shown by the Appropriations Committee in upping this amount from \$214 million appropriated last year under the Johnson administration and requested by the new administration to \$600 million, I still think that there is an opportunity to show greater wisdom than this great committee has shown by upping it to \$1 billion which would be the amount authorized under the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Secondly, when the campaign for cleaner water really took hold, it was incumbent upon the committee to take cognizance of that fact and they did. The subcommittee, as the chairman indicated, went to \$450 million. And apparently the full committee realized that they did not show sufficient wisdom in this area and increased it to \$600 million.

Therefore, I think this House should now show greater wisdom and fund this program for the full amount authorized.

Let me say that I think this is one of the crying needs of this Nation today. The need for action is now! Not next year or the next year, but now. The pollution is here now. Now is the time for this Congress to act and not next year. If you think we do not have a problem now, all you have to do is to visit one of our Nation's lakes or streams. You will find it polluted and unfit for swimming or fishing to say nothing of the fact that our communities are taking drinking water from them.

Mr. Chairman, when we are asked for

\$662 million so that a private aircraft company can build an airplane to fly at supersonic speeds across the ocean, is \$1 billion too much to ask for clean water? Why just a week ago the military authorization bill passed this House with an increase of more than \$1 billion over the amount that the administration had requested.

By comparison, Mr. Chairman, is \$1 billion too much to ask to clean up our lakes and streams of this great Nation so that our people will have clean water in which to swim and fish? Is this too much to spend to give this great Nation cleaner water to drink?

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a shame—a shame on America—to do what has been done to these streams and to these lakes in this great country of ours. Should not our children and their children inherit something better from our generation?

We are all for conservation and for doing something about this problem but now is the time to prove it. I think we can afford it. I am convinced we must afford it. Let us consider the matter of priorities for a moment. If we do not want to increase the budget, then cut it someplace else—cut it someplace else. This problem is upon us and it cannot wait.

I say this House can measure up to its responsibility in this area today by adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Minshall).

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this may appear to some of you to be somewhat of a role reversal for me. I am sure the Committee knows that I have had occasion to come to the well of this House in both support of, and in opposition to, certain appropriation matters. I have not been reluctant to express my disagreements when in my judgment the occasion warranted.

I have had the honor to serve on this committee for some time, and I can tell you when the full Committee on Appropriations had the kind of debate it did on this particular issue, and when we actually increase the appropriation in the full committee, as many of us on the committee urged, this is a meaningful and important event. And it is on this basis that I come into the well supporting my committee's action and opposing the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman on his position here. I too was one of those who signed the proposal to raise the appropriation to \$1 billion. I did it because the alternative seemed to me to be \$214 million. Now, when the committee decided to vote out \$600 million, this seemed to me to be a sensible and realistic program, and I think we would be irresponsible to go any higher than that.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I believe we should make it clear that it was not a matter of the full committee overruling or overriding the subcommittee handling the bill. It was the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS), himself, the chairman of the subcommittee, who made the motion, after extensive debate, that we fix the figure at \$600 million rather than at the \$450 million figure which had been tentatively agreed upon before.

Mr. COHELAN. The chairman is quite correct.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. And it was on the basis of the details which I will recite here that permits me and others on our committee to come before you today and urge you to stay with the committee on this particular measure.

Our colleagues from Ohio (Mr. Latta and Mr. Minshall) both have made this a black-or-white issue. I want to say this: Those of you who know me know that I yield to nobody, including the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), in my devotion to his cause, and I have nothing but the utmost admiration for his long term goals.

I suggest that we are going to accomplish those goals.

In my own area, you know we have problems and I would be the last person to stand in this well and say that we should not be in there battling for everything that you can get. I honestly believe the committee has done an adequate job for this fiscal year allowing for the formula under which funds are allocated.

I argued with many of my colleagues in support of the amendment to increase the appropriation to \$600 million and it was only after this discussion that I agreed to support the amendment on the floor. This figure, as has been pointed out, has been combined with a \$65 million carryover. This represents an increase of \$386 million over the budget estimates that we have all heard about.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore rise in opposition to the amendment. It is not easy to oppose this amendment because the cause of pure water is one that I wholeheartedly support. In my own district, the San Francisco Bay provided eloquent testimony to the effects of not planning for fresh water. The indiscriminate use of the San Francisco Bay as a repository for industrial waste, the diminution of fresh water outflow, and random and unplanned land fill projects have contributed to the pollution of the bay.

In the full Appropriations Committee, I argued along with several of my colleagues in support of an amendment to increase the appropriation to \$600 million. This figure is combined with a \$65 million carryover. This represents an increase of \$386 million over the budget estimate of \$214 million and the same increase over last year's appropriation. Yet, now we have before us an amendment that seeks to increase the appropriation still further. This proposed increase does not take into account the

fact that the current allocation formula would not be able to handle even the \$600 million passed by the committee. The current formula, which appears in the Water Pollution Control Act, allocates the first \$100 million on a relative per capita income and population base.

The balance of the annual appropriation must be allocated on a population basis only, regardless of the current need as evidenced by a backlog of pending projects. What this means, in effect, is that even if a total of \$1 billion were appropriated many States could not get rid of their backlog of pending projects because many of their projects would not qualify under the current formula.

There is legislation pending that would enable the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements, within the limits of the annual appropriation, with State and local government units to pay a grant or installment over a period of years not to exceed 30 years. It is necessary that such an agreement pass in the enabling legislation before these needed funds are tied up in an appropriation item that cannot be adequately utilized.

In addition, as I understand it, the current legislative formula requires that a large part of any increased appropriation would require that funds be used by States reporting no additional need. With the \$600 million Appropriations Committee figure, 25 States would receive \$142.4 in excess of their application for projects. Under the \$600 million figure, my own State of California will receive approximately \$49 million which is more than three times the original budget request. Since, however, the allocation formula is based on population not demonstrated need, six States—New York, California, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, and Wisconsin—which represent 75 percent of the current backlog would only receive 29 percent of the Federal funds available at various funding levels. Hence there is a definite need to restructure the allocation formula.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, under the additional \$386 million passed by the Appropriations Committee, there are more than adequate funds to meet the needs of the various States under the current formula. I would concede, however, that the figure is inadequate to mount a meaningful attack on the problems of water pollution if projects were ideally planned. I, therefore, urge my colleagues who wish to have an additional \$1 billion for pure water, to change the allocation formula and when this is done then funds can be expended according to demonstrated needs. Under such circumstances I could support an even higher appropriation. Until that time I am convinced that the \$600 million figure is the highest that can be effectively used under the current allocation formula and I intend to support the committee bill.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, in listening to this debate, it becomes abundantly clear that the Congress is responding very well today to the

call for clean water and a positive program of improving the water quality.

Whether the \$600 million or the \$1 billion figure carries in the legislation being considered is not as important as the fact that Congress is committing itself to accelerating the pollution abatement and sewage treatment program very substantially.

During the past few years our authorizing Committee on Public Works has offered our recommendations, legislatively, to attack the pollution problem head on.

Following extensive hearings and subsequently, we have found that additional legislative action will be required in order to change and develop a more equitable formula so as to permit States like our own California to accelerate its effort as requested by our Governor Reagan.

I will be urging the Nixon administration and Secretary Hickel to work with our Public Works Committee to develop a bold and realistic program for the future with major emphasis on equitable formula, broader funding, and tax incentives for industry, coupled with strict enforcement.

We can and must clean up the waters of America. I believe we are taking a major step forward today toward that goal.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, just like the speaker who preceded me, I yield to no one in my support of clean water.

I do not know why anyone even has to say that here. But evidently the measure of one's support for clean water has become whether or not you are for "full funding" of this program.

I want full funding or this program, for my State and for my Nation, but, Mr. Chairman, my vote for this amendment would not produce full funding either for New York or 17 other States whose needs under this program far exceed the amounts that they would become entitled to even under the full \$1 billion authorization.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman now standing in the well addressing us is a very distinguished and able member of the committee as well as a member of the subcommittee. The gentleman comes from the State of New York which is the one State that would not be fully funded even if the full \$1 billion were appropriated under the formula as written by the Congress which is based upon population rather than need. The gentleman is emphasizing the need for revising the formula and the legislative committee should address itself to this problem.

Mr. ROBISON. The gentleman is exactly correct. But it would not be New York, alone, that would not be fully funded under the \$1 billion, if that is what we want to appropriate, but 17 other States, as well, based upon their reported needs.

New York's total reported need, toward the meeting of which applications totaling \$202.2 million are now pending at Albany or at the FWPCA's regional office, is in excess of \$1.2 billion.

Toward the meeting of that need, under this amendment, New York would receive but \$89.2 million.

Mr. Chairman, that is hardly "full funding" under anybody's estimate.

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

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. I have done a little quick arithmetic and have come to the conclusion that it would take an appropriation of \$15 billion, under the present formula, to catch New York up to its backlog. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. ROBISON. I would agree—though I have not checked your figures.

Now, admittedly, that \$89.2 million is \$36.9 million more than New York could hope to receive under the committee figure of \$600 million. We could certainly use that additional amount, if the administration were in a position to release it, which I doubt. But, Mr. Chairman, the real barrier to full funding—the real villain—here is not so much the level of Federal appropriations but the allocation formula under which the program is forced to operate.

I believe the committee's recommendation of \$600 million for the program's purposes is a realistic compromise in view of that fact. It is probably the maximum amount the administration can hope to use in what remains of this fiscal year, and is a figure that ought to be supported.

I also believe that the only way for "short-fall" States like New York ever to obtain full funding is to band together to encourage the Committees on Public Works in this and the other body to review and revise the present allocation formula, which is clearly not working; and to give attention, too, to the Cramer proposal that passed the House last year in practically the same form, under which construction grants would be made to local municipalities in annual installments over a 30-year period, which would certainly permit us to do a great deal more than we have in these years of budgetary restraint.

Finally, one of the greatest inhibitors of progress under this program has been the failure of local government to come up with its share of construction moneys for these kinds of projects, which, in turn, reflects the failure of all but 14 of the States to contribute anything towards the cost of this one facet of the national effort to abate sources of water pollution. And one approach which we could use towards our common goal of clean water would be to support and promote the revenue-sharing proposals the administration has made, and that might give the States a further incentive than they now have to make this a full Federal-State and local partnership attack on sources of pollution.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I vigorously support the amendment offered by my colleague from Ohio to increase the appropriation for waste treatment grants under the Clean Water Act to allow the full authorized amount of \$1 billion to be allocated for fiscal 1970.

There is no river in this country more in need of the assistance of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration than the majestic Hudson River which flows by my district. Once described by Baedeker as "more beautiful than the Rhine," this priceless natural heritage now contains long stretches which can support no marine life except eels which have been known to attack humans. The sludge which has settled on its bottom in other areas makes any form of biological life next to impossible except disease-causing bacteria.

We are, all of us, responsible for the pollution and despoliation of the Hudson and for hundreds of other Hudson rivers throughout this country. We allow raw sewage by the ton to be dumped into its waters. We countenance industrial waste being poured into it and pollution from the vessels which ply its waterways.

We in New York City are already reaping the whirlwind of our neglect in the almost yearly droughts which afflict us because we cannot clean up the water in sufficient quantities in times of crisis.

The technology which serves 15 million metropolitan New Yorkers is responsible for the state of the river. This same technology must serve to reverse the condition of the river. Sewage treatment plants on the island of Manhattan are needed to stop the discharge of raw sewage into the river and the harbor below, and in order to process industrial wastes. We must also upgrade the operation of existing plants to obtain increased purification of the wastes which they treat.

Even were we to stop tomorrow morning the pouring of all wastes and sewage into the river, it would take several lifetimes to bring it back to anything approximating its original state. Apparently, we're not willing to do that. At best we propose facilities to clean up the junk which we still intend to dump. Such facilities cost money, though—and that is what this amendment is about.

Pollution is no longer the problem solely of the community which it surrounds. It is an interlocking problem which stretches from town to town, from city to city, from State to State. Local initiative is, of course, necessary for combating this problem. But it is becoming so serious—rather, it is already so serious—that the aid of the Federal Government is required.

This Congress originally proposed an authorization of \$1 billion to assist in the clean-up of all America's waterways. If you will pardon the expression, even this amount is a mere "drop in the bucket." At best, it can barely begin the process in only a few rivers. It could not

even clean up all of New York State's rivers—but it is a step in the right direction, and none too soon.

To cut back from the authorized monies in our appropriation is, to me, merely committing delayed suicide, because it spells an earlier death for even more of our rivers and, eventually, for us all as we continue to destroy this vital segment of our environment.

I cannot urge my colleagues too strongly to join in support of Congressman MINSHALL's amendment for restoring the \$1 billion for clean water.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I shall try to make my remarks brief. I have permission to revise and extend my remarks.

There is no need for me to recapitulate the history of this legislative program which this body, to its everlasting credit, initiated in 1955 and 1956.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most critical domestic problems facing this country today with its marvelous natural resources is the problem of adequate supplies of water that are capable of use for all our domestic needs. It is a gigantic problem, even though we have been on it since 1956, because we have neglected and even refused to meet head on the problem of preventing the pollution of our waterways. Now we must further accelerate our efforts and shift into high gear. We no longer can afford the luxury of allowing our waters to flow untreated into our rivers, lakes, and coastal waters. We must begin now with determination and daring to take great strides not in words, but in deeds. We no longer can afford dirty rivers, dead lakes, and filthy cesspools moving past our cities.

If we in the Congress really meant what we declared to be national policy in 1966, then we must proceed today—now—to live up to our commitment and appropriate the entire authorized amount of \$1 billion for fiscal year 1970.

When we first passed the Water Pollution Act of 1956, sponsored by our Committee on Public Works, we went along on a very limited basis for 10 years, in a modest way and in a responsible manner, exploring and feeling out the possibilities and the needs. This chart will show, starting in 1958, what the situation has been. The red bar shows the applications and the gray bar shows the appropriations. We went along well and worked beautifully together, but we found we were falling further and further behind.

In 1965 the Congress and the Nation took a great step forward when we enacted the Water Quality Act of 1965, which authorized the establishment of water quality standards on all the country's interstate rivers, lakes, and coastal waters. This passed without one dissenting vote. This act represented the first effort in the history of our Nation to attack the problem of water pollution on an entire river basis. It recognized the State's primary role in this field by requiring the States to establish adequate water quality criteria applicable to interstate waters.

In 1966, again without a dissenting vote and in what has been referred to by many as "one of the 89th Congress' most sweeping accomplishments," we enacted

the Clean Water Restoration Act wherein we recognized that in order to make progress in the battle against water pollution the partnership arrangement between the Federal, State, and local governments was needed. We recognized that only with all levels of governmental participation could this program be a success. In order to effectuate this partnership, the Congress greatly accelerated the schedule of annual appropriations and authorized as the Federal share of the agreement \$3.4 billion for construction grants for sewage treatment plants for fiscal years 1968 through 1971. The amounts authorized for each year were \$450 million for 1968, \$700 million for 1969, \$1 billion for 1970, and \$1.25 billion for 1971.

So much for history—now what does the record show for accomplishments? It shows that since we decided to really move forward, we on the Federal side have reneged on our commitments to our partners.

Look at this blackboard chart. In 1965, in 1966, and in 1967, we were appropriating as much, or a little less, or about what we authorized. Suddenly, 2 years ago, when we authorized the \$450 million for 1968 we appropriated only \$203 million or 45 percent of the authorized amount. Last year we authorized \$700 million, but we appropriated \$214 million or 30 percent of what we had authorized. Now, with the authorization of \$1 billion—the administration's request is \$214 million—we are offering only 20 percent of the actual need.

The Appropriations Committee, to their credit, raised this wholly insufficient amount of \$214 million to \$600 million—a vast improvement—I commend the committee and in particular Chairman MAHON and the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman EVINS. We are still not keeping faith with our partners. Even if the \$600 million were approved, we still would have appropriated less than half of what we promised for fiscal years 1968 through 1970.

In short, even if we approve the \$600 million appropriation, we are going to be \$1,126 million behind what we have promised. We did not just authorize. We made a commitment to the people. On the basis of that commitment, the States and municipalities moved ahead and voted bond issues. So today we have a backlog of \$2.3 billion worth of projects ready to go—certainly of that, \$1 billion are ready to go offhand.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BLATNIK was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BLATNIK. So here is what our needs are today. After 14 years of experience, after the problem has been examined and talked about all over the country, here is what Congress in this body, without one dissenting vote, authorized 3 years ago in the 1966 act. That is what we are asking for today. This is what we started out with a few months ago and what the administration wanted to get by with.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a partisan matter. Our own administration did the same thing last year, giving us about 40

percent of what we needed. That is all backlog. This is not even facing into the future what we will have to do to insure clean water 50 years from today. So much for the history.

Mr. Chairman, we have made a solemn commitment. We made a promise. We are obligated to live up to our word. The States cranked up their machinery and the municipalities went ahead on the basis of our promise and they accelerated their programs.

Look at the way the application requests came in. The long bar is the application requests coming in. That is \$2.3 billion. Where is our appropriation? Way down here, dragging.

I say we have absolutely no excuse whatsoever for defaulting on the solemn pledge, on the commitment we made to our own taxpayers and our immediate posterity and to our children.

I realize that it is difficult in these times of tight budgets, inflationary pressures, and critical international problems to vote for additional appropriations, particularly in view of the statements that have been made and, I suppose, will be made that the administrative capability at the State and Federal level to process applications is limited, that the local ability and readiness to fund their share of the costs is suspect, and that the capacity of design engineers and equipment industries to handle the expanded workload is insufficient to handle a \$1 billion appropriation.

In my judgment, based on a review of all the pertinent available information, if we appropriate \$1 billion as the Federal share, the money can be utilized. Obviously there will be administrative problems. Why should not there be? We have never permitted the program to gear up to what we promised. Through lack of sufficient appropriations we have hampered the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration's ability to mature and grow to where it should be. I say let us finally get the ball rolling. There is no better time to start than now.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this country are tired of promises. They recognize that in the battle against water pollution there has been a credibility gap of the first order. I urge my colleagues in this great body to join with me in voting for appropriating the entire authorized \$1 billion so that we can get moving forward with our battle against water pollution.

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

(On request of Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BLATNIK was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The formula which the distinguished gentleman and his committee wrote is such that 17 States are fully funded under the amount, eight additional States are fully funded with a surplus of \$142,373,000. The gentleman has not discussed the fact that after these funds are allocated they lay over for 18 months, and if not utilized can be reallocated to other States with need.

The gentleman and the committee wrote the formula under which many States receive more funds than they need, and after 18 months these funds can be reallocated to other States as they need them and request them.

Our table shows \$142,372,000 in excess funds for 25 States.

Mr. BLATNIK. I merely want to respond to the gentleman by saying I truly appreciate the problems which the subcommittee and the full committee have. I want it shown on the record and made public that no one is more aware of the tremendous effort our Appropriations Committee made, with help on both sides of the aisle, to raise the amount from \$214 million to \$600 million.

Without any reflection on those efforts, I do admit that the formula has to be corrected. I say it can be corrected in the near future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. As I understand the chart which is before the House right now, even if we accept and approve the Dingell amendment, which I hope we will, we are still going to be \$726 million short of the commitment that we made to the local communities of this country to make some meaningful progress toward cleaning up water supplies and sewers, is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Would my friend from Minnesota agree with me that coupled with the commitment, so far as the money is concerned, is also the formula under which the money would be distributed. Some of the States which have gone way over their entitlements, since they must have been able to do arithmetic, must have known what their entitlements would be to a penny. Even if every dime authorized had been appropriated, they still would not have received enough Federal funds to take care of their backlogs.

Mr. BLATNIK. I agree. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee explained earlier that there is a deficiency and an inadequacy and too much rigidity in the formula. It should be studied for possible revisions. We are prepared to accept improving amendments to it.

Mr. RHODES. Could that be done this session?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes. If not, we hope we can do it early next year.

I say, as seriously as I can, I cannot think of any valid excuse for not living up to our commitment, and for short-changing our people on their needs for water by three-fourths of a billion dol-

lars. We are that far behind, not at all caught up with the commitment.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. Am I correct in understanding that approximately \$1 billion worth of the applications pending are to be found in one State, New York State?

Mr. BLATNIK. Yes.

Mr. GIAIMO. As I understand it, \$1.3 billion.

Mr. BLATNIK. I believe that is about correct.

Mr. GIAIMO. Under the formula which presently exists, New York would not be eligible for all of this money even if we were to appropriate \$1 billion now?

Mr. BLATNIK. That is true.

Mr. GIAIMO. So that in effect when you point to the fact—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. GIAIMO), Mr. BLATNIK was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GIAIMO. You speak of the gap between the several billions in authorization and the lag in appropriations. Even if we were to give the entire \$1 billion in appropriations, even if we were to go over that amount, under the existing formula would we be able to meet these needs in a State like New York which has \$1 billion in applications pending. It is because of the formula that we cannot meet these needs.

Mr. BLATNIK. I understand the question and I understand the gentleman's argument, but out of all due respect, I wish to reiterate once more the fact and that is I do not care what route you use, as long as we keep on shortchanging and shortcircuiting our commitment and as long as we keep on welching on our commitment, we will have a backlog that continues to grow bigger and bigger and bigger. In other words, we will never have the capability to undertake what we have authorized. We have got to start sometime. We should have started last year as we promised and we should certainly start this afternoon.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the Chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON).

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, a brief summary of water pollution legislation to date may be helpful in understanding the issue we have before us today.

Prior to 1955, water pollution control was limited. Until the enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1948, the only role the Federal Government had in water pollution control was contained in three acts: the River and Harbor Act of 1899, the Public Health Service Act of 1912, and the Oil Pollution Act of 1924.

The Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 was experimental and limited to a trial period of 5 years but was subsequently extended to June 30, 1956. On July 9, 1956, there was enacted into law the first comprehensive Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Among its provi-

sions were: first, grants to assist States and interstate agencies for water pollution control activities; second, Federal grants of \$50 million a year—up to an aggregate of \$500 million—for the construction of municipal sewage treatment works; and third, a permanent procedure governing Federal abatement action against interstate pollution.

On July 20, 1961, the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments were enacted into law. The amendments, among other things, first, strengthened abatement enforcement of interstate and navigable waters, and second, increased Federal assistance to municipalities for construction of waste treatment works by increasing the grant authorization to \$80 million in 1962, \$90 million in 1963, and \$100 million for each of the fiscal years 1964-67.

The Water Quality Act of 1965, in addition to creating the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, increased the grants to \$150 million for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967. It doubled the dollar limitation on grants for construction of waste treatment works from \$600,000 to \$1,200,000 for individual project, and from \$2.4 to \$4.8 million for a joint project in which two or more communities participate. The removal of the dollar limitation up to a full 30 percent of the project cost was authorized if the State matched the full Federal contribution. It further provided that an increase in the basic grant of an additional 10 percent of the amount of the grant if the project conformed to a comprehensive plan for a metropolitan area.

In 1966 the Congress recognized that while it had commenced an aggressive role for the Federal Government in planning and enforcement by these prior acts, insufficient financial assistance had been offered to the States and the local governments to actively fight water pollution. This had been evidenced by the fact that while sewage treatment plants were being constructed as originally contemplated, they were insufficient to keep up with the problem. Thus, it became clear to the Congress that more tools were needed to fight this battle, and mainly the tools needed consisted of more Federal funds.

Therefore, in 1966, the Congress at the recommendation of the Committee on Public Works enacted the Clean Water Restoration Act. This legislation, which is based on the concept of a Federal-State-local government partnership, authorized \$3.4 billion for construction grants for sewage treatment plants for the fiscal years 1968-1971. The amounts for each year are \$450 million for 1968, \$700 million for 1969, \$1 billion for 1970, and \$1.25 billion for 1971. We did away with the dollar limitation on grants and in all cases the basic amount authorized for a Federal share for a single project or a combined one is 30 percent of the total cost. However, where the State agrees to match 30 percent of the total cost of a project, the Federal share is increased to 40 percent. In addition, if water quality standards have been established, the Federal share is increased to 50 percent. Hopefully, this was a major breakthrough in the fight against water pollution.

We all believed, and so advised our constituents, that the authorization for Federal assistance for construction of sewage treatment facilities would result in aiding our towns and cities in meeting the water quality standards which we had required to be established under the Water Quality Act of 1965.

However, we were mistaken. We learned again that authorizing a program does not insure that the program will be funded. Instead of \$450 million in 1968, appropriations were limited to \$203 million. In 1969, instead of \$700 million, appropriations were \$214 million. And now in 1970, despite the fact that the Congress authorized \$1 billion as recently as 1966, the administration in its budget request asked for \$214 million. The Appropriations Committee has recommended that the appropriation be raised to \$600 million.

In my judgment, anything less than \$1 billion constitutes a default on our obligations. We have promised assistance; instead, the obligation for carrying out the water pollution control program has been shifted back to the cities and towns.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly urge that this great body appropriate funds for sewage treatment facility construction in the amount of \$1 billion.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI).

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, since the beginning of recorded time, man has built his civilizations, his cities, and his homes along great rivers, streams, lakes, and oceans. Since the beginning of recorded time, man has discovered that one of the paramount needs for his continued existence on this earth of ours is water. Water to provide the means of transportation, of developing his industries, of providing his food, and most important of all, water for his very health and existence. We are told that the water table of this earth has remained constant during all this period. There is only so much water for our needs. It is an asset infinitely more precious than the diamonds, rubies, and emeralds that many treasure. Like the air we breathe and the food we need as fuel for our bodies, it is a necessity without which we as individuals cannot continue. Yet with this background and this knowledge, man has recklessly and thoughtlessly squandered this priceless heritage.

Today we are faced with the fact that the once abundant supply of water—the water that would never end—is not an unending stream. It has become contaminated and polluted. Ironically, the development of our great civilization and our great technology has also brought about this contamination. As we have advanced in our civilization, we have at the same time been systematically destroying water.

A few short years ago Congress recognized this problem. A few short years ago Congress enacted legislation known as the Clean Water Restoration Act to protect and preserve our waters and their uses for all of us. We have enacted meaningful legislation to protect our streams

and to enforce standards set up for this purpose. We have authorized a monetary program to get underway, in a meaningful fashion, a program for cleaning up and preserving our Nation's waters. With all of this the Congress as of the very moment I speak has made no real effort to fund this program properly. We are told that the need for funding runs into the billions of dollars, and we have appropriated only a tiny portion of this sum. This is an intolerable situation, one which cannot be allowed to continue.

Today this body has the opportunity of funding for the first time a meaningful sum of money to get our treatment plant program underway. For the first time, we have the opportunity to honor fully the commitment we made to the American people for a clean water program. For the first time, we have the opportunity to enter into a full-scale partnership with the States and communities to whom we gave this commitment when we passed the legislation covering this program. One billion dollars is a large sum of money, and yet by approving it this year, we will only be scratching the surface. However, in approving the \$1 billion appropriation, we will finally go on record that we do fully recognize the need for this program and recognize the fact that we are determined to see that it is properly carried out.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment, an item first proposed by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

I would like to read an outline of the problems facing St. Joseph, Mo., in its efforts to control water pollution. And, these problems are often repeated in many cities along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers in my district in Missouri.

[From Nation's Cities, September, 1969]
ST. JOSEPH, MO., FACES ITS FINANCIAL BIND

As an example of one city's efforts to meet its water pollution control responsibilities, here are excerpts from the testimony of Mayor Douglas A. Merrifield of St. Joseph, Mo. (pop. 80,000), before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee June 9. He was speaking on behalf of the National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors in support of full funding for fiscal 1970 of the \$1 billion authorized for waste treatment project assistance.

In the past few years, St. Joseph has placed in operation or put under construction nearly \$7 million worth of water and sewer improvements. I am proud of this record, and believe it exemplary of the efforts of municipalities around the nation. The city is currently pushing ahead on another \$2,512,000 of construction. For this program we have been advised that a grant of \$1,290,000 is approved as a reimbursable grant if waste treatment funds are appropriated. In good faith, the city is underwriting this new construction and advising our citizens that the federal government, in due time, will reimburse us for a portion of the improvement costs. St. Joseph has planned another ambitious project, costing about \$3 million, to complete its primary treatment program. However, it will be very difficult for us to finance this project unless increased federal aid to provide the 50 per cent matching share is assured . . .

Municipal bond interest rates are now at an all time high. In 1961 St. Joseph issued local sewer bonds at a 2.98 per cent interest rate. Today municipal water and sewer bonds are marketed at rates of 5 to 6 per cent and more. This means that debt service charges for long term financing projects such as waste treatment facilities will often exceed principal payments over the life of the bond. Despite record high interest rates, municipal bonds are becoming more difficult to sell. Large commercial banks, the traditional purchasers of municipal bonds, cut their net holdings of municipal bonds by nearly \$1 billion in the first quarter of 1969 although a record number of municipal bond issues were presented for sale. . . .

For clean water programs of the future, even greater levels of financing will be needed. But demands for more local action are simply not realistic unless federal support is increased. In St. Joseph we are told that programs of secondary sewage treatment must be operational by 1972. I do not believe we can construct the \$4 million facility required before 1974, and even that will be impossible unless federal aid is available for the full 50 per cent share.

In the distant future, the Interior Department is calling for separation of storm and sanitary sewers. Such a program could cost St. Joseph another \$13 to \$15 million and is estimated to cost between \$15 billion and \$30 billion nationally. My citizens will never vote for bonds for this unless there is assurance of massive federal and state grants to back the local effort.

I urge full funding of \$1 billion of this Clean Water Restoration Act in this bill.

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

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. BYRNE.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

Water, water everywhere and not a drop to drink. Water, water everywhere and all the boards did shrink.

All of us recall these famous lines from Samuel Taylor Coleridge's "Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner." They were written many years ago, but I think they are just as applicable in 1969. In many parts of our Nation there is indeed water, water everywhere but not a drop for drinking, for bathing, or for recreational purposes. The water is polluted. It is contaminated. It smells. It is a menace to health. This was once pure, pristine water. What has happened to it?

All of us in this body know what has happened to it. It has been polluted in many ways by many people, by all of us. As we advanced in civilization and built this great country we at the same time found untold methods of using water and destroying it, making it unfit for human consumption or any consumption whatever.

This is the problem before us today. It is a real one. It is one we have recognized through the legislative process but it is not one we have recognized through the appropriation process. The American public is aware of this and you and I in this body today are aware of this fact. It is one thing to authorize a program, but it is another thing to supply the money to move it forward. We have failed to do this in this water pollution program. We can no longer put ourselves in that position.

The reports of experts in this field,

the reports of those who fully understand the problem, indicate that there is need for billions of dollars to clean up our Nation's waters properly. They tell us with each passing year we fail to act to provide money to the States and local communities as we promised we would in the Federal-State program to build the treatment plants they need for these purposes, that with each day that goes by, the price will be higher and the problem more difficult. The answer is obvious. It is true we face a period of inflation. It is true we face a problem of budget control. We also face a question of basic priorities and certainly one of the basic priorities is water. Clean water we need for our very existence.

The record is clear. The history of the program is well known. There is no need to delay. We cannot delay. I urge this House to support an amendment to increase the appropriation for sewage treatment plants for the fiscal year to \$1 billion.

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

Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from Minnesota said is correct. In the past, the Appropriations Committee has not been as generous in this regard as I would have liked it to be. I certainly want to see every available dollar spent in order to get underway the job of cleaning up pollution.

We have made a great start this year. The fact is that our committee did increase the budget figure from \$214 to \$600 million. We brought the appropriation nearer to the authorization figure in this area.

In addition to the \$600 million, there are \$65 million in carryover funds. This means that we have \$665 million available of the \$1 billion authorization. This is before we go over to the other body and before we go to conference. In my opinion, this figure will be a minimum of \$600 million, plus \$65 million in carryover funds.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) has expressed his thoughts about getting started in this area. But the fact is that changes must be made in the formula so we can get all available moneys to the States which are ready to begin. Witness the case of New York and 17 other States that are being shortchanged because of the formula. New York has on hand requests for \$1.2 billion of this total of over \$2 billion. Yet, even if we were to vote the \$1 billion appropriation today, the State of New York could not obtain this money because of the formula.

Further, I have been a supporter of the proposal offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) to go to the \$1 billion figure. However, it makes no sense to do it today for several reasons. I very much doubt that under the existing formula we could dispose of the whole \$1 billion immediately. I very much doubt that the Bureau of the Budget, which only asked for \$214 million, is going to expend \$1 billion even if we appropriate it, let alone \$600 million. The fact of the matter is that this committee has acted responsibly. It is in the ball park. It is saying, in effect, that we are serious about clean water; we will make

a great start, even though your authorization is \$1 billion. But in view of what is going on in the States as a result of the formula and in view of the applications pending, how can we come into this House responsibly and ask for more than \$600 million, plus \$65 million in carry-over funds?

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this committee has done a great job and is entitled to our support for a job well done.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wonder if what the gentleman says is correct, and the committee is trying to act responsibly, how would the gentleman explain that in 1968 the committee reduced the authorization by \$247 million, in 1969 by \$486 million, and now in 1970 by \$400 million, all told more than \$1 billion in 36 months after the authorizing committee studied and made their recommendations?

Mr. GIAIMO. The committee may be guilty of past sins, but the fact is that today in the 1970 fiscal year budget the committee is putting its shoulders to the wheel. It is shouldering its responsibilities and is making a valiant effort to catch up in this area. I suggest that if we change the formula so that we can get more equitable treatment for large States, States like New York, we can do an even better job.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend members of the committee who are insisting that the Federal Government carry through its original program which provides \$1 billion to continue the fight to clean up the polluted waters in the lakes and streams of America. This much-needed program has been too long delayed. Medical reports state that it is impossible to estimate how many millions of our citizens are submitted to unnecessary illnesses and health hazards in 1 year's time by reason of drinking contaminated water which has been unnecessarily polluted by industries, sewage systems, and other sources which dump refuse in America's fresh water supply. Towns and cities along rivers throughout our Nation and adjacent to the lakes must take immediate steps to preserve the health of millions of American families.

Daily I receive many letters from my district and elsewhere protesting the administration's recommendations that the promised appropriation of \$1 billion toward cleaning up water pollution should be cut to \$214 million. This proposed weakening of the battle to preserve the health of millions of Americans against the drinking of contaminated and occasionally poisonous water in the urban areas of the Nation is beyond belief. The message which I am receiving from citizens, not only from my own district, but other parts of Indiana and the Midwest, is that they feel that this cut will be a major setback to cities and States and all citizens in their fight against water pollution.

A great number of Members of the House, including myself, have been working for legislation to restore the \$1 bil-

lion in the 1970 budget which was set up to support the Clean Water Restoration Act.

The Congress must take the initiative to provide the necessary matching funds to aid the States and cities to purify the Nation's water supply in our rivers and lakes. Our Government must give full support to compel the mammoth industries and cities and towns to install the proper machinery to terminate water pollution in our congested urban areas.

It is no excuse for the Government or the Congress to protest lack of sufficient funds to combat this water and air pollution scourge on the present and future health of millions of American families. The tax reform legislation if enacted this year will provide additional billions to amply supply funds to combat water and air pollution.

The tax reform bill, it appears now, is receiving the old legislative trick of postponement and stalling with the hope that public interest for tax reform will subside. The bill passed by the House is now apparently dormant in the other body, judging from the Associated Press dispatches in the papers recently. The postponing of this tax reform bill until next session of Congress will mean that the Federal Treasury will not only suffer a loss of many billions of Federal tax dollars from large tax loopholes, but it will afford a better opportunity for the continuation of the unnecessary 10 percent surtax for another year, running it into 1971.

Further, any Member of Congress who opposes this \$1 billion fund to curb water pollution and protect the health of millions cannot in good conscience give as his reasons that this necessary appropriation for pure water is beyond the possibility of the Federal Government to spend. During the recent tax reform legislation debate I and other Members submitted uncontested figures wherein if just the fabulous, and in some cases fraudulent, tax loopholes of big oil were repealed upwards of \$4-\$5 billion would come into the Federal Treasury.

As an example from 1962 through 1966 the Atlantic-Richfield Oil Co. had profits of \$411,621,000. But after deducting its 27½ percent oil depletion allowance, "intangible drilling costs" and other items it came up with a whole string of goose eggs. Its total income tax obligation for those 5 years was zero.

In 1962 the Marathon Oil Co. had a net profit of \$36 million. After deducting its depletion allowance and other items, Marathon not only paid no income tax but received a tax credit of \$2.2 million.

Let us consider the tax "bonanza" enjoyed by the 27½ percent exemptions under the oil depletion allowance. In this case you determine your income from a producing well and deduct 27½ percent of that amount before beginning to calculate your income tax. You do the same next year, and the year after that and every year as long as that well produces. You do not stop when you have retrieved your investment; in fact, the average well is "depleted" 12 times over. If your drilling cost was \$50,000, your total income tax deductions on its production might be \$600,000. This bill reduces the depletion loophole 7½ percent and most

Members feel that it should be repealed entirely.

I am not going to take the time to narrate the additional billions that could be brought in by closing loopholes on foundations, real estate, capital gains, and inheritance exemptions, and so forth, which would further ridicule the contention that our Federal Government cannot afford to spend \$1 billion next year toward eliminating water pollution.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the gentleman agree, if you look at the chart, that one could argue effectively they are not appropriating anything for 1970 because actually the \$600 million they are recommending in this bill does not even meet the \$247 and the \$486 million they short-changed us in 1968 and 1969?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, what a ridiculous situation comes out here this afternoon when the gentleman from Ohio offers this amendment to increase this money by \$400 million to provide eventually clean drinking water for 15, 20, or 25 million families, and then to hear Members of this House oppose this amendment.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, life, in every conceivable form, is dependent for its very existence, on water. Nowhere in this country do we see this precious commodity so threatened as in Lake Erie. Unless drastic action is taken to control the threat of water pollution, the present condition of this virtually dead lake could be a foreboding of what lies ahead for many more of our Nation's waterways.

In 1965, the U.S. Public Health Service estimated that the cleanup of Lake Erie at that time, without provision for future control, would be a \$75-billion program. They projected that failure to take this remedial action would lead to the complete death of the lake—the point at which it would be unable to support any form of life.

Although one might conclude that such dire predictions would not be ignored, industrial and municipal pollutants continue to be dumped into Lake Erie daily. Nearly 1½ million pounds of pollution discharge into Lake Erie from just one source—the Detroit River. In addition, the bacteria count in the Cuyahoga River which flows into Lake Erie is four times the level expected in an ordinary stream of raw sewage.

It has been estimated that it will cost \$100,000 per year simply to remove the floating debris from the few square miles of the Potomac River in the District of Columbia area. Lake Erie, on the other hand, covers a surface area of 9,910 square miles. The pollution, however, has penetrated far below the surface. Vast areas of bottomland are devoid of oxygen, and the deoxygenated areas are expanding. The longer we procrastinate in the halting of this continuously spreading blight, the more difficult—and more expensive—it will become to control this threat to the more than 11 mil-

lion Americans who depend on Lake Erie.

Prior to the passage of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, the assessment of blame for the polluted condition was on the persons in the specific areas who tolerated the industrial and municipal sewage and waste pollutants that were dumped into the waters. Finally, we have recognized that it is not solely a local area problem, but one of national concern and responsibility.

Despite the recognition by Congress of the problem and commitments to take the lead in the fight against water pollution, the Federal Government has spent just over \$200 million per year during the past 2 years for pollution control. The city of Cleveland alone, with a population of approximately 835,000, has voted a \$100 million bond issue for better waste-treatment facilities, relying on Federal participation.

If we are to achieve those goals contained in our commitment, we must appropriate the full \$1 billion authorized in 1966. Settling for anything less would be compromising the present and future welfare of our great Nation. A token appropriation at this time will not lead to a solution.

I urge the approval of the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague (Mr. MINSHALL) of the amount of \$1 billion, which is necessary to meet the catastrophic conditions that exist and will multiply unless we take a firm stand to eradicate water pollution, which is a national problem and a responsibility of great magnitude.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak out on behalf of appropriating the full \$1 billion for waste treatment plant construction grants in the public works appropriations bill—H.R. 14159—under consideration today.

We have heard a lot about "compromising" and I fully understand that this procedure is both prudent and necessary at times. However, the \$1 billion itself was a compromise. To further compromise a compromise, in my opinion, is to make a gesture that can border on dereliction of duty.

For the benefit of newcomers to this body, or for those who have forgotten, I should like to outline what happened when this authorization was enacted back in 1966.

First, however, let us examine the situation in perspective.

Earlier this year, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration issued a report on the cost of water pollution abatement and control. The report shows that, if costs continue to rise, the total bill is expected to amount to \$26 to \$29 billion in the next 5 years. Broken down, this is \$8 billion for municipal works, \$6.2 billion for sanitary sewer construction, \$2.6 to \$4.6 billion for industrial waste treatment plus another \$1.8 billion for cooling equipment, and \$5.3 billion to \$5.7 billion for municipal and industrial operating and maintenance costs.

You will recall that this authorization was contained in the Clean Waters

Restoration Act of 1965—an enactment somewhat overoptimistically named. Prior to passage of this landmark legislation, the Secretary of the Interior asked for \$3.45 billion over a 6-year period. The Senate, however, allowed \$6 billion over 5 years while the House granted initially only \$2.3 billion for the same period. The final authorization of \$3.4 billion over 4 years thus was a compromise.

However, even though many States went ahead with their commitments on the assurance that Federal help would be forthcoming, the Congress has not come through. In fiscal 1968, we allowed only \$203 million of the \$450 million authorized. In 1969, the figure was \$214 million on an authorization of \$700 million. Thus, we are already far behind in meeting our commitments. Anything less than the full \$1 billion authorized will compound the problem.

The reluctance to appropriate the Federal share sometimes is difficult to understand when poll after poll, conducted by Members of the House among their constituents as well as by national surveying organizations, reveal a deep concern on the part of the public.

A survey conducted earlier this year by the Gallup Organization, Inc., for the National Wildlife Federation showed that three-fourths of the people are concerned about contamination of the environment and 73 percent are willing to pay additional taxes to improve their natural surroundings.

Since 1964, the voters of nine States have voted in statewide elections on water pollution control bond issues. Of these nine, seven were approved and the other two attracted majority voter support. Of 17,625,254 citizens who voted on the nine proposals, 11,725,444—66 percent—said "yes."

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I am but one among many who feel that our national priorities need to be reviewed. And, when we do, water pollution control must rank high in the list. It is difficult to keep our eyes on the stars when standing up to our ankles in crud.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment.

The U.S. Congress put itself firmly on the record in 1966 in support of maintaining an environment of quality for all of our citizens.

The Clean Water Restoration Act authorized additional matching Federal grants to municipalities in construction of sewage plants. It also called for a steady increase over a 5-year period in funds to States, ranging from \$150 million in fiscal 1967 to \$450 million in 1968, \$711 million in 1969, \$1 billion in 1970, and \$1.25 billion in 1971.

The Appropriations Committee has now recommended—in H.R. 14159—a total of \$600 million for 1970, but this is far short of the \$1 billion that was originally authorized and is direly needed. The backlog of demands by States for these matching funds has grown to more than \$6 billion since 1966. The \$1 billion appropriations is still a paltry sum when

compared to the magnitude of the problem. The trouble with the problem of water pollution is that by the time we fully study the problem, discuss its ramifications and fund it adequately, we will have passed the point of catastrophe. Oceans, rivers, and lakes are just like any other sink; they have a finite capacity for waste, after which they clog up.

According to a report on last night's NBC special, "From Here to the Seventies," by the end of this century, two-thirds of the entire fresh water supply of this country will be polluted. The oceans will be next. Experts tell us that we have 10 years to solve this problem. I repeat, 10 years. We are living with the distinct possibility that we may drown in our own sewage. We must realize that environmental control in the 1970's will of necessity cost hundreds of billions of dollars, if we hope to begin the reversal of the tragic path we are on. We must begin to fund this program adequately and realistically. The preliminary programs which have already been established are inadequate when measured against the problem we have ahead of us. To put it candidly, the ratio of talk to action is far too high.

We are forcing cities to meet Federal water quality standards even though they do not have the Federal appropriation to help meet the programs. We are trying to recreate an environment that is safe, healthful, attractive, economically and biologically productive. In looking at the past, we know that lack of adequate funding has often resulted in deferment of programs and sometimes the permanent loss of opportunities. I personally do not think that we can afford not to appropriate the full \$1 billion, we cannot delay any action that will stop the dumping of inadequately treated sewage into our waters.

We, as Members of Congress, have a strong say as to the priorities of America now and in the future. The choice must be made—are we to take the road to deterioration and destruction of our environment, or will we choose to develop an environment that not only sustains but enriches human life. Our success or failure depends on the goals we set our sights on, our willingness to establish adequate machinery to meet these goals, and appropriation of funds to preserve our environment.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there are few issues which rate a higher priority in West Virginia and the Nation than clean water and pure air. We are losing ground in our fight against water and air pollution. I cannot for the life of me figure out how Congress one week can vote \$1 billion above the President's budget for ships the Department of Defense has not asked for, and then turn around and fail to vote the necessary money to protect our environment. Unless we clean up the air we breathe and the water we drink, this Nation will not have much left to defend with our huge military expenditures.

I believe that the State of West Virginia has fallen down on the job in our

efforts to get cleaner water. If this amendment should fail, I feel that part of the responsibility falls on the State of West Virginia. In today's RECORD, commencing on page 28834, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) who has done such herculean work in leading the fight for clean water, has included communications from officials of nearly every State setting forth the needs of the States in graphic terms. I regret very much that no information has been supplied by the State of West Virginia, and a few minutes ago I asked the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) the reason for the omission. He commented that although he had asked for and received information from every other State, the State of West Virginia had failed to respond to the inquiry.

As far as I can ascertain, West Virginia will need \$55 million in Federal assistance during the fiscal years 1969 through 1973 to help build waste treatment works. If the pending amendment fails, West Virginia will receive only \$6,646,700; if the amendment succeeds, West Virginia will receive \$10,840,700. I certainly hope that this amendment passes, because the total authorization of \$1 billion is sorely needed throughout the Nation in order to fight water pollution.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give you the position of one who has always lived in the city and like so many who have grown up in our city's streets has been appalled by the despoliation of our natural resources.

Only a quarter of a century ago Loren Eiseley wrote:

If there is magic on this planet, it is contained in water.

The magic of water is not limited to the esthetics of water, but it is in the fact that water is the essential link that both supports and provides the environmental medium for life in our ecology. We in this country are witnessing the death of water's splendor, as our lakes have become devoid of life and as our garbage-strewn rivers spew their filth into the sea.

Our expanding population and technology has required more agriculture and industry. Each requires more water and has produced more wastes. The increased demand on water will continue with the spiraling complexity of our society. New chemical compounds in agriculture and industry are daily released into our environment in quantities which are poisoning it for those now alive and perhaps beyond repair for our future generations. We must undertake to improve our environment in order for it to continue to support mankind and protect it from the savage attacks man has made upon it. We have soiled our own well.

Our country and our world have seen the trends of urbanization to the point that more than 70 percent of this Nation's population now inhabits a mere 1 percent of our space. The future will see this density rise, making our ecological problems more acute. Waterborne

wastes in metropolitan areas do more than destroy the physical beauty that relieves the oppressiveness of the city, prevent water-related recreation, and deny water its miracle of life.

Manhattan is one of the country's most densely populated areas, and every day New York City produces 1,400 million gallons of raw sewage. Currently, only 1,000 million gallons are treated per day in the existing sewage treatment plants for that area which leaves 400 million gallons of raw sewage to be dumped directly into New York rivers.

The Hudson River, which once was a scenic resource, is now an open sewer between Albany and Manhattan. Daily, rivers such as the Hudson and East receive untreated sewage, the effluent of riverside factories. And the problem mounts as the volume of the wastes increase.

We must recognize the inadequacy of this year's \$600 million appropriation. In 1965 the Water Quality Act authorized a concerted nationwide attack on water pollution. And in 1966 the Clean Water Restoration Act authorized Federal matching grants to local governments for treatment plant construction between 1967 and 1971.

These are the important Federal programs now contending with water pollution. However, we are not meeting these projects fiscally, as last week Congress only appropriated three-fifths of the funds required to continue projects of the Clean Water Restoration Act for fiscal year 1970. Between the additional \$400 million needed for 1970 programs and gaps between requests and appropriations for the last 5 years, the program is now short \$1,126,000,000 of the \$2½ billion originally designed for 6 years' work.

The fiscal dilemma is especially difficult for New York City. Currently, there are 13 sewage treatment plants in New York City, one of which will be abandoned. Two more plants are to be built. The present estimated construction costs for the 14 total plants in New York City amounts to \$934 million which may be increased during the actual construction depending upon engineering feasibility of the existing plans. New York State pays 30 percent of the construction costs and can pay an additional 30 percent of prefunded construction costs while Federal grants from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration under the Clean Water Act of 1966 can amount to 55 percent of the total cost. These figures represent the maximum cost sharing percentages of the FWPCA grant formula. Instead of paying the 55 percent, the Federal Government is in fact now paying only 1 percent.

Federal funding is made on a per capita basis according to State rather than on the criterion of need which does not rationally deal with this problem. Hence, in addition to the need to fully fund the water restoration program we must work to reorient the program by redesigning the grant formula so it will realistically respond to the needs of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, let this 91st Congress be remembered as one which held dear the goal of clean water and provided the moneys to achieve that mission.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, the Nation, the President, and the Congress are all against inflation; and Government spending has been labeled a major factor to be controlled. Yet within any given budget limit, there must be choices made and priorities set. That is what this bill before us today does—it sets a high priority for action to restore the quality of our lakes, streams, and estuaries.

Thus, I do not believe that arguments against the full \$1 billion appropriation on the basis of fiscal conservatism are sound. The total Federal budget may well be limited, possibly by an expenditures control act as occurred in 1968—but the willpower and the purse power of the taxpayers are behind water pollution control and the Congress has a clear responsibility to legislate.

Furthermore, we are only asking that we live up to our own authorization passed in the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. In that act, on the basis of years of study, testimony, and surveys of State and local community needs, a financing and construction program was agreed upon. The bill passed both Houses with hardly a single dissenting vote. The echoes of speeches supporting clean water are still ringing in this Chamber. Representatives and Senators have been congratulating themselves ever since on their leadership role in bringing Government powers to bear on pollution.

I do not demean our authorizing legislation. Rather I applaud it and regard it as right today as it was right in 1966. The Congress did know what was needed and nothing in the intervening years has come to light to lessen the conviction with which we acted.

But there is more than a little hypocrisy in our appropriations for grants for sewage treatment plant construction since the glorious days of the authorization act. In 1968 we appropriated \$203 million instead of \$450 million authorized; 1969, \$214 million out of \$750 million and this fiscal year the authorized amount is \$1 billion. So the question is one of sincerity of purpose as well as setting a scale of priorities for the financial resources of the world's richest Nation.

Let us match our authorization rhetoric with appropriation dollars so as to realize abatement results.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) to provide \$1 billion for Federal aid to local water pollution control programs. I commend his extensive and energetic efforts in the cause of cleaner water for all Americans. I believe that in light of the high water quality standards which Congress has set for States and local communities throughout the Nation, we must take the next step of providing sufficient Federal financial assist-

ance to help them achieve those standards.

The Public Works Subcommittee increased the amount for construction grants for local waste treatment facilities from the totally inadequate amount—\$214 million—requested by the administration. The subcommittee is to be commended for its action in raising this amount to \$450 million. The full Appropriations Committee increased the amount still further, to \$600 million. This, too, deserves the thanks of all of us interested in cleaner water for our citizens.

But, Mr. Chairman, these increases by the subcommittee and full committee are still not enough. The proper amount must be measured not by what the administration requested—for that amount is inadequate by anyone's standards. The two measures ought to be: first, what this Congress authorized when it enacted legislation authorizing Federal aid for construction of local waste treatment facilities; and second, the backlog of requests which the Water Pollution Control Administration already has received from local governments which want Federal funds to aid such construction. By both of these standards, we are obligated to pass the Dingell amendment. We have made promises to the local communities and to our constituents; now it is time for us to ante up. Nothing less than the \$1 billion figure will fulfill our commitment to our citizens and meet the pressing need already demonstrated by requests for Federal assistance now awaiting action.

Mr. Chairman, anybody can talk about clean water. None of us can walk on the water but we must stand on it. Now is the time for those who really care about the quality of water Americans must swim in, live with, and drink, to really do something about it. The figures which the gentleman from Michigan has put in the Record show how much each of our States will benefit from the additional funding in his amendment. If we really feel that turning the tide of environmental spoliation is a job worth doing, if we really want to keep our promises to America about cleaner and safer water, then we must pass this amendment.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, Tuesday night the National Broadcasting Co. televised a 2½-hour program entitled "From Here to the Seventies."

Its purpose was to highlight the turbulent events of the sixties and to use these as a basis to project what problems we will face and how they might be resolved in the seventies.

This was a fine program.

It highlighted the key issues before the country today. One of these the program hit hard was pollution. Pollution in all forms, including pollution of our Nation's waters. The point was made that experts in the field indicate we have less than 10 years to find ways and means of cleaning up our polluted waters. If we fail to so act, we will have destroyed this very land we love. We will be left with

nothing but our empty technology, our towering buildings, and a land that has lost its great natural assets.

You and I are aware of this. The American public is aware of this. I believe the people are ahead of us. They want action, and action now.

Today we have the opportunity to provide some of that action. Today we have the chance to finally place some meat on the skeleton of the water pollution program, to start to breathe life into it and to move it forward so that our waters can be restored.

Some will say you have the budget. Others will say you have inflation. Others will say, what about your priorities. To all this, I say priorities, indeed. Budget, indeed. Inflation, indeed. There is no more important priority than the protection of our country and our well-being. This is a must. The funding for the program you are asked to adopt today will be a signal that we do indeed consider the preservation of the country top priority.

We can wait no longer. I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in 1950, my father, serving as chairman of the National Security Resources Board commissioned a study of resources which indicated that in a quarter of a century the resource which would suffer the most serious depletion was clean, fresh water. Like many such reports, it was received with the indifference of a nation engaged in more pressing commitments. Twenty-five years seemed a long time. Fifteen passed before the Clean Water Act was passed. Never fully funding it, we are actually asking ourselves today whether we can afford to turn back the tide of pollution at its crest. It is no longer a question of putting a finger in the dike. There is no dike. We have a dead lake to show for it, and many a dying one.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration reports that 4,525 State and local projects are being developed which will call for \$2.3 billion in Federal aid in constructing water facilities having a total cost of \$5.1 billion. Others doubtless will be proposed later but these early plans demonstrate the urgency of the need.

Under the pollution abatement construction grants—the primary program funded under the Clean Water Restoration Act—Missouri last year received \$4.9 million for primary and secondary treatment plant construction. This level of funds was, as is the present administration request for Missouri, at least three times below the level of funds needed for pollution abatement construction in our State. Jack Smith, executive secretary of the Missouri Water Pollution Control Administration, has estimated that the need stands at more than \$14 million. There are 42 cities in Missouri, including our own St. Louis metropolitan area, which require and are eligible for funds for primary and secondary treatment plant construction. Even the committee provision for Missouri, in the

amount of \$10,368,900, is less than sufficient for the pressing need throughout the State.

The Second District of Missouri has seven project applications for water pollution control funds. The total estimated cost of the projects is \$18,519,722. One-third of this or \$6,000,136 is being requested from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. The Metropolitan St. Louis area has applied for seven different grants under this program. Other applicants include the St. Louis Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer District and the city of Ballwin.

Mr. Chairman, some years ago I described St. Louis as—

The fairest of the daughters
Born on a journey wild
Of the Father of the Waters;
The Mississippi's child.

That vagabond has brought her
Many gifts since then
But her dowry of water
Makes her beautiful to men.

The Nation's dowry of water is threatened. Its beauty is tarnished. And we do not have 25 years to think about it. I support the amendment.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL. I wish to commend my colleague from Cleveland and tell him how much I appreciate his support of the amendment I have previously offered. I know that he has long been in the forefront of the effort to obtain clean water in Lake Erie, and to obtain additional money for bringing about an end to the pollution problem of Lake Erie. I hope the amendment will pass.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank my able colleague for his kind and generous remarks.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio for offering the amendment which was to be offered by and on behalf of seven of us today, by Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. REUSS, and the present Speaker in the well.

I would like to begin by stating that I believe it is important that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by reading the remarks of Secretary Hickel, which I believe tend to set out in some clarity the reasons why the House should adopt this amendment. I quote from an article published in the Chicago Tribune dated September 20, 1969, as follows:

MUST HAVE MONEY

"The technology for cleanup is here," Hickel told the Executives Club of Chicago. "But without money, we cannot do the job. And during the administration's current fight against inflation the prospects for sizable increases in appropriations for the financing of new municipal waste treatment plants are not only slim, but will not solve the problem. So we must innovate.

Hickel said it is futile to depend on the conventional congressional appropriations method to solve a problem that has been building for the last 30 years. Congress never appropriates funds for water pollution con-

trol grants in the amount that it authorizes, he said.

Congress had authorized a billion dollars for water pollution control grants in 1970, but it has indicated 214 million dollars will be appropriated.

"This may sound like big money," said Hickel, "but we now find that one-billion dollars will be merely a token sum compared to what we really need. We have come to the realization that we must spend a much larger amount of money and that we would spend it regardless of what that amount is."

Mr. Chairman, my remarks on this amendment appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which appeared on the desks of Members of Congress today at page 28834 and following.

They set out the responses received by me from Governors and from organizations and from individuals, and they set out a number of circumstances, including editorial comments in matters of this kind, which I believe make clear the needs before us.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, certainly the gentleman from Michigan has been in the forefront in the fight for water pollution control funds. But I would like to inform the gentleman from Michigan that Secretary Hickel and I yesterday had a conversation, which is more current than the gentleman's testimony, in which the Secretary said that we should hold the line at \$214 million on account of inflation, but he said that in no event should we go beyond \$600 million. He said if we do, he would have excess funds which he could not obligate and could not commit, and he would have to tool up and get more people, and he could not obligate this amount of money at this time.

Mr. DINGELL. Let me comment, Mr. Chairman.

The gentleman from Tennessee and his committee have done a good job, and I wish to praise the gentleman and the committee, because raising this figure to \$600 million in the committee and subcommittee was a great achievement and deserves the compliments of all of us.

But let me also say, the money we are appropriating today is then available until expended. Second, it is spent rather slowly. According to the Department of the Interior, only 5 percent will be spent in the first year, 20 percent in the second year, 40 percent in the third year, 30 percent in the fifth year, and 5 percent during the last year.

In 18 months the funds we appropriate today—and I am satisfied the House is going to do this thing—will be eligible for reallocation and can be reallocated on any basis, on the basis of need or on a basis of reimbursement.

If we fail to vote this fund today, it means that cleanup will be set back as much as 2 years or as much as 5 years, depending on when we bring this fight to the floor again.

The Senate has already adopted an amendment offered by the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), which would authorize the utilization of a portion of

this fund for reimbursement to meet the needs of the States which have spent so much money, such as New York State.

If the Members will look at my remarks in the RECORD of yesterday, they will see I have referred to the levels of allocation for reimbursement and other things of that kind.

Another thing to remember is this. The committee that handles water pollution, the Committee on Public Works, has already indicated it is possible and they will shortly begin their endeavors to arrive at a better formula, so I think the question of formula and matters of that kind are not necessary to be discussed now.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am sure I speak for many Members of the House in commending our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, who is in the well, for the Herculean effort he has put forward in offering this amendment. He has gotten 220 Members to join him in offering this amendment. I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan on his tremendous achievement. I am sure many people in the country will benefit from the gentleman's efforts.

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

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan mentioned the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, Senator JAVITS, which was adopted in committee in the other body.

The dean of the House had a short colloquy, which the gentleman from Connecticut alluded to, and I would simply reiterate what the gentleman from Michigan said about the need to rework the formula and to meet the needs of the States, such as New York, and the problem mentioned by the gentleman from Connecticut and alluded to by the dean of the House.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned that Secretary Hickel referred to the failure of this House to appropriate funds. Not only did that appear in the Chicago Tribune, but it also appeared in the Committee on Public Works, where Secretary Klein said that it should be noted the level of expenditures outlined in the State program plans is strongly influenced, by the authorizations approved in providing and maintaining adequate programs for the communities.

The quote follows:

It should be noted that the level of investment outlined in State Program Plans is strongly conditioned by the anticipated level of Federal assistance. Therefore, unless this rate of investment is increased, the Nation will fall behind in its goal of providing and maintaining adequate waste treatment for its sewered communities.

Mr. Chairman, at this point in the RECORD, I offer a further collection of letters and telegrams, in support of full funding of the grant program to support construction of water pollution abate-

ment facilities under Public Law 660 as amended:

OCTOBER 1, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL, HON. JOHN BLATNIK, HON. JOHN SAYLOR, HON. HENRY REUSS, HON. MICHAEL FEIGHAN, HON. JIM WRIGHT, HON. PAUL McCLOSKEY, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: Congratulations on your efforts and those of your many colleagues to secure full funding, to wit \$1 billion, for the Clean Water Restoration Act. Conservation, labor, and many other citizen, civic and professional organizations, representing millions of concerned people, firmly believe water pollution prevention and abatement should be given very high national priority. Only full funding for the Clean Water Restoration Act will restore public confidence and meet expectations for progress in cleaning up the Nation's waters. You have our full and wholehearted support.

SIGNERS

American Association of University Women.

American Society for Landscape Architects.

Pollution Control Administrators.

Association of Interpretive Naturalists.

Consumer Federation of America.

League of Women Voters of the United States.

The National Wildlife Federation.

United Steelworkers of America.

National Audubon Society.

Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

The Wilderness Society.

The Conservation Foundation.

American Fisheries Society.

Sport Fishing Institute.

The Long Island Environmental Council.

The Adirondack Mountain Club.

The Sierra Club.

The United Auto Workers.

National League of Cities.

National Conference of Mayors.

National Consumers League.

The Wildlife Society.

Oyster Institute of North America.

Trout Unlimited.

Wildlife Management Institute.

Northern Virginia Conservation Council.

Citizens Council for Clean Potomac.

Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Association.

National Recreation and Parks Association.

National Fisheries Institute.

Conservation Committee, the Garden Club of America.

American Institute of Planners.

American Institute of Architects.

Izaak Walton League of America.

LANSING, MICH., October 8, 1969.

Representative JOHN DINGELL, Washington, D.C.:

Today, Michigan sold the first \$30 million of \$335 million clean water bonds mandated by Michigan citizens last November. Again, I and all Michigan citizens urge your support for full funding for the Clean Water Restoration Act for fiscal year 1970 so that adequate State and Federal funds are made available to Michigan communities to achieve our water pollution control goals. I sincerely hope you can lend your support to this timely and vital measure.

WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN, Governor.

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 7, 1969.

Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Society of American Foresters greatly appreciate the efforts you and your colleagues are making to secure funding for restoring the quality of the Nation's water. We trust your efforts will be successful.

H. R. GLASCOCK, Jr., Executive Secretary.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS., October 7, 1969.

Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

We would like to know which Mass. Congressmen are not supporting your fight for a billion dollars for water pollution control. We may start a petition to urge them to vote the full amount.

MISS JEAN MOCZULEWSKI.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., October 7, 1969.

Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, Washington, D.C.:

I urge your support of full funding of "clean water bill."

PETER M. WEGE.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., October 7, 1969.

Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your efforts to obtain one billion dollars appropriation for clean water.

WEST MICHIGAN ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION COUNCIL.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., October 8, 1969.

Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Michigan division of the Izaak Walton League favors the appropriation of one billion dollars for the clean water restoration program.

JACK C. LONDON, President.

Mr. Chairman, I also insert editorials of a group of newspapers in support of our effort for full funding:

KEEPING PROMISES

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 1969]

Several months ago, we were critical of Congress for retreating from its commitment to the states and localities to provide \$1 billion in matching grants for water pollution control. What bothered us at the time was not so much the enforced slowdown in this important program but rather the immorality involved in mousetrapping local governments into commitments they can ill afford, and then not coming across.

In this context, it is especially gratifying to note that over 220 congressmen have gone on record as favoring the full \$1 billion appropriation for waste treatment plants. At present, the House money bill contains \$600 million for this program—itsself a considerable improvement over the \$214 million originally earmarked. Interested lawmakers will offer an amendment on the House floor this week to up that to \$1 billion. If they all vote the way they have talked, this amendment should sail through easily.

The next move would then be up to the Senate. To date there has not been a comparable show of support in the other chamber for a full-funding of the water pollution program. But this is perhaps because the quite remarkable groundswell of concerned public opinion on this subject has so far been focused on the House.

It should be understood, of course, that this is definitely a time when budgetary restraint is indicated. Accordingly, a number of important government programs are in imminent danger of severe cutbacks. Even so, there are two good reasons for not stinting on water pollution control, quite apart from its merit as a program. First, local governments have already been induced to commit their own limited resources for this purpose. And second, there appears to be broad public support for the program. In this case at least, there is reason to give the public what it wants.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 7, 1969]

DOLLARS AGAINST POLLUTION

SIR: During the past several months more than 220 members of Congress, dozens of state governors and mayors, 40 national organizations and a good segment of the American public have worked diligently to rescue the Clean Water Restoration Act from fiscal oblivion.

This effort has cut across party lines and political thought. It has united organizations and men often opposed to each other. It has resulted in one of the most unusual coalitions ever to come out of Washington, the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water, consisting of conservation, labor, consumer, professional and industrial organizations. It has challenged the Bureau of the Budget's Keynesian assumption that any federal program can be meat-axed for inflation without public censure—even one that is vital to the restoration of the nation's waters. It has articulated public demands for a healthier and saner environment and public willingness to see a greater share of its tax dollar used to that end. It has, in the words of the New York Times rejected the "hypocritical Congressional practice of passing grandiose programs only to undermine them later by quietly slashing appropriations that are vital to their fulfillment." And it has created the climate for major debate on the floor of the House when the public works appropriations bill comes to a vote this week.

This week the public works appropriations bill comes to a vote in the House. An amendment to increase the Committee's \$600 million recommendation to the full \$1 billion Congress authorized in 1966 will be offered. At least 220 Members of Congress, to their great credit, have indicated their determination to win the day for cleaner waters for the nation. The \$1 billion to be sought will help take care of a \$2.5 billion backlog created by consistent underfunding. It will only begin to touch \$8 billion worth of water pollutants.

TED PANKOWSKI,

Conservation Associate, The Izaak Walton League of America.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., October 7, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: A bipartisan coalition—Citizens Crusade for Clean Water—has been working to develop support for the full funding of the war against water pollution. The coalition also represents many labor, conservation, municipal and state groups.

The original budget request of \$214 million has been increased to \$600 million by the Appropriations Committee. But this amount falls far short of the \$1 billion authorization and has a serious impact on the states' progress toward construction of necessary water pollution abatement works.

Just recently, the House Armed Services Committee increased the military authorization by \$1 billion over Nixon's request. It is inconceivable that, at a time when there is a serious questioning of our ability to reorder national priorities, Congress is unwilling to commit itself at least to its own authorization goal.

We urge that you vote to amend the Appropriation Committees' recommendation so that the full \$1 billion will be made available to local communities to construct waste treatment plants.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. SHEEHAN,
Legislative Director.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF OHIO,
Columbus, Ohio, October 7, 1969.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Mrs. Clusen of the League of Women Voters tells me you are

interested in putting news clippings re need for funds for sewage treatment in Congressional Record right up to day House considers appropriations bill—These may be too late but if you can use any of 12 enclosed please do—I do hope you can return them to me—I would like very much to have them back for our record—thank you—

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. HOWARD T. MOORE,
Water Reservoir Chairman.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer,
Sept. 30, 1969]

CLEAN WATER MONEY

There is good news from Washington in the fight against water pollution.

A majority of congressmen—219 so far—have pledged to fight for an appropriation of \$1 billion in fiscal 1970 to help cities and states build wastewater treatment plants.

The pledges were lined up by Rep. John D. Dingell, D-Mich., Rep. Michael J. Feighan, D-21, of Cleveland and five colleagues in the House who formed an ad hoc committee to attain a higher priority for the long-neglected battle for pollution control.

Like other domestic programs, the cleanup effort initiated by the Clean Water Act of 1966 was pushed into the background because of spending on the Vietnam war. From the beginning, appropriations fell short of the authorizations. Both the Johnson and Nixon administrations, for example budgeted only \$214 million for sewage plant grants in fiscal 1970, although Congress had authorized \$1 billion.

Now Congress is saying that regardless of the war and in spite of a general desire to reduce federal spending, water pollution must be attacked. The battle can be put off no longer.

We like that sentiment. We have argued for it a good many months. We believe Congress should appropriate the full \$1 billion. It will be the best \$1 billion ever spent, helping hundreds of communities across the country to build treatment plants that simply must be built to protect a precarious resource from ruin.

[From the Findlay (Ohio) Republican
Courier, Aug. 28, 1969]

LWV SAYS ONLY NINE OHIO CONGRESSMEN FAVOR MORE MONEY FOR SEWAGE TREATMENT

COLUMBUS.—Only nine of Ohio's 24 congressmen are supporting a move to raise the federal appropriation to construct sewage treatment facilities, the Ohio League of Women Voters said Wednesday.

Although \$1 billion was authorized for that purpose in fiscal 1970, the league said it is likely only the \$214 million suggested in President Nixon's budget will be forthcoming.

The league, part of a 35-member national organization called the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water, is trying to get the appropriation hiked.

Mrs. Carolyn Moore, representing the league, said 218 votes are needed in the U.S. House of Representatives to bring about the increase. Only 160 are committed, she said.

Only nine Ohio congressmen have said they will work for the boost, Mrs. Moore told a news conference. She urged Ohioans to write letters to the others.

Ned Williams, executive director of the Ohio Water Development Authority, said the \$214 million now earmarked would mean that Ohio would receive \$9.4 million, the same as last year.

Over the next 5 years, he said the same amount each year would still leave a deficit of \$302 million in cleaning up a backlog of work that should be done now.

"As of March 1969, there were 224 communities on orders from the Ohio Water Pollution Control Board to construct additional sewage treatment facilities," he said.

The cost of the construction, he said,

would be \$459 million at 1969 prices. This, he said, includes only construction and not the cost of collection systems and other improvements.

Mrs. Moore noted that Ohioans favor water pollution control "but these 15 congressmen are still hesitant." A \$100 million bond issue for water pollution was approved by Ohioans last November.

In addition, the legislature passed the bill allocating the money and set it up so the \$100 million could be used as seed money for loans to help municipalities build facilities.

If more federal money is made available, he said, it will mean the seed money can go to finance facilities other than treatment plants.

"The city of Cleveland alone estimates the cost of cleaning up all pollution at \$1.5 billion," Williams said. "The total in the state could exceed \$10 billion."

The U.S. House is expected to take up the issue Sept. 10, Mrs. Moore said.

The nine Ohio Congressmen supporting the boost were listed as William Harsha, Thomas Ashley, J. William Stanton, Charles A. Mosher, Wayne Hays, Michael A. Feighan, Charles A. Vanik, William E. Minshall and Donald E. Lukens.

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times,
Aug. 28, 1969]

HARSHA FOR BILL TO FIGHT POLLUTION

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—While Ohioans favor water pollution control efforts, 15 Ohio congressmen still are hesitant to seek more money for sewage treatment facilities, the League of Women Voters says.

Carolyn Moore, representing the league, told newsmen Wednesday that voter approval last November of a \$100 million bond issue for water pollution was an indication that Ohioans want to clean up their lakes and waterways.

But, she said, only nine of Ohio's 24 congressmen have come out in support of a move to raise the federal appropriation to construct sewage treatment facilities.

The nine include Portsmouth's William H. Harsha Jr., 6th District Republican.

Although \$1 billion was authorized for that purpose in fiscal 1970, Mrs. Moore said, it is likely only the \$214 million suggested in President Nixon's budget will be forthcoming. She said 218 votes are needed in the House to raise the appropriation, and only 160 are committed so far.

Mrs. Moore urged Ohioans to write to their congressmen in support of the increase. She said the House is expected to take up the issue Sept. 10.

The league is a member of the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water, a coalition of 35 groups seeking to get the appropriation hiked.

Ned Williams, executive director of the Ohio Water Development Authority, also spoke at the news conference in favor of increasing the federal funds.

He said the \$214 million now earmarked would mean Ohio would receive \$9.4 million, the same as last year. The same amount each year over the next five years would leave a deficit of \$302 million in cleaning up a backlog of work that should be done now, he said.

"As of March 1969, there were 224 communities on orders from the Ohio Water Pollution Control board to construct additional sewage treatment facilities," he said.

The cost of this construction, Williams said, would be \$459 million at 1969 prices.

[From the Steubenville (Ohio) Herald Star,
Aug. 28, 1969]

HAYS SUPPORTS APPROPRIATION HIKE: 15 OHIO CONGRESSMEN DO NOT FAVOR INCREASES

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—While Ohioans favor water pollution control efforts, 15 Ohio congressmen still are hesitant to seek more money for sewage treatment facilities, the League of Women Voters says.

Carolyn Moore, representing the league, told newsmen Wednesday that voter approval last November of a \$100 million bond issue for water pollution was an indication that Ohioans want to clean up their lakes and waterways.

But, she said, only nine of Ohio's 22 congressmen have come out in support of a move to raise the federal appropriation to construct sewage treatment facilities.

Although \$1 billion was authorized for that purpose in fiscal 1970, Mrs. Moore said, it is likely only the \$214 million suggested in President Nixon's budget will be forthcoming.

218 VOTES NEEDED

She said 218 votes are needed in the House to raise the appropriation, and only 160 are committed so far.

Mrs. Moore urged Ohioans to write to their congressmen in support of the increase. She said the House is expected to take up the issue Sept. 10.

The league is a member of the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water, a coalition of 35 groups seeking to get the appropriation hiked.

Ned Williams, executive director of the Ohio Water Development Authority, also spoke at the news conference in favor of increasing the federal funds.

HAYS BACKS INCREASE

The cost of this construction, Williams said, would be \$459 million at 1969 prices.

He added that the cost of eliminating all water pollution in Ohio could exceed \$10 billion.

The nine Ohio congressmen listed as supporting the appropriation increase were William Harsha, Thomas Ashley, J. William Stanton, Charles A. Mosher, Wayne Hays, Michael A. Feighan, Charles A. Vanik, William E. Minshall and Donald E. Lukens.

[From the Marietta (Ohio) Daily Times, Aug. 28, 1969]

URGE VOTERS TO SEEK INCREASE IN FEDERAL AID

COLUMBUS.—Ohio residents have been asked to write their congressmen urging an increase in federal aid for sewage treatment facilities to help fight water pollution.

The League of Women Voters of Ohio told a news conference Wednesday that voters should contact their representatives in Washington quickly, before a vote is taken next month on the appropriation for construction grants for treatment facilities.

Mrs. Carolyn Moore, the league's water pollution specialist, said that although \$1 billion is authorized for treatment plant construction next year, it is likely that a House Appropriations subcommittee will recommend only \$214 million when Congress returns in September.

Mrs. Moore said 160 congressmen have pledged to support an increase in the appropriation.

"But there are many congressmen as yet uncommitted, and it is these men that we would like to reach," she said. "We want to encourage each citizen in Ohio to write a letter to his congressman urging that he join those who support increased appropriations."

Only nine of Ohio's 24 congressmen support higher grants, Mrs. Moore said.

Ned E. Williams, executive director of the Ohio Water Development Authority, told the news conference that Ohio would receive only \$9.4 million under the current proposal as recommended by the Nixon administration.

Williams said this would mean Ohio would be able to construct only \$31 million worth of sewage treatment facilities per year, and the state already has ordered construction of \$459 million worth of community projects.

However, Williams said that if Congress is persuaded to raise the appropriation to \$1 billion as suggested by the League of Women

Voters, Ohio will receive \$43.9 million a year, other sources will provide \$102 million, and the state will be able to more than wipe out its construction deficit in five years.

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade, Sept. 8, 1969]

LATTA SUPPORTS FULL WATER FUND: WANTS ORIGINAL \$1 BILLION GRANTED

(By Frank Kane)

WASHINGTON.—Support for the drive to win appropriation of the \$1 billion originally authorized for construction grants to curb water pollution has been voiced by Rep. Delbert Latta (R., Bowling Green).

Mr. Latta, whose fifth congressional district includes part of Toledo, said that Congress recognized the paramount importance of cleaning up the nation's lakes and rivers when it passed the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

FORMULA ADOPTED

At that time, a formula was adopted which called for spending \$700 million in federal funds in fiscal 1969, but Congress appropriated only \$214 million. The act authorized \$1 billion for fiscal 1970, but the Administration has requested only \$214 million again.

"I understand the Administration's budgetary difficulties, but I believe that one of our priorities should be clean water for all Americans," Mr. Latta said.

CALLS FUNDS ESSENTIAL

He termed it essential that congress provide the \$1 billion because "We cannot afford any unnecessary delay which would increase the ultimate cost of abating pollution" or would endanger the health and welfare of Ohioans.

Rep. Thomas L. Ashley also is supporting the campaign to provide the full \$1 billion.

[From the Sandusky (Ohio) Register, Aug. 28, 1969]

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS URGE AID FOR SEWAGE FACILITIES

COLUMBUS.—Ohio residents have been asked to write their congressmen urging an increase in federal aid for sewage treatment facilities to help fight water pollution.

The League of Women Voters of Ohio told a news conference Wednesday that voters should contact their representatives in Washington quickly, before a vote is taken next month on the appropriation for construction grants for treatment facilities.

Mrs. Carolyn Moore, the league's water pollution specialist, said that although \$1 billion is authorized for treatment plant construction next year, it is likely that a House Appropriations subcommittee will recommend only \$214 million when Congress returns in September.

Mrs. Moore said 160 congressmen have pledged to support an increase in the appropriation.

"But there are many congressmen as yet uncommitted, and it's these men that we would like to reach," she said. "We want to encourage each citizen in Ohio to write a letter to his congressman urging that he join those who support increased appropriations."

Only nine of Ohio's 24 congressmen support higher grants, Mrs. Moore said.

Ned E. Williams, executive director of the Ohio Water Development Authority, told the news conference that Ohio would receive only \$9.4 million under the current proposal as recommended by the Nixon administration.

Williams said this would mean Ohio would be able to construct only \$31 million worth of sewage treatment facilities per year, and the state already has ordered construction of \$459 million worth of community projects.

However, Williams said that if Congress is persuaded to raise the appropriation to \$1 billion as suggested by the League of Women

other sources will provide \$102 million, and the state will be able to more than cancel out its construction deficit in five years.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal, Sept. 5, 1969]

LWV ENLISTS CLEAN WATER CRUSADERS

To the Editor:

The time has come for everyone who wants the elimination of water pollution to do something about it.

Everyone who is concerned about the deterioration of our environment should write to President Nixon, Senators Young and Saxbe, and Congressman Ayres. Tell them that you want more of the tax money you are already sending to Washington spent to clean up our lakes and streams.

The immediate issue is an appropriation for construction of sewage treatment facilities in cities with inadequate systems which dump raw sewage into lakes and streams—a major cause of water pollution.

Federal money for this purpose is to be matched by state and local money. Ohio is prepared to do its share because of the bond issue the voters have already approved.

For the last several years the need for federal money in pollution control has been far greater than the appropriations. This year the need is for \$1 billion; the administration has asked for only \$214 million. A flood of letters is needed telling the President and Congress to spend the full billion before pollution overwhelms us.

Twenty-five nationwide organizations, including the League of Women Voters, are joining in a Citizens Crusade for Clean Water. They are asking you to write now and tell Washington that the citizens want more of their federal tax money spent for Clean Water Restoration.

Several Ohio Congressmen have already joined a bi-partisan group in the House in a drive for full funding of the Clean Water Act. If Congressman Ayres has not yet joined this group, it is possible that he is waiting for expressions of interest and concern from his constituents.

Please join the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water. The future of your environment is at stake.

Mrs. JAMES R. SMALL,
President, League of
Women Voters of Akron.

[From the Newark (Ohio) Advocate and American Tribune, Sept. 2, 1969]

WOMEN VOTERS URGE OHIO WATER CLEANUP

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—While Ohioans favor water pollution control efforts, 15 Ohio congressmen still are hesitant to seek more money for sewage treatment facilities, the League of Women Voters says.

Carolyn Moore, representing the league, told newsmen Wednesday that voter approval last November of a \$100 million bond issue for water pollution was an indication that Ohioans want to clean up their lakes and waterways.

But, she said, only nine of Ohio's 24 congressmen have come out in support of a move to raise the federal appropriation to construct sewage treatment facilities.

Although \$1 billion was authorized for that purpose in fiscal 1970, Mrs. Moore said, it is likely only the \$214 million suggested in President Nixon's budget will be forthcoming.

She said 218 votes are needed in the House to raise the appropriation, and only 160 are committed so far.

Mrs. Moore urged Ohioans to write to their congressmen in support of the increase. She said the House is expected to take up the issue Sept. 10.

The league is a member of the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water, a coalition of 35 groups seeking to get the appropriation hiked.

Ned Williams, executive director of the Ohio Water Development Authority, also spoke at the news conference in favor of increasing the federal funds.

He said the \$214 million now earmarked would mean Ohio would receive \$9.4 million, the same as last year. The same amount each year over the next five years would leave a deficit of \$302 million in cleaning up a backlog of work that should be done now, he said.

"As of March 1969, there were 224 communities on orders from the Ohio Water Pollution Control Board to construct additional sewage treatment facilities," he said.

The cost of this construction, Williams said, would be \$459 million at 1969 prices.

He added that the cost of eliminating all water pollution in Ohio could exceed \$10 billion.

The nine Ohio congressmen listed as supporting the appropriation increase were William Harsha, Thomas Ashley, J. William Stanton, Charles A. Mosher, Wayne Hays, Michael A. Feighan, Charles A. Vanik, William E. Minshall and Donald E. Lukens.

[From the Upper Sandusky (Ohio) Daily Chief Union, Aug. 28, 1969]

POLLUTION BILL SHORT OF VOTES

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—While Ohioans favor water pollution control efforts, 15 Ohio congressmen still are hesitant to seek more money for sewage treatment facilities, the League of Women Voters says.

Carolyn Moore, representing the league, told newsmen Wednesday that voter approval last November of a \$100 million bond issue for water pollution was an indication that Ohioans want to clean up their lakes and waterways.

But, she said, only nine of Ohio's 24 congressmen have come out in support of a move to raise the federal appropriation to construct sewage treatment facilities.

Although \$1 billion was authorized for that purpose in fiscal 1970, Mrs. Moore said, it is likely only the \$214 million suggested in President Nixon's budget will be forthcoming.

She said 218 votes are needed in the House to raise the appropriation, and only 160 are committed so far.

Mrs. Moore urged Ohioans to write to their congressmen in support of the increase. She said the House is expected to take up the issue Sept. 10.

The league is a member of the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water, a coalition of 35 groups seeking to get the appropriation hiked.

Ned Williams, executive director of the Ohio Water Development Authority, also spoke at the news conference in favor of increasing the federal funds.

He said the \$214 million now earmarked would mean Ohio would receive \$9.4 million, the same as last year. The same amount each year over the next five years would leave a deficit of \$302 million in cleaning up a backlog of work that should be done now, he said.

[From the Ashtabula (Ohio) Star-Beacon, Sept. 23, 1969]

COUNCIL ASKS U.S. FUND FOR PURE WATER

A resolution calling for Congress to appropriate the full amount of \$1 billion for implementation of setting water quality standards was passed Monday night by Ashtabula Council.

City Manager David P. DeLuca requested the resolution be passed. He noted that the federal authorities has asked for \$214,000,000 for fiscal 1970 to set water quality standards.

The resolution calls the \$214 million "woefully inadequate" to provide for the carrying out of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

City Manager DeLuca announced that he had received preliminary reports on the

water pollution study being done by Environmental Pollution Control Inc.

"There are definite violations of the water pollution laws of Ohio," he said.

He told council that additional reports on both air and water pollution would be forthcoming. When the reports are complete he will discuss them with council.

The city manager also noted that he planned meetings with the industries involved in the pollution problem to go over the reports.

These meetings will not be open to the news media, he said, so that both sides could speak freely.

"There will be no holds barred," he said. "They've asked for facts and proof and we will furnish facts."

[From the Bowling Green (Ohio) Daily Sentinel-Tribune, Sept. 24, 1969]

WATER POLLUTION CLEANUP FUNDS ARE REQUESTED

TO THE EDITOR:

We are seeking the help of fellow citizens with a problem that is vital to Bowling Green, the State of Ohio and our nation—water pollution.

Congress has promised to help communities improve their sewage treatment plants by authorizing \$1 billion dollars for grants-in-aid for construction of such facilities. However, the amount asked by the Nixon administration for 1970 (the same amount as that appropriated under the Johnson administration) is \$214 million. Ohio's share will be only \$9.4 million.

The Ohio Pollution Control Board has ordered 224 Ohio communities to improve their sewage treatment. Ohio voters passed State Issue No. 1 last November—an indication of our willingness to spend more tax dollars for clean water. But, the \$9.4 million in federal grants, even when added to state and local monies, will not be enough to provide the estimated \$450 million for the required construction in Ohio. Funds are lacking also for separation of storm and sanitary sewer systems, collection facilities and community growth.

One-hundred and seventy representatives from both parties have already shown their concern by pledging their support for appropriation of the full \$1 billion. Thirty-five citizen organizations, including AFL-CIO, American Association of University Women, National Wildlife Federation and the U.S. Conference of Mayors have banded together in a "Citizens' Crusade for Clean Water" and are actively working for the entire \$1 billion appropriation.

Our representative, Mr. Latta, has shown continued interest in improved water quality but has not committed himself on this issue.

If you share our conviction that more of the national budget should be used to combat water pollution, please write Mr. Latta requesting his support for increased appropriations for sewage treatment construction. A concerned constituency can influence his decision.

Mrs. WILLIAM R. ROCK,
Water Resources Chairman.

Mrs. HAROLD T. HAMRE,
President, League of Women Voters of
Bowling Green, Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

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

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

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

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan on a gallant fight, and I be-

lieve an effective fight, and I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, the question which confronts us is one of priorities. We must ask ourselves how important clean water is, how dangerous and how desperate present conditions are, how much it will cost to make some substantial progress in cleaning up our polluted streams, and how much that is worth to us. Those are the questions. Once we answer those to our satisfaction, we will know how much we are willing to spend this year for clean water.

Simply as a matter of perspective, the administration's request for \$214 million would have amounted to approximately \$1.07 per citizen for the year's efforts. The committee bill would represent approximately \$3 per citizen for the year, and the amendment would be about \$5 per citizen. How much is clean water worth?

We are wasting at least 20 billion gallons of water each day by pollution. This is water which could be used and reused if treated properly. It is ravaged water, a menace to health.

This wasted water today represents better than one-fourth of the country's pure water needs.

Every major stream in the country is contaminated to an alarming degree, and the condition is getting worse.

How dangerous is a contaminated stream? A cup full of water taken from the Connecticut River near Hartford was found to contain 26 different infectious bacteria. The Hudson River which runs sluggishly through New York City could have saved the Northeast from the 1965 drought, but it is too foul to drink.

Lake Erie is described as "dying." Because it is fed by 20 grossly polluted streams, it has a dead core at its center measuring more than 2,600 square miles in which marine life cannot live.

An epidemic in Riverside, Calif., which afflicted 18,000 and claimed at least a few lives, was traced to the city's water taps.

At the level requested by the administration, \$214 million for the year, we would be losing ground in the struggle against pollution. At the level of \$600 million recommended by the Appropriations Committee, we might be just about breaking even. We might be assisting enough communities to clean up old sources of pollution at just about the same level that new sources will arise. The infection might cease to grow, but the degree of infection might be just about the same.

With \$1 billion, we can make progress. We can begin to make appreciative headway on a national basis. To do so will cost about \$5 per citizen per year. In our scale of priorities, I think that much is easily worthwhile for pure water. And I believe the American public feels the same way.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan for the remarkable job he has done on this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman in the well.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my friend.

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

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman. I should like to join the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and to thank him for his very effective leadership in this fight.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a privilege to work with him in this effort to obtain an appropriation of \$1 billion for fiscal year 1970 for the sewage treatment plant programs as authorized by the Committee on Public Works in the Clean Water Restoration Act.

All of the Members of this body are fully aware of the program. All of the Members of this body are aware of its importance. All of us are aware of the fact that the American public today sees the need for the cleanup of our waters as a paramount issue. One need only turn to the news media, the radio or television, to discover the intense interest of the American people in clean water.

Between fiscal year 1965 and fiscal year 1967, a total of \$400 million was authorized for the sewage treatment plant program, and a sum of \$407 million was made available. There was no gap in those years between authorization and appropriation, but when one looks at recent history, the gap is tremendous. For fiscal year 1968, \$450 million was authorized and \$203 million appropriated, or a difference of \$247 million not appropriated. In fiscal year 1969, when \$700 million was authorized for the program, only \$214 million was appropriated, a gap of \$486 million. Today the Appropriations Committee has increased the budget recommendation of \$214 million to \$600 million. That is a major step forward, but it is still \$400 million short of the authorized figure of \$1 billion. It is time to fund this program on the same level as the authorization. Funds authorized for this program remain available for the Secretary of the Interior until expended. If this money is not allocated for new construction during the next 18-month period, it can at the end of that period of time be reallocated to those States where a crying need exists. It can be used to reimburse those States who have been forward looking enough to face up to this problem. To those who say this money, if appropriated, cannot be used, I say the facts are to the contrary. Every cent can be put to proper use.

Of course, it is necessary to change the allocation formula. It should be on the basis of need.

To assist States such as New York, I have introduced H.R. 12956, which amends the current reallocation policy so that only those States which are currently receiving 50-percent grants will be eligible for the reallocation of unused funds. These States would divide the reallocation funds in the ratio that their

current year's allotment bears to the total of all the allotments for 50-percent States.

The Senate yesterday passed the Tydings amendment as amended by the Javits amendment to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which will assist those States such as New York and Maryland, which have advanced the Federal share of construction costs and have not been reimbursed.

If the full authorization of \$1 billion is appropriated, it will be on hand when the formula is changed. There is no reason to continue the gap between authorization and appropriation.

It took many years for the people of this Nation to face up to the mounting problem of water pollution. As its proportions became fully recognized, Congress responded with the series of Federal Water Pollution Control Acts. This has been landmark legislation which has leveled a frontal attack on the problem. From the citizen's nascent concern with the dangers of bacterial contamination of our waters and the consequent threat to the public health, water pollution has come to be recognized as a multifaceted, long-range evil. Congress' legislation has paralleled this growing concern with the authorization of continually higher funding to aid the cities in controlling pollution. A major victory was achieved in the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966 with the authorization of Federal matching grants totaling \$2,150 million through fiscal 1970.

People who had become alarmed at the degradation of our precious water resource were filled with optimism by this 1966 act. The Federal Government was seen taking the required lead in the attack on the problem. The Nations Cities magazine referred to the act as "one of the 89th Congress' most sweeping accomplishments."¹ Not only conservationists were pleased by the bill; those responsible for managing our cities and overseeing their desperate financial headaches were overjoyed. These same overburdened cities were experiencing mounting pressure from their State governments to construct the treatment facilities necessary to meet the water quality criteria promulgated by the Water Quality Act of 1965.

These people and these municipalities have seen their rising expectations cruelly shattered. Of the \$2.3 billion authorized, only \$567 million has been appropriated through fiscal year 1969. Including the \$214 million requested for fiscal year 1970, the total will be only \$781 million unless we act today to reduce the funding gap as much as possible. Less than a third of the money available has been tapped; and even the full amount would be but a start at coping with the problem.

It has been extremely heartening to me to witness the growing list of Representatives aligned behind the proposition that the administration must secure full funding of the \$1 billion authorized for 1970. The expansion of this drive is demonstrative of the groundswell of pub-

lic opinion voicing disgust over the degraded condition of our waters.

In its August-September issue, National Wildlife ran an article entitled "Our National E Q—the First National Wildlife Federation Index of Environmental Quality." I wish to quote in its entirety the brief assessment of our Nation's water quality.

Water flows through all the problems facing man and his environment. Water, essential to life, is quickly becoming a conveyor of death.

The 1969 Water Quality Index: BAD! The Trend: We're still losing!

Virtually every stream, river, lake and estuary in the country is polluted to some degree. The Great Lakes are becoming dirtier every year. Lake Erie is the worst, followed by Lakes Ontario, Michigan, Huron and Superior. The once great commercial and sport fishing industry in Lake Erie is dead, and recent DDT threats to Lake Michigan foretell the same fate for it.

Water pollution takes many forms: Municipal wastes and industrial effluent; pesticides and fertilizer runoff from agricultural operations; heat released through cooling operations; radiation from atomic generating plants; and chemical disposal from military uses.

Pollutants in our waters can be measured but we have too few monitoring devices. And the effect each has on the health of humans and other forms of life is still largely unknown.

Although the water quality picture is gloomy, we have made some progress. Best legislative efforts are the Federal Water Pollution Control legislation which requires every state to establish its own water quality standards—or have the Federal government do it.

Early this year, the last states adopted acceptable water quality standards, though some still have "exceptions." Horrible example: More than 2,000 communities still discharge raw sewage into our waterways.

Another weakness of these standards in some states is they have been set to allow high pollution levels so the situation can deteriorate and still fall within that state's water quality standards.

For this reason, the Department of Interior is trying now to get all states to adopt "nondegradation" policies which would place the quality standard at the present level of pollution, allowing no further deterioration. *Thirty states have not done this.*

Biggest problem is money. The Federal government holds out the carrot in form of grants and matching funds. Applications have been made for \$2.25 billion in water pollution abatement projects by state and local governments. But the big hang-up is that Congress has authorized \$1 billion in appropriations for 1970, but only \$214 million has been requested. In the last six years (including 1970) Congress has authorized \$2.5 billion for treatment plants but may only appropriate \$1 billion.

In spite of the public's willingness to pay more taxes to control water pollution (Gallup Survey, *National Wildlife*, April-May 1969), we are afraid the \$26 billion [a 1968 Water Resources Council Report figures 20 billion] needed in the next five years will not be raised by Federal, state and local governments, and industry.

This at a time when the quality of our water is bad, and getting worse.

The same article goes on to give figures concerning the funding of municipal sewage treatment facilities. For 1969, \$214 million was appropriated in response to requests for over \$2,224 million. The administration budget request for fiscal year 1970 of \$214 million, the same appallingly small request as for 1969, ap-

¹"Are the Cities Trapped in the Water Pollution Control Funding Gap?" *Nations Cities*, Sept. 1969, p. 9.

appears paltry indeed when stacked against the more than \$8.6 billion it is estimated will be needed for sewage treatment facilities in the years 1969 to 1973.

The American people are concerned with water pollution, and they are willing to spend more money to cope with it. A recent Gallup poll, which asked people how deeply they were concerned about water pollution—among other ills—and sought support for that concern in an expressed willingness to pay, found that half of those interviewed were “deeply concerned,” a third were “somewhat concerned,” and only 12 percent were “not very concerned.”²

Beyond this very informative expression of national concern, we can witness the huge bonding issues people have voted through, the most striking of which was New York State's \$1 billion issue. Since 1964, the citizens of nine States have voted in statewide elections on water pollution control bond issues. Of these nine, seven were approved and the other two attracted majority voter support. Of 17,625,254 citizens who voted on the nine proposals, 11,725,444—66 percent—voted “Yes.”

Clearly, people want clean water for themselves and their children—water to swim in, to boat on, and to fish from, water just to have around, water that is as clear as they remember it from their own childhood, from their rural back-grounds, or from their last vacations into one of this Nation's last refuges from this ubiquitous disgrace. As I said before, their priorities are clear. What then is the difficulty? Irving Fox, a prominent water resources expert, has commented that the United States has the money, the technology, and the will to clean up her waters, and that all that is missing is a way of deciding who will pay and how much. This bottleneck was seemingly overcome by the 1966 Clean Waters Restoration Act, and yet we still are sliding toward an unprecedented ecological and economic catastrophe.

The “Conservation Bill of Rights” reads:

The right of the people to clean air, pure water, freedom from excessive and unnecessary noise, and the natural, scenic, historic, and esthetic qualities of their environment, shall not be abridged.

The people want a higher quality environment, with air that does not bring tears to their eyes and filth to their lungs, with water that is more nearly the colorless, odorless, liquid it is supposed to be, not oily sludge that will not support even the lowest forms of aquatic life, a land not barren of trees, crawling with cars and their highways, and laced with utility lines. They do not want a war which drains \$30 billion each year, and they harbor grave doubts as to the wisdom of rushing to land on Mars, of intensifying the arms race, or of the SST.

The key to our Nation's future lies in the cities, and our continued world leadership will be determined by how well we handle the difficult problems which have developed and are festering there.

The roots of our cities' problems are in

our country's exploding and urbanizing population. The Water Resources Council report of 1968 anticipated a “population of about 468 million in the co-terminous United States in 2020. In 1965 the Nation's population was 195 million and in late 1967 is past the 200 million mark. This projection of 468 million by 2020 approximates the population growth rate of the period 1950-65.”

Not only are there more people, but these people are more concentrated. From rural beginnings, we have come to the point in less than two centuries that nearly three-quarters of our people live in metropolitan areas. The Water Resources Council report notes:

There has been considerable migration of population from rural to urban areas. About 72% of our population is now concentrated in urban areas. If current trends continue, almost all of the projected population increase would occur in expanding urbanized areas. The transition will be accompanied by many water and related land use problems.

That is about as dour a statement as possible to describe one of the major population migrations in human history, and the monumental problems it has caused.

Increasing population size and urbanization still do not tell the whole story. Our growing population was using, it was reported in 1954, 50 percent of the raw material resources consumed in the world each year. The same article³ went on to estimate that by 1980 we might be using up to 80 percent of those resources. We are the most productive and the most wasteful people on earth. As one consequence, our waters are the most polluted.

Ignoring for the purposes of this message the effects of industrial, agricultural, and utility pollution—which are fully as staggering as municipal—let us examine what happens when raw or inadequately treated sewage is flushed into our waters.

First there is the distinct possibility of pathogenic or disease-bearing bacterial pollution, particularly for those waters which receive completely untreated wastes. It is incredible to discover that, in our most advanced Nation, the sewage of 11 million people still is not treated in any way whatsoever.⁴

The remainder of our population's wastes receive either primary, secondary, or, in rare instances, tertiary treatment. Primary treatment simply removes solid matter from the waste water. It follows this removal with chlorination which effectively kills the disease-causing bacteria. But this is so only when the waste is treated, and all too often it is not treated at all because of our ancient combined sewerage systems. During heavy rainfall, the additional water brought to the plant often makes it impossible to treat any of it, and the sewage, along with the rainwater, is released to our rivers and lakes. When this happens beaches must be closed to prevent outbreaks of disease. The cost of separating storm from sanitary sewers in our older cities is high, and has led to other ways of dealing with this massive

flow of water. The most common method is storage of some sort, whether in the mains themselves as in Detroit, or in the forthcoming deep tunnel storage in Chicago. The problem is that Detroit's method is adequate for only a small rain, and Chicago's is, like so many other things, very expensive.

But even on an average day a city with only primary treatment pollutes the water heavily. Though the bacteria are well controlled, only about half of the oxygen demand is removed from the sewage effluent. Thus, when the partially treated sewage is released to the receiving water, it is attacked by naturally occurring bacteria which reduce it to its elemental, inorganic form; in doing this, they use up oxygen dissolved in the water, oxygen vital to the life of the aquatic ecosystem as a whole. With prolonged oxygen depression, fish of high quality, which generally require more oxygen in the water, are replaced by trash fish.

Once the sewage is broken down what happens? It acts as fertilizer and produces blooms of algae which clog our waters, ruin our beaches when they wash up in malodorous heaps, and work to further destroy the aquatic environment.

Secondary treatment, through controlled bacterial action, manages to remove most of the oxygen-demanding material in the wastewater. But it does not substantially eliminate the nutrients, the fertilizers phosphorous and nitrogen, from entering the receiving waters. In moving water this enrichment often is not too serious, but in standing water it is sure, if slow, death.

The most striking examples of death by enrichment are Lakes Erie and Michigan. If it is not already dead, Lake Erie is moving inexorably in that direction, and Lake Michigan is following the other's demise with alarming speed. Any lake grows old, and will eventually die due to natural processes. But man's activity around Lake Erie has accelerated the natural aging. By dumping many billions of gallons of partially treated sewage into the lake each day, especially from Detroit and Cleveland, we have so enriched it that it is filling with algae. Algae, like any green plant, gives off oxygen during the day through photosynthesis, but it also takes oxygen in through respiration, during the night. The result of large algae blooms is that the level of dissolved oxygen in the water is very low at night. Since the point of lowest oxygen will determine what species of fish can survive, the very low night oxygen level in Lake Erie means that valuable fish such as lake trout, whitefish, and blue pike can no longer survive there. Thus man's waste products, with considerable help from other pollutants and the lamprey eel, to be sure, have obliterated a thriving fishing industry in Lake Erie. As for recreation, only three of the many beaches on Erie's southern shore are considered completely safe for water contact sports.

The same things are happening to Lake Michigan. Increasingly more beaches around the southern basin must be closed due to pollution. Algae blooms are increasing at an alarming rate. We have seen what can happen to a lake in the

² George H. Gallup, Jr., “The U.S. Public Looks at Its Environment,” IUCN Bulletin, July/Sept., 1969.

³ Walter E. Howard, “The Population Crisis is Here Now,” *Bioscience*, 19:9, Sept. 1969, page 782.

⁴ “The Cost of Clean Water and Its Economic Impact,” FWPCA, 1969.

case of Lake Erie, and yet we continue to pour wastes into Lake Michigan as though convinced—as we must have been in Lake Erie—that our little bit of pollution cannot possibly hurt such an immense body of water. But there is one very major difference between the two lakes: Erie flushes every 2½ years or so; Michigan's flushing action is imperceptible, particularly in the heavily populated, shallow southern basin, so that pollution, once introduced, remains.

With the exception of a few towns in California, tertiary treatment, which removes the nutrients, is only a dream in the conservationist's eye. Eventually we must move to this stage of treatment, but it is first essential that we get some treatment for all our cities, and at least secondary treatment for the major ones. More than that, we must get effective secondary treatment that will continue to function under conditions of heavy rainfall.

As I said before, the future of our country lies with our cities. These cities need clear water for water supply, for recreation, for industrial use, transportation and its amenity value. Polluted water is one of the reasons behind the finding of Gallup's recent poll that only 13 percent of our urban dwellers would continue to live there if they had a choice. These cities, already on the financial ragged edge in their attempts to deal with deteriorating housing, inadequate and worsening education and transportation systems and a host of other troubles, are being forced to absorb an increasing fiscal beating due to the administration's renegeing on water pollution control funding. If they are to comply with the standards set up after the Water Quality Act of 1965, they must do so without the promised Federal aid and at the expense of other urgently needed programs.

The year 1973 was set as the deadline for compliance with the standards established by the Water Quality Act of 1965. The bold and insightful legislation by Congress in 1965 and 1966 has helped to crystallize a growing public awareness of the extreme gravity of our water pollution problem. Yet, with the present funding gap, our chances of meeting the 1973 deadline are rapidly nearing zero, and public confidence is and will continue to be deeply shaken. Can we really afford not to meet the funding needs, now when a growing number of our citizens are questioning whether our Government can respond effectively to crisis, and wondering whether our democracy is truly viable? Public momentum and trust are being jeopardized by the failure of the Federal Government to carry through its promises.

In lieu of Federal financial aid, many cities have gone ahead, dangerously stretching their bonding capacities. Others have faced even sterner measures, as the Nations Cities article reports:

Already communities in Pennsylvania, Missouri, Florida, California, and New Jersey have faced state-imposed restrictions on future residential and commercial construction because of water pollution problems.⁵

It is proposed by the Secretary of the Interior that long-term—up to 30 years—financing plans be worked out to repay the cities for the Federal shares they are due. However, this plan is clearly not appealing to the cities since they will have to put up the whole cost to begin with and in addition, will have to pay the interest.

A recent, 10-State survey of consulting engineers indicated that they are ready to handle the design work for treatment plants if, and when, the money is available.⁶ The funding gap, though, is crippling progress.

A total of 4,648 applications for construction grants are now languishing in FWPCA regional offices or in state water pollution bureaus.⁷

This situation is deplorable; we must rectify it.

In signing the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1965, former President Johnson voiced the dark mood of our people on this subject:

The clear, fresh waters that were our national heritage have become dumping grounds for garbage and filth. They poison our fish, they breed disease, they despoil our landscapes.⁸

Our Nation's waters, once symbolic of our strength, have become a disgrace. With the other degraded aspects of our environment—smog-filled air, cluttered and noisy cities, strangling traffic jams, and an increasingly defaced countryside—they speak to us in awful harmonies of the consequences of our historic unwillingness to realize that our heritage of natural wealth and beauty, the well-springs of our greatness, are not limitless and can be irrevocably defiled. We must realize that our world is finite and delicate. Acceptance of two concepts is necessary: The first is that of the spaceship earth and the second is that of the stewardship of the land. The first tells us that we must care for our world and husband well its resources, for once we have rendered it uninhabitable, there is nothing left, just the void. This is an appeal to the rational, intellectual side of our natures. The second speaks of moral responsibility, a responsibility that comes with our birth to love and care for that which nourishes us, and which instructs us to think of the earth as something not to be conquered and exploited, but as something to care for, to guard, and to pass on undiminished in quality.

The introduction of a report delivered to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1967 phrases these ideas well:

At the two-thirds point of the 20th Century, man has discovered that he cannot act toward his surrounding with the abandon of a caveman. For countless thousands of years, man has treated this planet as a dumping ground, boundless in its ability to absorb insults.

For generations we assumed Nature had the ability to absorb an increasing number and variety of environmental insults. And for a while it did. Now Nature has rebelled. The lashback today threatens metropolis, town, and village, and to a growing degree open

countryside as well. Sadly deficient in precise knowledge of the growing and changing array of hazards in our environment, we know enough to realize that we must mend our ways.

We cannot keep adding more wastes to the air.

We cannot turn more rivers and streams into open sewers, and lakes into cesspools.

We cannot befool the land with the discards of abundance.

In short, we cannot engage in biological and chemical warfare against ourselves. Our health and well-being—and those of future generations—are at stake.

Man lives in delicate equilibrium with the biosphere—on the precious Earth-crust, using and re-using the waters, drawing breath from the shallow sea of air. While these can cleanse themselves, they can do so only to a finite point. That point is being reached and passed in many places in the United States. It is not only necessary that we take preventive action, it is also urgent that we take steps to restore the quality of our environment.⁹

Though it takes as its subject the whole environment, this report is clearly applicable to our Nation's water resources. As it said:

We know enough to realize that we must mend our ways.

I believe that a movement to mend our ways has started, and a failure to provide the promised funding for this movement would constitute an unconscionable breach of promise.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan for his excellent work in this matter and I wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, it shocks me that Texas speaks with so divided a voice on a question in which there is such a clear need for water pollution control. Governor Smith has made his position clear. In a telegram to me he said if the billion dollar authorization of the Clean Water Restoration Act were restored in the Appropriations Act, this "would be significant to controlling water pollution and to the economy of Texas." He is undoubtedly right.

Some time ago I invited Hugh Yantis, executive director of the Texas Water Quality Board, to accompany me and others in an oyster boat on Galveston Bay. Looking over the side he remarked that the pea green water of the bay indicated the degree of pollution. We ended up at the San Jacinto Monument, traveling through the India ink waters of the bayou.

I have also heard him say that we have not made a quantitative improvement of the quality of Buffalo Bayou though he feels that progress has been made in educating and in controlling some of the plants that contribute to industrial pollution.

Thus, I was surprised to find in the

⁹ *A Strategy for a Livable Environment*, a report to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by the Task Force on Environmental Health and Related Problems, June 1967.

⁶ *Ibid.*, page 12.

⁷ *Ibid.*, page 9.

⁸ "A New Era for America's Waters," FWPCA, 1967.

⁵ *Nations Cities*, (page 10) September, 1969.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD distributed the same day—October 7—that I received the telegram from Governor Smith a copy of a letter from Mr. Yantis to JOHN DINGELL in which the following curious language appeared:

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.

He then goes on to say:

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.

I cannot see how one can be so complacent under conditions where municipalities, largely due to lack of funds and resources, are the biggest contributors to water pollution. The city of Houston is, understandably, the biggest polluter of Buffalo Bayou, and certainly it needs help.

That Texas cities such as Houston realize the need for these additional Federal funds for the construction of municipal sewage treatment plants is made clear by the letter in the RECORD of October 7 from the Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies. This association, which includes Houston and Dallas, states:

The full one billion dollar appropriation can be utilized this fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment, and I think it is necessary to point out this disparity between the position of the State officer specifically involved with pollution and the Governor of Texas and its municipalities. I feel that there may be misunderstanding within the Texas delegation, and a few votes which may be pulled away from this amendment by the disparate position of Mr. Yantis may well cause defeat of the amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and I rise in support of his amendment.

I commend the distinguished gentleman for the great leadership he has displayed in focusing the attention of this Congress on a matter of extreme gravity and urgency. I urge enthusiastic support of the Dingell amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL), to increase to \$1 billion the 1970 fiscal year appropriation for waste treatment grants under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Mr. Chairman, for as long as I can remember, the Board of Water Supply in Honolulu, Hawaii, has been identified with the slogan: "Pure water—man's greatest need." Pure water is indeed man's greatest need, and it is a sad com-

mentary that what man needs greatest he has neglected most. We have been so engrossed in making ours the most industrialized nation in the world, that we have given too little thought for too long to this basic essential of life—pure water. And now time is running against us. Our Nation's lakes and rivers are polluted to the extent that even the fish die and add to the pollution.

The 89th Congress, of which I am proud to say I was a Member, did recognize the enormity of the task of cleaning up the Nation's polluted rivers and lakes, and did make an initial grant of \$150 million for fiscal year 1967 under the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. That act authorized annual increases until the sum of \$1.25 billion would be provided in fiscal year 1971 for matching grants to the States for sewage treatment facility construction. For fiscal year 1970 the sum of \$1 billion was authorized. The present amendment, if adopted, would fund the Clean Water Restoration Act fully for the first time since its enactment in 1966.

By adopting this amendment, we will be keeping a commitment made to the States and municipalities that we would assist them in their struggle to clean up our Nation's water. The challenge that the Congress issued in 1966 to the States and the cities across the Nation is now being answered. This is evidenced by the tremendous number of grant applications which have been filed and which are being prepared for submission. We are told that as of August 31, 1969, a total of 1,893 applications involving \$841 million in grants were pending, and that another 2,931 applications, involving approximately \$1.5 billion in grants, were being prepared. My own State of Hawaii too has responded enthusiastically in this nationwide drive for clean water. We in Congress have a responsibility to keep up this enthusiasm.

The Congress can ill afford to compromise the sound judgment it exercised in the 1966 act. Appropriating a lesser sum than \$1 billion for the 1970 fiscal year would constitute a negation of that sound judgment.

Our cities are being compelled to meet Federal water quality standards. Without the funds that they have been promised, they cannot be expected to comply. It would then be painfully clear to the American people, as it was stated in today's editorial of the Washington Post, that "Congress has reneged on its clean-water pledge to the country."

Mr. Chairman, let us not renege on that pledge. Let us adopt the Dingell amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his leadership in this area and for providing necessary funds in this critical area of national need.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and

to commend him for his leadership in this area of vital national concern.

I realize the budgetary restrictions under which the Appropriations Committee has been forced to operate in considering this legislation and appreciate the very difficult decisions they have been required to make. Certainly, they have recognized the inadequacy of the budget recommendations for water pollution control by more than doubling funds for construction grants.

However, with more than 4,500 projects awaiting some \$2.3 billion in Federal funds, additional appropriations are essential, and I support the gentleman from Michigan and the Citizens Clean Water Crusade for full funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act.

In my own congressional district there are already 13 outstanding projects, either in the active planning stage or pending at State or regional offices. The Federal share of those projects is nearly \$1.5 million.

What is more, studies are presently underway which will in all probability result in orders for secondary treatment plants in most of the major cities along the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, in compliance with State and Federal water pollution control regulations. One community in my district—Clinton, Iowa—has just received word that secondary treatment will be required, at an estimated cost of at least \$1 million, and they will be unable to meet that requirement without Federal assistance.

Technical experts tell us that we have less than 10 years left if we are to control pollution on our Nation's waterways. We cannot afford to delay the massive effort which that challenge demands, and to which we committed ourselves in enacting the Water Quality Act of 1965 and the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966.

I urge the House to approve the full \$1 billion authorized for this essential program for the current fiscal year.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I would be most remiss if I did not commend my good friend and colleague, JOHN DINGELL, of Michigan, for the outstanding work he has done on this matter of pollution.

I have known JOHN DINGELL ever since I came to Congress 15 years ago. He is one of the country's outstanding conservationists, a fisherman, hunter, and outdoors man. Above all, he is a patriot and an American first.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my good friend from Ohio.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Ohio, authors of the amendment for their leadership in bringing this matter before the House. I was one of

those 222 Members who signed the letter requesting the administration to support a \$1 billion appropriation for pollution control grants. Living in Ohio I am fully cognizant of the pollution problems in the waters of our Nation. Lake Erie is the No. 1 pollution problem in the country and unless we begin now to stop polluting that great body of water and the other waters of this Nation our very existence on this earth is in jeopardy.

Ohio has applications for Federal assistance exceeding \$44 million in grants for municipal treatment plants. Under the \$600 million appropriated by the committee, Ohio will still be shy in excess of \$13 million.

Under the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL), Ohio will receive enough to fully fund those pending applications. How are we to clean up our waters if only part of the applications are funded? Money spent on funding part of the applications is poorly spent when other cities are permitted to pour pollutants into the streams because their applications were not funded.

Let us go about resolving this problem once and for all, let us establish a national priority to clean up our waters. Let us demonstrate once and for all that the Congress is willing to assume its share of the responsibility by providing the money needed to meet this regrettable situation.

Time is of the essence—each day we delay in preserving our most precious natural resource is time we can ill afford.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope I can have the attention of Members. I believe some impressions have been left here that it would be unfortunate to leave, since we all in this body are working for the same purpose, for the same country. I should like to keep that situation.

What has not been made clear here is that these large figures the Members see on the blackboard offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) as to total requests, are an accumulation of the requests for funds. They are the sum totals of the requests which in many cases mean estimates of needs that have come into the Water Pollution Control Administration. I am sure they do evidence need and requested grants, but in many cases there is no showing that they are backed up by action by the applicants. In other words they do not represent firm request for money that can be released now.

It is my belief that the pollution needs of this country probably run as high as \$20 million over the next 5 years, but this problem, like any other, has to be met in a proper and organized way—both to get the job done, to do it right with a minimum of essential expense.

It looks from the board as though the Committee on Appropriations has deliberately cut back the authorization committee in its authorization each and every year. That is the impression one gets from reading the figures on the blackboard. The facts are that each and every year we ask the Federal Water Pol-

lution Control Administrator, "How much money can you use?" We have gone along with what he said he could use as reflected in the budget requests, which has been much less than the sum total asked for by the prospective recipients of the grants. This is the basis for the difference in these figures. It relates to the applicant's readiness to do its part to meet the requirements of the law. Again that is the reason for the difference from the requests that have been gathered together and sent in and the amounts the Federal Water Pollution Control Commission has told us they could use.

If one were in Ohio, listening to all my good friends and you were Governor of Ohio, if you did not send in a big figure you probably would not be there long after that, because the need is really tremendous. The question is how soon can we meet it and when can Ohio be ready for us to help.

This is an accumulation of the items, or the sum total of all these requests. Before the Federal grant is really released there must be a showing that 25 percent of the work has been completed. That is another slowdown as to how fast we need appropriations. That is the reason why we have \$65 million now unused and uncommitted.

Let me repeat again: the \$600 million recommended by the committee is in excess of what they told us they could properly use.

Now, the Secretary of Interior who heads the Department says if you give him more money they cannot and will not use it.

We have got to go along with what the man says who handles the grants and who says how much can be used. I know that the Public Works Committee wants the ceiling high enough so if the applications come in and are approved he would have the money there to use and that, therefore, we should provide the money for that purpose.

If you appropriate this money under a formula whereby the first \$100 million goes out on the basis of population and per capita income and the rest on population alone, you will have a lot of States with a lot of money to their credit which they cannot use and when you try to bring in a change in the law so as to change the formula, you can imagine where we would be in trying to recapture these funds for common distribution.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that these large figures represent something which they say they could use now but if you wrote them and asked them what they could use next year they would probably tell you they could use twice that much.

Mr. Chairman, the figure which has come from the Committee on Appropriations is based upon what the man who makes the grants said he could grant with the great number of applications which have been received and approved. We must take his word.

Mr. Chairman, the law does not require the party making the request to make any showing that he has issued any bonds or that he has any money with which to pay his share.

I am saying to the members of the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the pollution job with which we are confronted is tremendous. However, we will be able to get it solved in a better fashion if we proceed judiciously, effectively, and apparently the Secretary of Interior is going to see that we do that whether we try to do otherwise or not.

There is an indication on the part of our good friends on the legislative committee that he went as far as he could. But, mind you, we in this country operate on a fiscal year basis and anyone who says that we have committed another Congress beyond this session has not been reading his history. There is no one who has been in this Congress who can say that we can commit additional funds prior to the beginning of the fiscal year because we, of course, work on a fiscal year basis.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has appropriated the money in line with what the man who handles it said he could use and not based upon the estimates of the number of applications to be sent in.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Would the gentleman agree with me also that even with reference to these smaller appropriations, appropriations smaller than the authorizations, we have had carryovers and the main reason we have had carryovers is because of the manner in which the formula was operating in some of the States. In other words, they just could not use it. Further, the appropriation bill is not the way to cure these defects. That has got to be done through legislative committees.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. The Appropriations Committee or the Congress in this action today, if it goes over the figure and under the formula puts a whole lot of money to the credit of some State that cannot use the money, it is going to have to wrestle with that problem in the future.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 5:30.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5:45.

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

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many Members are on their feet? One minute is not enough.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on

the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. On the limitation of debate on this amendment, each Member who was standing on his feet at the time will be recognized for 1¼ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, we have for each of us a question of national priorities, whether the fight on water pollution is worth \$1 billion out of a total expenditure of something like \$190 billion.

Fortune magazine, hardly a radical journal, says we ought to put in \$3 billion. Certainly \$1 billion is not exorbitant.

I think this is a beautiful amendment, and I commend the authors, and in just a moment when the teller lines are formed let the Members favoring the amendment flow through that teller line like a mighty river of clean, pure water.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to you, when you go back home and you try to tell your constituents who are trying to get a sewage disposal plant that the Committee on Appropriations said that they were worried about a formula as to the application of funds for sewage treatment plants, that you will not be back in Congress. Those are just the political facts of life.

Your constituents are not going to be impressed by the fact that you say that certain States might be overfunded, and certain States may be underfunded; the constituents back home are worried about clean water, and they are waiting for Congress to keep its word.

Those of you who were here in 1966—and every one of you voted for it because on a record vote there was not a single dissenter—said that you would this year appropriate \$1 billion for sewage treatment plants. This is your opportunity. If you do not, and you do not come back in the 92d Congress, remember this day, especially those of you who will insist that in about a week or so you will be perfectly willing to give \$3 or \$4 billion in foreign aid. I know your folks back home will love that when you refuse to give them \$400 million more to keep them alive, with pure water you are willing to vote billions for foreign aid, where we have no friends.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think that the passage of this amendment can be the most important action taken by this Congress to preserve our environment at this session.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the Appropriations Committee for its constructive action in raising substantially the amount of funding for the Clean Water Restoration Act for fiscal year 1970.

It became clear quite early that the \$214 million requested by the administration for funding the act for 1970 was grossly inadequate. It was then gratifying to note that the Appropriations

Committee responded to the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water by raising the appropriation to \$600 million in the bill reported to this body.

But, Mr. Chairman, \$600 million is still not nearly enough. And that is why this amendment should be passed.

When the Federal Government authorized \$1 billion for aid to local units of government for construction of sewage treatment facilities, it was an indication of national commitment to one of our most pressing national problems. Acting upon this authorization, thousands of local communities applied to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration for assistance in dealing with municipal pollution. More than 4500 of those applications are now pending in FWPCA regional offices or in State water pollution bureaus.

Something must be done about those pending applications which will call for \$2.3 billion in Federal aid in constructing water treatment facilities, having a total cost of \$5.1 billion.

In Wisconsin's Seventh Congressional District alone, 87 projects are undergoing development. These 87 projects will cost an estimated \$12,809,553. An estimated \$4,688,543 in Federal funds has been requested. These requests total more than will be allowed for the entire State of Wisconsin during the coming year, unless Congress acts to raise the amount the administration has asked for.

The inadequate funding of pollution abatement programs becomes ironic when we contemplate the ease with which Congress can supply funds that exceed the budget requests of the administration. On June 10, for example, the House approved a budget which gave the National Aeronautics and Space Administration \$256 million more than it had originally requested. It provided for 10 manned space flights to the moon over the next 3 years rather than the six originally planned. I voted against the NASA budget. The \$256 million in excess funds which we so generously voted for NASA could have more than doubled the administration's requested funds for aid to local units of governments for water treatment facilities.

We know that without water there is no life. And, the water we must have to sustain life on this planet is in serious danger. The extent of pollution of that water is critical.

During the past few months I have cited example after example of lakes and streams in this country that are dying or are already dead. Those examples are far too numerous to chronicle today.

In our efforts to halt this disastrous trend of pollution, we have fallen further behind each year since the Clean Water Restoration Act was approved in 1966. We have continued to lose ground in this battle because our promises have far outdistanced our performance. In fact, the appropriations from fiscal year 1967 through 1969 total only \$567 million—less than half of the \$1.3 billion authorized.

It is essential that we provide at least the full \$1 billion to fund the Clean Water Restoration Act promised for fiscal year 1970. I urge the Congress to respond

to the millions of Americans who have joined in the citizens crusade for clean water by voting for this amendment. The Moon and Mars can wait. Our water cannot.

Mr. Chairman, the Washington Post this morning called today's vote on the funding for the Clean Water Restoration Act—and I quote—"a major test of whether this country is sincere in trying to clean up its polluted rivers and lakes." Indeed it is.

The Congress made clear its commitment to the cause of clean water in the words of that far-reaching authorization measure passed just 3 years ago. But we have yet to make good on the promises of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. We have an opportunity to do so today by voting for this amendment to raise the appropriation to the full \$1 billion authorized by the act. I am pleased to rise in support of this amendment. I urge that my colleagues join now in reiterating our commitment to clean water by voting for it and I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) for his leadership on this question.

Mr. Chairman, some of our colleagues may not have seen the lead editorial in this morning's Washington Post. It is an excellent statement on the issue before us today, and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

ONE BILLION FOR CLEAN WATER

A major test of whether this country is sincere in trying to clean up its polluted rivers and lakes will come in the House of Representatives today. In principle, the Congress, the administration and the country are thoroughly committed to the cause of clean water. It is one of the most popular crusades of the day. But lip service and even authorizing legislation do not remove filth from our streams. Sewage-treatment plants must be actually constructed, and Congress has to date provided only meager funds for this purpose.

New hopes were raised in 1966 when Congress approved a sharp rise in federal assistance to states and cities for the construction of clean-water facilities. The program was to expand from \$150 million in fiscal 1967 to \$1 billion in fiscal 1970. But out of the \$2.3 billion authorized for the last four years, including this one, Congress has appropriated only \$567 million for the three past years, and the current budget request is for only \$214 million for fiscal 1970. In other words, the real cleanup program, as distinguished from the reassuring words and good intentions, has not yet gotten off the ground.

Fortunately, the great gap between promise and performance has not gone unnoticed on Capitol Hill or among the millions who are now demanding restoration of a healthful environment. A large number of organizations representing conservation groups, organized labor, professional societies, civic associations and city and county officials have united their efforts in a Citizens Crusade for Clean Water, and more than 220 members of the House have pledged themselves to vote a billion dollars for clean water when the big test comes.

One vital element in the situation is the plight in which many cities find themselves. Under the prodding of Congress, state legislatures have been raising standards of sewage treatment which the cities will have to meet. But if they are denied the federal aid that was contemplated when the higher standards were set they will have to choose between failure to comply and the diversion of funds from education, housing, law en-

forcement and so forth to meet the new demands for clean water. It is reported that more than 4,600 applications for aid to cities in the construction of sewage-treatment facilities are awaiting action, largely for want of funds.

The plain fact is that Congress has reneged on its clean-water pledge to the country. The technical know-how for restoration of the Nation's streams and lakes to a tolerable condition is readily at hand. Much of the needed legislation is already on the books, although Secretary Hickel is seeking authority to help pay for treatment facilities on an installment basis through contracts with cities and states, which would greatly ease the demand for current appropriations. The missing element is immediate funds to change the clean-water drive from a remote hope to a current reality.

We agree with the National League of Cities, the League of Women Voters and the many other groups and individual leaders who are calling for the immediate appropriation of a billion dollars for the 1970 cleanup effort. On the eve of the test vote there are indications that the administration will accept substantial expansion of the clean-water budget item it carried over from the Johnson budget. But compromise at this point is not enough. The judgment of Congress as expressed in the Clean Water Restoration Act that \$1 billion would be needed this year for grants in this area was sound. It should be adhered to today. In a matter of such vital concern to the country, Congress simply cannot afford to put itself into the position of withdrawing from an obligation it has assumed and sought to impose on the states and cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER).

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my very good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) for his leadership in promoting this amendment. I wish to speak in support of appropriating the full \$1 billion authorized for waste treatment plant construction grants in the public works appropriations bill—H.R. 14159—under consideration today. The Federal Government must meet its commitments to the States and municipalities as promised in the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. We have appropriated only \$417 million of the authorized \$1.15 billion in the last few fiscal years.

In the face of these underappropriations for matching grants for waste treatment plants, Carl L. Klein, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Quality and Research has ordered a get-tough policy against the many municipalities concerned, whom he calls the Nation's No. 1 polluters. His statements appear in an article in Monday's New York Times which I will ask to have included in the RECORD when we return to the House. Mr. Klein, in ordering the crackdown, stated that the administration planned amendments to the Clean Water Restoration Act to eliminate "foot dragging" by the municipal agencies. I agree with the crackdown, but I believe we cannot expect to obtain stricter control and then not live up to the commitments made to States and municipalities under the 1966 act.

New York passed a record \$1 billion pure waters bond issue, the largest in the Nation, in response to and reliance on the Federal legislation.

Unfortunately, to date the State has only committed \$18 million of this bond issue and has spent on water pollution control only \$59 million. The Governor has used as an excuse for his failure to clean up New York's waters the failure of the Federal Government to provide the funds it promised.

We must remove this excuse if we are to see New York's serious pollution problems remedied.

I strongly urge adoption of the amendment.

The article referred to follows:

LOCALITIES TOLD TO CLEAN WATER—U.S. OFFICIAL BIDS THEM ACT REGARDLESS OF FEDERAL AID

(By Gladwin Hill)

DALLAS, October 6.—The nation's top water pollution official admonished states and cities today that they would have to clean up their sewage whether or not they got promised Federal subsidies.

Outlining a new and stricter policy on water quality, Carl L. Klein, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Quality and Research, also said that the Administration planned amendments to the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 to eliminate "built-in delays" in administrative procedures that permit "foot-dragging" by polluters.

Addressing members of the Water Pollution Control Federation, Mr. Klein said: "We can't have procrastination by anyone saying he's not getting enough money from the Federal Government."

At the same time, Mr. Klein said he now rated industry as only the third ranking contributor to the nation's water pollution, behind municipalities and agriculture.

FIVE THOUSAND TO BE THERE

Mr. Klein was the principal speaker at the opening session of the federation's 42nd annual conference at Dallas Memorial Auditorium. About 5,000 members, including water officials and engineers, are expected to participate in what has been described as the biggest water pollution meeting in history. It will continue through Thursday.

Federal subsidies represent a point of contention with states and cities. The Government has been pressuring the states and cities to clean up their water. But so far this year, the Administration has sanctioned the outlay of only \$214-million out of a \$1-billion 1969-70 program of assistance grants for building sewerage works.

When several participants chided Mr. Klein about unfulfilled Federal aid promises, the Interior Department official suggested that this had just been an excuse for inaction.

New Jersey officials came to my office the other day and said: "Where's the money?" Mr. Klein said. "But they admitted that even if the Federal Government had given them everything: 'we wouldn't have the matching money anyway.'"

PIECEMEAL TECHNOLOGY

"We need new laws—tough laws, to save us from ourselves and our thus far piecemeal technology," Mr. Klein said. "We shall be asking Congress for these laws."

Asked at a news conference what laws would be sought, Mr. Klein would specify only the desire to eliminate "built-in delays in enforcement procedures."

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has about 40 outstanding pollution abatement actions against various states. Some of the actions have been protracted, under existing laws, for a decade.

Mr. Klein enumerated a dozen new clean-up actions initiated under a recent policy to "move in on polluters" and give them six months to come up with remedial programs.

Among other "get tough" actions, he said,

was the determination of the Secretary of the Interior, Walter J. Hickel, to stop the city of Richmond from pouring 30 million gallons of raw sewage daily into the James River while it enlarged its existing sewage treatment plant.

CITY GIVEN WARNING

The city has been notified, he said, that all Federal water quality funds will be cut off if it does not spend the extra money necessary to keep the plant operating during alterations.

While industries were the target of several of the new actions, Mr. Klein said he thought industry had generally been doing an effective enough cleanup job.

Mr. Klein, a former Illinois legislator, who specialized in water pollution, was joined at the conference by Martin Lang, director of New York City's Bureau of Water Pollution Control. Mr. Lang said he was pleased with Mr. Klein's emphasis on equality in enforcement because "it will help explain to the people in New York City why we're doing what we're doing."

"The citizens of New York City put their money where their convictions are," Mr. Lang said, only to have the effort counteracted by "the flow from another state." Apparently he was referring to New Jersey.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OTTINGER yielded the remainder of his time to Mr. ASHLEY.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY).

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding me his time.

Mr. Chairman, on September 3, just a very few weeks ago, the city of Toledo, Ohio, was singled out by the Department of the Interior and identified as a municipality contributing to the pollution of Lake Erie.

This was pursuant to a new policy on the part of the Department of the Interior to insist upon strict compliance with the water quality standards that have been adopted pursuant to legislation passed by this Congress.

Tomorrow in the city of Cleveland there is going to be a hearing to determine the extent to which Toledo is a guilty party. We in Toledo applaud a policy of strict antipollution enforcement. But I find it strange and difficult to understand how the gentleman from Tennessee can get on his feet and read a letter from the Secretary of the Interior saying—No, he does not want a billion dollars or \$600 million—and that all he wants is \$214 million which averages up, no matter how you cut it, to \$4 million or \$5 million per State per year for the fight against pollution.

What are we saying? That the Federal Government will stake out for itself the role of law enforcement but will transfer to the States the full responsibility for financing the pollution abatement facilities? What kind of new federalism is this, pray tell?

It was established some years ago by the Congress that responsibility for cleaning up our rivers and waterways was a joint responsibility shared by the Federal Government, the States, and the cities and towns and other political subdivisions. Since that time, however, the Federal Government has not met its commitment. It has promised but it has not performed. The result, of course, has

been to shift the burden of financing treatment facilities to the States and local communities and they simply have not been able to manage the job with their own limited resources.

The situation was summed up well by Richard A. Vanderhoof, director of FWCA's Ohio Basin region when he said:

We're making progress in water pollution control if everyone would stand still. But we must run faster. A combination of industrial growth and municipal growth puts us in a position of status quo, particularly with the level of funds we have available.

Mr. Chairman, the status quo is not good enough. What "status quo" means is that every day our water resources become more contaminated and just that much more difficult and expensive to clean up.

Clearly there is no question as to need for full Federal funding for waste treatment works and I believe I am accurate in saying that the Department of Interior has acknowledged the backlog of project applications could well absorb the billion-dollar level of Federal contributions proposed in the amendment before us.

The real question arises, as we all know, with respect to the budget impact of fully funding the authorization bill approved by the Congress. In light of the Interior Department's recent policy of strict enforcement of water quality standards, it must be assumed the administration wants compliance at the State and local level—and let there be no doubt about it, compliance means construction and construction means the expenditure of public funds.

The issue, then, is where these funds are to come from.

To the extent that the construction of pollution abatement facilities contributes to inflation, these pressures are not eased or obviated by shifting Federal responsibility to the States and local communities. If we are going to have clean water, it is going to cost dollars and, from the standpoint of inflation, it does not make any real difference where these dollars come from.

But from the standpoint of getting the job done, it does make a difference. The States were led to believe by the Congress that the financial burden would be shared and they have acted on this premise. Last fall the voters in Ohio approved a bond issue earmarking \$120 million for pollution abatement and a number of municipalities, including Toledo, approved separate issues for the same purpose. In addition, the State legislature established the Ohio Water Development Authority which is empowered to sell bonds for an additional \$350 million for antipollution facilities. For its part, the Federal Government budgeting \$9½ million for Ohio for the current fiscal year, roughly 20 percent of what it promised and what the State of Ohio was led to believe it could count upon.

Mr. Chairman, we have sophisticated ways of measuring increases in our cost of living but no one yet has put a dollar amount on the cost of polluted water because there simply is no way of doing so. But it is a fact that Lake Erie, one of the great inland bodies of water in the entire world, is a dying lake because of

the wanton and undisciplined behavior of many millions of Americans. If disaster is to be averted, if our water resources are to be preserved for the generations to come, then action can no longer be postponed until it better suits the convenience of our economy. We must act now and the amendment before us gives us this opportunity.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to quote the words of a gentleman who has impeccable qualifications as a most conservative individual, the Governor of my State, Ronald Reagan.

He says that 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 Act abatement in California.

He goes on to cite statistics that are very pertinent to this discussion here.

He says the authorization in the act of \$700 million for the fiscal year 1969 and \$1 billion for the fiscal year 1970 lead communities to believe ample funds will be available.

That is the fact, and that is the issue here. I compliment the Committee on Appropriations for increasing the funds to the \$600 million level—but that is 60 percent of our commitment. Let us meet all of that commitment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the amendment being offered today to provide for full funding of the Department of the Interior's waste treatment plant construction program. The Congress has authorized \$1 billion for this vital program in fiscal year 1970. The administration requested only one-fifth of that: \$214 million. I am pleased that the Appropriations Committee has increased the amount for pollution control construction to \$600 million.

But as a representative from the Lake Erie Basin, as one who represents a congressional district which lies along the shores of what must be the most polluted body of water in the world, I know that \$600 million is inadequate. Indeed, \$1 billion is totally inadequate to meet the pollution problems of this Nation. It is estimated that to stop pollution flows into Lake Erie alone would require more than a billion dollars. The money which we appropriate today is allocated by the State governments, and, from past history, it is clear that very little of this money will go for the solution of massive, billion dollar pollution problems such as face Lake Erie and the other Great Lakes.

At the present rate of pollution control appropriations, our natural resources and clean water supplies will soon be totally destroyed and our health increasingly threatened.

I would like to point out at this time that another pollution control program, passed by this Chamber, is in serious danger because of opposition by the administration. Included in the Tax Reform Act, which passed the House August 7, was a provision providing for

rapid depreciation for pollution control facilities. The reform bill amended the tax code to permit rapid 5-year amortization of expenditures for certain facilities for the control or abatement of air and water pollution. This provision was included in the tax reform bill by the Ways and Means Committee to assist industry in financing costly pollution control devices. The measure would be particularly important to industries in central city areas and along waterfronts where construction and land costs are particularly high. In addition, it would help many small businesses in meeting the demands placed upon them by the Water Pollution Control Acts of recent years. The measure will cost \$400 million per year, but the committee felt that the problem of pollution is so serious that the provision was justified.

On September 4, the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Senate Finance Committee and questioned the necessity for this provision and recommended that it be amended, cutting the incentives for pollution control to \$180 million. I find this recommendation by the administration incredible in light of all their talk about incentives and in light of the administration's request to the Senate Finance Committee that the corporate tax rate be cut 2 percent: The cut in the corporate tax rate will cost the Treasury \$1.6 billion by 1972. This money will be returned to America's corporations as a simple profit. It will not be earmarked for any social goal. It will not be required to be used in the battle against pollution.

The position of the administration on this issue is indefensible. At this time of pollution disaster in Lake Erie and other areas of the country, we must mobilize all of our available resources against further pollution. It is my hope that the other body will approve the House provision in its entirety and reject the administration's attempts to weaken the provision.

Next year I expect to urge the authorization of at least \$100 million for the handling of national pollution disaster areas such as Lake Erie and other parts of the Great Lakes, San Francisco Bay, New York Harbor, various parts of the Gulf of Mexico, and portions of the coast of southern California.

The problem of water pollution is so critical that it requires multiple approaches. One approach is to stimulate industrial treatment by legal enforcement and tax incentives. Federal funding should be designed to stimulate the development and construction of public waste treatment facilities but Federal funding must also be provided to meet national pollution disasters which are of a dimension beyond the control of local governments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order before the vote on

the pending amendment to offer an amendment to increase it to \$2 billion?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be in order.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I want to say for the record that I am vigorously opposed to this amendment providing unbudgeted money for water pollution control.

I am not against water pollution control per se, for I yield to nobody in my desire to have our waters remain pure and uncontaminated. I was, in fact, one of the cosponsors of a bill establishing a Council on Environmental Quality legislation just recently approved by this body.

But we must come to grips with the fiscal facts of life, governing ourselves according to certain spending priorities. The fact of the matter is that it will be of little avail if, in endeavoring to promote pure water, we pollute our budgetary process beyond the point of no return. It is not enough to say pure water over and above everything else, because there are also other practical and important considerations.

It is interesting to observe that the budget approved by the administration for this water pollution control program is \$214 million. I am willing to go above this figure and, in fact, support the \$600 million figure recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. This committee has studied this matter long and diligently, recommending the \$600 million figure as one practically designed to cope with the problem. I do not think we should turn our backs on the collective wisdom of this committee.

Undoubtedly in the discussion of this issue, a great cry will go out that this \$1 billion amount must be spent because Government must fill the vacuum left by private industry in dealing with water pollution control. In my congressional district, I know of at least one big industry that is spending vast sums of money toward the end of controlling the pollution of both air and water. Other industries are equally concerned and active in this area. If anything, I fear that the expenditure of this vast sum of money would have the effect of discouraging rather than encouraging these private industries to carry on with their yeoman work with water pollution control.

Mr. Chairman, in my mind the \$600 million figure recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations is both realistic and practical. In effect, it promises to deal with the problem of water pollution by making a substantial amount of money available for dealing with it. On the other hand, it recognizes that even highly worthy programs have to submit to some disciplines in spending, for otherwise they stand to be cured at the expense of creating a disability in another part of our Government structure.

I am a conservationist, and I am for the preservation of our natural resources, one of the most important of

which is an abundant supply of pure water. I am also a realist and, as I said previously, I know we must accept what can be done without threatening the stability of our economic system, particularly while we are saddled with the burdensome expenses imposed on us by the war in Vietnam. The \$600 million is, in my mind, an ideal compromise. I give it my strong support, and I encourage my colleagues to do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, the expression has been used about commitments and about welching out on commitments. Here is another facet of the argument, I think we should consider in these closing moments.

In 1965 and then again in 1966, the Clean Water Act was strengthened. Every Member of this body who was here in 1966 is today bound to support adequate funding for water pollution control. The reason is the House in 1966 voted 247 to zero for authorizations for each year from 1967 to 1971.

There was a lot of oratory 3 years ago but regardless of the talk when the roll was called not one single Member who was present and recorded, voted in the negative. Who would deny that such a vote was a commitment that we clean up our water by providing treatment plants for the waste created by all of our municipalities and industries?

It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress by several votes which in the first instance gave the authority to the executive branch to establish water standards and then followed these enactments for authorizations for funds made a solemn commitment not only to our municipalities and industries but to all America that we meant business in the attack against the growing menace of water pollution control in these United States.

If we fail to adequately fund this appropriation bill in title III which provides for funds for the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, including not only pollution control operations but also research, then we renege on our expressed promise. We welch on our commitment.

We have a great opportunity today not only to redeem the covenant made with the American people in 1966 when we authorized these funds but we have presented to us the chance to do something about our environment and to pass on a cleaner environment to the generations who come after us. We all like to orate. We have campaigned in the past 2 years for water pollution control. The time is past for any more lipservice. Now is the time to fish or cut bait. Now is the time, not next year.

The States, municipalities, and private industries have been depending upon the Federal Government to do its share. The States and all of our municipalities have cranked up their programs. Last week we said we could afford the defense procurement bill and that was certainly a high priority. The health of America is one of our highest domestic priorities. Who can say we can be sure

of good health in this country if our families are subject to being stricken by drinking water polluted by waste of those who live upstream? People are aroused about contaminated water. It is time that we were concerned.

We have set up water standards. Since that time we have gone around the country saying to municipalities and industries, "You are going to have to meet these standards." What we have said to those people is not merely a commitment. They have been forced, sometimes under court order, to act. They have been trapped into a situation. It is our obligation today to meet that commitment. This will also give reassurance to the little communities of the Nation and their officials who have been elected on the promise of no bond issues until the Federal Government puts up its funds. We must redeem that commitment and take them out of that trap.

Yes, last week we voted for some protection for America in the defense procurement bill. This is a chance to vote for our health. In the next few weeks there will be a much easier choice when we have to decide whether we send more money to Africa or Asia.

We have authorized in fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1970 funds to construct sewage treatment plants in the amount of \$2½ billion. We have appropriated only \$1.4 billion, leaving a \$1.1 billion gap. If we continue this course we will get further and further behind. Our job is increasing. Our pollution problems are increasing. The time to start on the task of attacking one of our most serious problems of water pollution control is now. We should not wait. We cannot wait.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. McCARTHY).

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, we have talked about the failure to meet our commitment to municipal polluters. I think it should be pointed out that our failure to act has created an environment which encourages private and other polluters to continue to seek exceptions to the law.

In recent months, in the Buffalo area, we have had several major polluters—the Bethlehem Steel Corp., the Hanna Furnace Co., and even the State of New York—seek exceptions to existing regulations to dump waste and other materials in the desperately polluted Lake Erie. So I think what we are doing here is not only assisting municipalities but setting a tone and letting these people know that we are serious.

I have had them say to me, "Why do you complain when we seek this exception, when you, yourself, in the Congress are not providing full funding?" What is our answer to that? We really do not have an answer, but I think we can provide it today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Michigan. It is imperative that we belatedly recognize our responsibility and fulfill our commitment to the States and cities and to the people of this country by appropriating the necessary funds to combat effectively the pollution of our

vital water resources. I need not repeat the shocking figures representing the ever-widening gap between the amounts authorized by this Congress and the amounts subsequently appropriated for water pollution control. Each year the gap has grown and each year the waters of this country become more and more polluted.

When we passed the Water Quality Act of 1965 and the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, we meant to begin an active cleanup campaign. We recognized a serious problem and took action by authorizing a strong Federal program to combat the contamination of our lakes, rivers, and streams. But this strong program loses its significance and becomes a meaningless series of words on paper if we do not appropriate the funds to carry it out.

There has been a good deal of talk about the promise made by this Congress. It is true: we did make a promise and many of our States and cities have acted on the understanding that we would keep that promise. Millions of local dollars have been spent, in the expectation that Federal matching grant funds would be available. Now we threaten to keep only six-tenths of our promise. Six hundred million dollars is, of course, almost three times as much as the administration proposed, but it is still much less than is needed. In fact, \$1 billion is less than is needed to do a really good job of cleaning up our waters. It has been estimated that it will take at least \$6 billion in the next 4 years to provide adequate sewage treatment facilities. The \$1 billion proposed in this amendment is only a beginning.

There are those who say that it would be irresponsible to appropriate funds that could not be spent. They argue that the States and cities could not gear up to spend \$1 billion this year. I strongly disagree. The States and cities are prepared to spend the funds. The only problem is that the funds have not been available, and it seemed until relatively recently that the funds would not be available this year either. Now we have a chance to make the funds available, and I believe that we must jump on that chance. By not appropriating the full amount authorized by the Clean Water Restoration Act, we would be compounding the errors of the past few years.

Already the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration has \$2.3 billion in pending grant applications. While some of these pending applications represent requests for more funds than certain States would be entitled to even with the \$1 billion appropriation, many other applications are being prepared by other States and cities which would not only be entitled to the funds but which also desperately need them.

Perhaps the most compelling argument is that Federal law—the Water Quality Act of 1965—absolutely requires the States and cities to meet Federal water quality standards by a certain date. But these standards cannot be met without the promised Federal grant funds. The States and cities simply cannot do it alone. Already many cities are up against their bond limits. Our cities are in trouble. Polluted water is only one of the

many serious problems which they face. We can, of course, be of assistance in other areas as well, but as a start we must honor our promise to help clean up the water.

Let us not forget that we are not just cleaning up the water to provide pleasant recreation areas for swimming and boating. We are cleaning up the water that we and our children drink every day, the water with which we cook, the water in which we bathe and wash our clothes and dishes. No wonder that nationwide polls show that an overwhelming majority of people in this country are in favor of spending more money on water pollution control. No wonder that local bond issues are easily passed. The issue is one of life or death—good health or disease. In these days of inflation and high Government spending on all levels, there are very, very few programs for which the people of this country are willing to spend more money. But water pollution control is one of those programs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we respond to the public demand, that we exercise our responsibility in this area, that we honor our promise to the States and cities of this country. I urge that we approve the amendment to provide full funding of the Clean Water Restoration Act.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I believe it may very well be the most important single vote in this session of Congress. If we do not do something meaningful to help communities build adequate sewage treatment facilities, the damage to this country will be beyond any comprehensive assessment. Lake Michigan, the greatest natural resource in the world, will be dead in 10 years.

I say, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment it is absolute folly to suggest that there is a community or State in this Nation that cannot use this money. In my own State, the chief engineer is not accepting any more applications because his funds already are committed for the next 4 years. I think we are already tragically behind time. All we are doing here now is trying to restore more than \$700 million that the Appropriations Committee has trimmed out in 2 previous years. This \$400 million will still leave us \$750 million short of the absolute minimum needs to those communities to which we are committed to give Federal aid.

So I agree with those who have said that this may very well be the most important vote in this session. I urge adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON).

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment that would increase the appropriation for waste treatment construction grants to the amount originally authorized by Congress—\$1 billion in fiscal year 1970.

I recognize that the administration recommended that we freeze the level of spending for water pollution control facilities at the 1969 level—\$214 million—and I want to strongly commend a

courageous Committee on Appropriations and the members of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee for reporting to the House a bill containing nearly three times the budget estimate. The committee recommendation that we allocate \$600 million for waste treatment construction grants is a major step in the right direction, but considering the very high priority that all Americans place on the task of restoring our water resources, this step does not stretch far enough. It still means a 40-percent cut in the original authorization.

There is no way to overstate or to overemphasize the seriousness of this Nation's water resources crisis. We have come to the incredible point where Americans take for granted filthy lakes, stinking rivers, and closed bathing beaches. In most of our densely populated areas we are long past the point of prevention in the fight for clean water—we have reached the stage where if we do not place a crisis priority on anti-pollution programs and expenditures, we will lose many bodies of water to irretrievable death by pollution.

Before the passage of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966, I accompanied a Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee to the eastern Great Lakes area, where we held hearings and toured by land, air, and water, the Lake Ontario-Lake Erie area, in the vicinities of Rochester and Buffalo. What we saw then was horrible. At that time the biological death of Lake Erie was imminent, and beaches in both metropolitan areas were closed to swimmers. At that time, Lake Erie was acknowledged as the most polluted major body of water in the country. Today, just 3 years later, there are many other lakes and rivers competing for this sad title. A report released today by the International Joint Commission on Great Lakes Pollution cites the worsening nature of this problem.

Both before and since this inspection tour, I have placed pollution control measures at the top of my Federal budget priorities, along with education and housing. I have both introduced and supported numerous bills that would add teeth and dollars to the Federal campaign to save our water resources.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that we can and must afford to live up to our commitment to the public to provide the full measure of funds authorized for anti-pollution facilities.

Some have argued that even at the \$600,000,000 level, many States, under the population-based allocation formula, will be allotted more funds than they need for pollution facilities in the next fiscal year. While this argument has some validity on its surface, it fails to recognize two important factors.

First, several States, and notably my home State of New York, have applications for projects under this program that vastly exceed funds available under the committee bill. Of a potential backlog of Federal Water Pollution Control Administration applications for funds totaling \$2.4 billion, over \$1.3 billion are from New York State. Thus, funds for New York under the committee bill

would provide only 3 percent of the State's needs, whereas they provide a much higher percentage to other States. This is because population density and the presence of water resources, not solely population, determine the level of need for pollution facilities improvements.

Congress, in its wisdom, has allowed the Secretary of the Interior to redistribute funds that are not fully obligated to States receiving them under the population-based formula. Under present law, approved projects in States such as New York would certainly receive additional funds under this redistribution. The FWPCA has estimated that there would be nearly \$100 million in non-obligated funds at the \$600 million funding level, and that this amount—available to States which need additional funds—would grow to between \$200 and \$250 million if we were to appropriate the full billion dollars. Without looking at the facts, this looks like a great deal of money to have to redistribute. In fact, even these amounts would not fully fund the backlog of projects in those States which—facing the most serious pollution problems—have expended the most effort to correct them.

New York, which as of May 30, 1969, had a backlog of grant requests of \$1.306 billion, would receive only \$51.5 million under the committee bill. On the initial allocation of funds, it would receive \$88.4 million under a full \$1 billion appropriation, but this does not consider the substantial amount that would be redistributed to States which have large backlogs. I am proud to represent the State which has marshaled the greatest effort, out of all States in the Nation, to lick the problems of pollution. At a time when taxes are high and budgets are tight, it is difficult to win public support for major undertakings by State government. But the people of New York overwhelmingly approved a \$1 billion bond issue for the pure waters program.

The State and local governments in New York have embarked on dramatic projects and programs to clean up our lakes and rivers and keep them clean. No one pretends that this is an inexpensive venture. In fact, New York has largely gone ahead without waiting for the Congress to make good its promises of full funding. The State has, through its pure waters program, advanced most of the Federal share of local antipollution projects, so that this problem can be tackled before it is too late.

The second compelling reason for supporting full funding of the authorization for this program lies in the fact that the Senate yesterday adopted an amendment to S. 7, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, which would allow the Secretary of the Interior to make good the Federal Government's moral commitment to reimburse State and local governments to the extent they have advanced all or part of the Federal share of these projects.

This amendment offered by Senator JAVITS, if adopted in conference, will mean that nonobligated funds under this program can be used for such reimbursements. Because of the vigor of their programs, and the priority they have put on

ending water pollution in New York State, my State has put up a full 44 percent of the State and local funds that have been advanced to cover the Federal share of many of these projects and make up for inadequate Federal appropriations.

As of August 31 of this year, New York has prefinanced \$308,612,970 toward the Federal share of waste treatment projects within its borders. Obviously, this cannot be reimbursed in a single year. But the fact that this State, and other States faced with catastrophic water pollution problems have substantial application backlogs indicates the necessity of full funding of this program. By making good our moral commitment to reimburse those States which could not wait for adequate Federal funding, we will free additional State and local funds so they can be applied to antipollution projects that are still pending.

We must once and for all decide that the Federal Government will not reduce or quibble its commitment or its priority to control pollution. We must start by full funding of the 1970 fiscal year authorization and continue to fully fund this program until the job is done. Pollution will not wait for us, it has in fact passed us by. We must act now to make up for lost time, and to allow Americans to enjoy once again the health, recreation, and the beauty which pure waters will bring.

One billion dollars is not too much to pay in 1 year to begin the restoration of now-filthy lakes and streams. There are other programs in the Federal budget which deserve far less priority than this one. I cannot agree with those who say we can do this job and cut the authorization by 40 percent at the same time. A full commitment to this task requires full funding over a long term of years. I am willing to do my share to honor this commitment, and hope my colleagues will do their share by supporting this amendment.

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

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, fiscal year 1970 requests for Federal grants have already exceeded \$59 million and there are additional California applications presently pending which will exhaust the full \$83 million-plus to which California would be entitled under the full \$1 billion funding.

The single most persuasive argument against this amendment has been that there have not been sufficient applications to use the funds actually funded in the past.

I suggest, however, that one of the reasons for this lack of applications in many areas has been caused by the uncertainty that sufficient funds would be available even if the municipality or county government went through the procedures of making formal application.

By voting the full \$1 billion today, establishing the priority for clean water that the problem deserves, Congress will be making a clear and unmistakable declaration of its priorities. Such declaration cannot help but stimulate the confidence of local governments that funds will be available when applied for, and

I suggest that this in itself will promote the goal we have adopted in the 1966 act—a major attack by local government on the pollution of streams which have long been the greatest treasures of the American Government, and which will be again if we in Congress will only be consistent in our leadership and commitment.

I hope we will overwhelmingly adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RUPPE).

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, the people of the State of Michigan have been among those who have most enthusiastically supported the clean water program. I am proud to say that last year our people passed a bond issue in the amount of \$355 million for that particular purpose. The success of the bond issue depends on the support the Federal Government can give to it by full funding of this particular measure.

The success of the bond issue depends on the support of the Federal Government, however, which can be given today by full funding of this particular measure. I endorse the amendment.

The people in my own particular district support our actions here today. Even those people living along Lake Superior—which, incidentally, is the only large body of fresh water left in the United States today—wholeheartedly endorse the program. In my own poll several weeks ago they indicated by a 3-to-1 majority that they support this legislation and want full funding of the clean water legislation.

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

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, the No. 1 domestic issue in my district today is water pollution. I know from the volume of mail I have received that most of my constituents will be looking to this Congress to see what constructive efforts we are going to make.

I came reluctantly to the philosophy of Federal grants for water pollution control, but I am convinced now we must not only give Federal leadership, we must give Federal financial support.

In my area of Illinois, the residents of the North Shore Sanitary District voted \$75 million, their constitutional limit, for pollution control. It seems to me that that is the kind of local support we are getting from the people. If we provide \$1 billion, we meet the commitment in Illinois of only 44 percent of the requirement. It seems to me that is the least we can do today.

I congratulate the leaders of the effort to obtain full funding. No matter the outcome today, all of us who supported funding at the level of \$1 billion, and especially the sponsors of the amendment, should be aware that the move to increase the appropriation already has had a salutary effect. Quite obviously, the support of more than 200 of my colleagues for the \$1 billion figure has encouraged the committee to virtually triple the \$214 million provided in the budget. If nothing more is accomplished, the sponsors of the amendment deserve to take credit for the huge in-

crease in appropriation which has resulted from the move for full funding.

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore funds vital to the success of the national water pollution control program. Many construction projects throughout the United States will be delayed or stopped unless we appropriate the full \$1 billion we authorized this year for the clean water program. I want to commend the subcommittee for recognizing the seriousness of the problem. It did a good job in increasing the administration's request of \$214 million to \$600 million, yet I believe the Committee of the Whole should give its approval to the full authorization of \$1 billion.

We have heard from time to time the term "credibility gap." I think the phrase might apply to the present situation. Or perhaps we should talk of the "pollution gap." In any event we are faced with the proposition of forsaking our commitment to improving the quality of our Nation's environment unless we vote for this amendment.

Unfortunately the administration recommended only \$214 million for fiscal year 1970. We may well be castigated by the administration for voting the nearly \$800 million addition as we were in adding almost \$1 billion to the education budget. I am not worried about this, however, because I know the American people are extremely concerned, and rightly so, about their environment and their schools. These are part of the Nation's agenda, unfinished business, if you will.

If we review the rather sad record of the alarming gap between authorizations and appropriations for clean water we note that for the Nation as a whole only 30 percent of the funds authorized for water pollution control construction have actually been allocated. In Illinois the figure is even lower. Only 25 percent of the funds actually needed have been allocated. This is shameful and we must remedy the situation now.

In terms of dollars, the Congress in the 1968-70 period has authorized over \$2.1 billion under the Clean Waters Restoration Act; yet only a paltry \$631 million has been allocated. In Illinois, the figures are comparable. Its authorization share is \$113 million, but the State has received only \$29.2 million. In this fiscal year alone, the State of Illinois' authorization is \$53.4 million and were we to abide by the Nixon administration budget recommendation Illinois would receive only \$9.8 million.

We have heard a great deal of discussion about the Federal Government's responsibility to our local governments. I fully agree with these sentiments. Our local governments must become more viable, but how can they when they are forced to meet certain Federal standards without commensurate Federal assistance. During the 1967-69 period, for example, over \$4.1 billion was spent on waste treatment facilities but only \$567 million of that amount was in Federal assistance. At the same time, local and State governments were under pressure

to meet new Federal and State water quality standards set by the 1965 Water Quality Act. It is obvious that our local and State governments somehow aggregated enough money to move ahead.

But this type of partial action is far from comforting. Time is running out and the demands increase. In my own district seven communities have applications pending with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. The estimated cost of the projects is over \$4 million of which approximately \$1.3 million is in Federal assistance. They include Nameoki, Mitchell, Bethalto, Collinsville, Wood River Township, and Rosewood Heights in Madison County and Mascoutah in St. Clair County. Another eight communities in the Madison-St. Clair Counties area are probable applicants at some point. They include East Alton, Hartford, Granite City, Roxana, and Wood River in Madison County and Duplo, Sauget, and East St. Louis in St. Clair County. It is fair to say that if we were to accept the administration's recommendation of \$9.8 million for Illinois for fiscal year 1970 the prospects for funding these projects is discouraging.

It is time, Mr. Chairman, for the Congress and the White House to meet their obligations and honor their commitments to improving the quality of the Nation's environment. Water and air pollution have reached crisis proportions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, it is very evident this is not a partisan issue, the issue is clean water. I do not know when I ever have seen such a bipartisan effort in order to achieve full funding. Last year certainly, with the \$700 million authorization and only \$214 million appropriation, there was not full funding under a Democratic administration. This year, with the bipartisan effort, perhaps there will be full funding. With our urban areas growing and the need for sewage disposal becoming more pressing, we are going to have to increase our appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support this amendment for full funding of \$1 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to provide full funding for the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. Those who have spoken here today have dramatized the fact that we, as a Nation, are at last facing up to our responsibility in the area of water pollution. The bind we find ourselves in today was started several years ago when the previous administration failed to honor its commitments as a partner with the States and localities in working to assure a supply of clean water and good water for recreation. We in Maryland, with others, took that commitment at face value and willingly put up our share of the funds. Along with other States sharing the Potomac Basin, Marylanders are concerned that the river is becoming an open sewer—an intolerable condition for any of our great rivers, and especially the river running through the Nation's Cap-

ital. The Patuxent, the Patapsco, and other Maryland rivers will also benefit from this amendment.

In addition, I am pleased that this legislation includes appropriations for the Bloomington Dam. Until we clean up our river, we must act to provide adequate augmentation from the upper basin. Surveying and planning for Bloomington are already in progress, and this measure will push it further toward completion. It is one part of an insurance policy against water shortage in the Washington metropolitan area.

I am also very gratified to see that additional funds have been appropriated for a study leading to the construction of the Chesapeake Bay Basin hydraulic model. This bill also includes further funding for the enlargement of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, a project which, when completed, will be a great boost to the port of Baltimore and to the economy of the mid-Atlantic region. However, bay experts advise us that the enlarged canal could jeopardize another of our economic resources, the bay. The intrusion of saline water into the bay upon enlargement of the canal could have a profound effect on its ecology. The population of oysters, rockfish, and other staples of our seafood industry could be drastically reduced. We need, therefore, to study the physical, ecological, and biological changes which could result from the canal's diversion of water from the bay, and scientists tell us that the bay hydraulic model is an essential tool for such a study. I would caution that it would be unwise to complete the enlargement of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal until we have had a complete investigation in the context I have outlined.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KARTH).

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Three years ago Congress made a promise to the American people in the enactment of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 that we were no longer going to tolerate the continuing and accelerating deterioration of our Nation's waterways. On the contrary, Congress boldly decided in that act that it would authorize increasing sums of money during the next 5 years to mount an attack which would turn the corner in the fight against water pollution and permit us to begin the huge task of reclaiming and preserving what remains of our clean water supplies.

The Clean Water Restoration Act was an ambitious commitment to the American people. It promised Federal matching expenditures for construction of sewage treatment facilities amounting to \$150 million in fiscal 1967; \$450 million the following year; \$700 million in fiscal 1969; \$1 billion in the current fiscal year, 1970, and \$1¼ billion in the next fiscal year. That would have been a total of \$3 billion, \$650 million over the 5-year period.

Now let us see how we have done. In the first fiscal year—1967, we appropriated \$173 million; in the next, \$203 million; in the third, \$214 million, and for

the current fiscal year the budget request was \$214 million. Overall, then, for the first 4 fiscal years of the 5-year authorization period, the cumulative deficit—the gap between the promises and performances—would amount to about \$1.5 billion if the Congress should go along with the administration's budget request for the current fiscal year. Let us assume for the sake of discussion that Congress should go along with the figure recommended by the Appropriations Committee in the bill before us today. Then the cumulative 4-year deficit would amount to about \$1.1 billion. No matter how you slice it, Mr. Chairman, we have not been living up to the promises proclaimed with great fanfare when we passed the Clean Water Restoration Act. Even with the full \$1 billion appropriations authorized for this fiscal year by that act, we would have quite a distance to go if we wanted to make good on our promises of 4 short years ago.

Mr. Chairman, our country cannot afford not to spend what is needed—and to spend it now—in order to curb the runaway pollution of our remaining clean water. This is quite literally a matter of life and death. We must assume our responsibility and appropriate the funds needed to assist in building the sewage treatment plants which represent our first line of defense in this battle.

We made a promise 4 years ago. I urge my colleagues to reject those who would renege on that promise. I urge support for the Dingell amendment.

Mr. Chairman, following is a fact sheet resulting from a national survey conducted by the Gallup Organization, Inc., on the water pollution subject:

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 governments 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 "GMG" 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	1,214	1,038
The gap.....	7	9	-23	247	486	786	1,512

¹ Budget request.

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I take this brief opportunity to commend the many in the House who perhaps somewhat belatedly are now voting for full funding of this program.

This is particularly gratifying, Mr. Chairman, when we consider the silence was penetrating when this bill was offered at \$214 million last year. I think it is very significant that now we have those, who made no effort to fund beyond the \$214 million last year, who are now for the \$1 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, after listening to this debate, I feel like Gunga Din. I am also reminded of the quote from "The Ancient Mariner," "Water, water everywhere, and not a drop to drink."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOLAND yielded his time to Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES).

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to listen for a few moments to figures. If we put in \$1 billion for this particular purpose, because of the formula there will be about \$340 million overfunded. It will not be possible under the formula for the States to use the money which is allocated. It will not be possible to spend the money.

Please let us not do anything foolish. Let us put first things first. The first thing is to get this program off the ground—and we all want to do that—and that requires revising the formula in the legislation so that the money will go where the need is.

If this is done, we will not have any problems with the Appropriations Committee, because we are perfectly willing to fund the program and fund it to the highest capacity.

We do not intend to do anything silly, and we do not believe the Members of the House will, either.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) to close debate.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, what we are considering here today is a \$4.5 billion bill. Excluding AEC, \$2.3 billion is for water resource programs, all of which directly or indirectly contribute to water quality and pollution control.

So when Members vote for this bill they are voting for clean water, for water quality to the tune of \$2.3 billion.

This is repetitious, but last year the appropriation for waste treatment

grants was only \$214 million. For the present year the budget estimate was \$214 million. The committee has raised this to \$600 million, which is nearly three times what we funded last year. We believe this is a very generous amount.

I offered the amendment myself in the full committee to raise the amount from \$450 to \$600 million, so we have gone a long way in providing clean water.

Under this formula, I would repeat, the backlog of 25 States will be fully funded even for applications still pending at the local level. Seven more States will receive funding of all applications pending at the State and regional office levels. The remaining, and 18 States will receive grants totaling \$334 million.

Following this, at the end of 18 months there may be a surplus of as much as \$142 million that can be reallocated.

We believe the committee has provided very generously for this program. These applications are in various stages of preparation. Some of them have not even been verified. There is no assurance local funds are available. The bond markets and the interest rates make it very difficult to proceed as fast as some of us would like to proceed on this matter.

I read earlier, and I note again, the letter from the Secretary of the Interior, who says that because of inflation, because of the fiscal situation, he asks us to stand by the budget, but then says in any event not to go beyond \$600 million. That is all he believes can be effectively used.

Under the bill we will have \$100 million more than the Department says it can obligate. I urge the defeat of the amendment and ask the Members to stand by this bill, for \$4.5 billion.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Chairman, today this House can show its sincerity in trying to clean up the country's polluted rivers, streams, and lakes.

The bill before us is a major test as to our real determination in this fight for clean water.

The Congress, the administration, all segments of State and local governments are thoroughly committed to the cause of clean water. This is one of the most important and most popular crusades of the present time. But discussing it and forming committees to provide for the cleanup of our water supplies does not solve the problem and does not remove the filth from our water supply. In our fight for clean water, we must aid the municipalities to construct sewage treatment plants, but Congress has provided only a meager part of the funds necessary for these projects.

Congress, in 1966, raised the hopes that clean water would be made available to our Nation. At that time we approved a

significant rise in Federal assistance to States and cities for the construction of clean water facilities. This program was to expand from \$150 million in fiscal 1967 to \$1 billion in fiscal 1970. Yet out of the \$2.3 billion authorized in the last 4 years, including this one, Congress has appropriated only \$567 million for the 3 past years, and the current request is for \$214 million for fiscal 1970. In other words, while we were talking about a real water cleanup campaign, with good intentions and reassuring words, it has not gotten off the ground.

It is fortunate, however, that the great gap between our promises and performance has not been unnoticed by many Members of Congress or by the millions of American citizens who are now demanding the restoration of a healthy environment. A large number of organizations representing conservation groups, professional societies, organized labor, civic associations, city and county officials, and State governments have united their efforts in the crusade for clean water. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, more than 200 of us in this House have pledged ourselves to vote a \$1 billion appropriation for clean water when the big test comes.

One vital element in this situation is the plight in which cities find themselves. Under the prodding of Congress, State legislatures have been raising standards of sewage treatment which the cities will have to meet. But if they are denied Federal funds which were contemplated when the higher standards were set these cities will have to choose between failure to comply and the diversion of funds now allocated for education, housing, law enforcement and other programs to meet the new demands for clean water. It has been reported that more than 4,600 applications for sewage-treatment facilities are awaiting action, largely for lack of funds.

The plain fact is, Mr. Chairman, that Congress has reneged on its clean water pledge to the country. The technical knowhow for restoration of the Nation's streams and lakes to a tolerable condition is at hand. Much of the needed legislation is already on the books, and the missing element to help pay for treatment facilities is the immediate funding of these projects. Such action would change the clean water drive from a remote hope to a current reality.

I agree with the League of Women Voters, the National League of Cities, and the many other groups and individual leaders who are calling for an immediate appropriation of a billion dollars for the 1970 cleanup effort.

There are indications that the administration will accept substantial expansion of the clean water budget item it carried over from the Johnson budget. But we cannot compromise this issue. The judgment of Congress as was expressed in the Clean Water Restoration Act that \$1 billion would be needed this year from the Government for grants in this area was sound. We have a chance, today, to adhere to this judgment. In a matter that is of such vital importance to the country, we simply cannot afford to put ourselves into a position of with-

drawing from an obligation we have assumed and sought to impose on the States and cities.

Mr. Chairman, last week we authorized over \$21 billion for military purposes, many of them at overinflated values, many of them of dubious value and some of them unproven. Today we can, and should, provide this \$1 billion to clean up our water sources for the benefit of American mankind.

Let us not now go back on our past promises to adequately fund this water pollution program. Let us move forward and provide the money that is needed now—for tomorrow may be too little and too late.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL) to provide the full \$1 billion funding for the fiscal year 1970 construction grant program of the Clean Waters Restoration Act.

It is clear that both the \$214 million recommended for this program in President Nixon's budget and the \$600 million recommended by the Appropriations Committee would be inadequate. Just this week, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Quality and Research, Mr. Carl L. Klein, told members of the Water Pollution Control Federation that States and cities would have to clean up their sewage whether or not they get Federal subsidies promised under the Clean Waters Restoration Act.

According to the president of the National League of Cities, Mayor C. Beverly Briley of Nashville:

Local improvements must be made since the act provides for enforcement through the courts. Local units will be compelled to proceed with major improvements and expenditures whether or not the federal government meets its obligations. The sad product will be that cities will be forced to clean up the waterways but will do so at the expense of improving housing, education, and other critical local needs which draw upon the same resource base.

The full funding which would be provided by the amendment now under consideration would make a significant difference to New York State. At the present time, New York has pending application involving estimated Federal grants of \$1.3 billion. If the full \$1 billion funding is approved, New York would be eligible for Federal construction grants for waste treatment works totaling \$88,400,700. This represents an increase of approximately 72 percent over the \$51,470,200 which would be allocated to New York under the \$600 million appropriation recommended by the committee, and an increase of about 460 percent over the \$15,832,500 which would have been allotted to New York under the \$214 million requested by the administration.

It is clear, in view of the fact that New York State alone has application for Federal assistance totaling \$1.3 billion now pending, that even the \$1 billion appropriation we are considering will be inadequate to meet the enormous need for construction of waste treatment works. Municipalities, now considered the foremost contributors to the Nation's water pollution, have shown their

determination to do their share of the job of cleaning up the Nation's waterways. However, as Mayor Briley pointed out, any reduction in Federal assistance for waste treatment works must result in the cities' shortchanging other critical areas in order to combat pollution.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support this amendment to provide full funding for the Clean Waters Restoration Act for fiscal 1970, and to renew their efforts for the coming fiscal years. This problem can no longer be ignored if we are to keep America's lakes and rivers from turning into open sewers. I urge that the Dingell amendment be adopted.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, daily the tide of pollution rises higher, threatening to inundate and destroy the fabric of our national life. Communities and industries alike are pouring filth into our finite supply of clean water, and if action is not taken immediately and forcefully, we shall be too late. Any dollar we do not spend now in the name of false economy will cost us several dollars tomorrow in the name of national survival. The hour is late. Our leeway is almost gone. Words will not suffice. Immediate legislative action is imperative, to be followed by forceful national implementation by the Government.

The previous administration sought to meet this impending national disaster by passage of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. It provided for matching grants to States and local governments for construction of sewerage and other sanitary facilities. This act authorized \$1.6 billion for the total Federal contribution, \$1 billion of which was slated for fiscal year 1970. This year the Nixon administration aimed a crippling body blow at this vital effort by allotting \$214 million to it. States and municipalities have believed the word of the Federal Government, and their applications for assistance grants have poured in as water pollution's tide rises daily. State after State has adopted standards and drawn up plans which will come to naught without a Federal commitment of the most generous sort.

If any American citizen desires a classic illustration of how the administration has reversed national priorities, here it is. Our very life depends on clean water. Without an end to water pollution, America as a viable society will perish—utterly and disastrously. It is quite understandable that the administration has gutted park acquisition funds, consumer protection, model cities, aid to education, libraries, hospitals, and civil rights enforcement. These are programs which would help segments of society which simply do not figure in the President's political order of priorities. It is quite understandable that he would dismantle OEO, VISTA, Job Corps, and medical research, for these, too, are expendable in his scheme of things.

But the assault on water pollution and waste disposal threatens all of our society. Pollution knows no boundaries and the situation is already close to being totally out of hand. This year, \$1 billion was the figure to be committed, and there can be no compromise. Full funding is a

"must," and the Congress can and should act accordingly.

It is an act of national suicide to take any other position. No State, municipality, industry, or farm will act to prevent pollution without a major Federal fund commitment or example. Tough talk to polluters is all well and good, but it has failed in the past and will fail in the future unless we provide the monetary wherewithal to do the job.

I simply cannot comprehend how any administration can close its eyes to raw sewage pouring into water slated for drinking purposes farther downstream. Or to the devastating spectacle of Lake Erie. Or to the Cuyahoga River, which has been declared a fire hazard. Or to DDT pouring into watersheds. Or to paper plants and steel mills heaving billions of gallons of filth into irreplaceable bodies of water. Or massive fish kills and heaps of dead wildlife. Or bathing beaches closing down everywhere. Or ruined commercial fishing industries. Or oil spills and tankers flushing their bilges off our coasts.

Cumulatively, this spells the end of our society. No one is immune. No one is safe. No one can afford to ignore the ominous picture appearing with greater clarity every day before us.

I say there is no room for compromise on this issue. The full \$1 billion appropriation for clean water must be voted by this House. Any other action would be total betrayal of the struggle for a clean environment.

Mr. Chairman, many societies have risen and fallen throughout man's recorded history. Some have perished because of war. Others of pestilence or rupture of their frameworks because leaders have not heeded the inevitable warning signs. Unfair taxation, repression, and outdated institutions have caused others to disintegrate. Our society is daily tearing apart the delicately balanced structure of our natural heritage. Nature always strikes back at those who abuse her. If we do not act now to redress the already perilous imbalance we have created, we shall perish too, in an overwhelming tide of filth, pollution, and disease, all done by our own hand. We shall not go out with a bang, but like a last spark winking out in a garbage dump.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment to increase funding for the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to \$1 billion.

We have heard about the problems of many areas of the Nation, including Lake Erie, where a \$1 billion appropriation would only be a start to meeting the massive problems of that now dead lake. We need only drive down to the Potomac River to witness another massive problem.

Even so, many Members still may fail to realize the full extent and cost of meeting water pollution problems. I would like to cite an example from my hometown and congressional district. San Jose, Calif., is not yet one of the most famous cities of this Nation. It is, perhaps, best known for two songs, one "Do You Know the Way to San Jose?" and the other a humorous song involv-

ing San Francisco and garbage, but that is another story.

Even so, San Jose is the fourth largest city in California and it has faced massive water pollution problems. In fact, the city and the surrounding area has already spent more than \$30 million to combat its problems and has committed more than \$30 million to further improvements in its sewage treatment system. The total expense of the San Jose-Santa Clara sewage treatment system will exceed \$70 million.

The administration's original request for water pollution construction grants was a mere \$214 million, not enough money to take care of even three San Joses, not to mention Lake Erie.

In addition San Jose, which fronts on south San Francisco Bay, has a responsibility to help with the total problem of bay pollution. The solution to that problem will cost more than \$1 billion additional. Finally, the great city of San Francisco has no adequate sewage treatment program and its failure in sewage treatment is one of the major causes of soiling the bay. Cost of an adequate sewage treatment system for San Francisco is estimated to cost another \$1 billion.

Thus, in the relatively small area in which I live, the cost of meeting sewage treatment problems will exceed \$2 billion. We are but a small part of the United States and our massive problems are only indicative of the total problem.

One of the three great crises of our time is the struggle to retain and improve our environment and to do so before man poisons this planet and destroys all life on it. I believe this appropriation is at least as important, if not more important, than the military appropriations we recently approved.

In today's world our battle for survival is against man's mistakes and his own poisons. Armaments will not help, this appropriation will help.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in vigorous support for the amendment offered by Mr. MINSHALL. As one whose district suffers sorely from the problem of polluted streams, rivers and lakes, I know firsthand how badly this amendment, and the full funding it contains, are needed. My district contains a body of water, Onondaga Lake, which has been described by the FWPCA as one of the worst examples of pollution in the entire Northeastern United States. And like other areas of the Nation, Syracuse and Onondaga County have inadequate waste treatment facilities, so that a bad situation becomes worse every day.

Mr. Chairman, in 1966 the Congress made a commitment to the Nation that we would move ahead with proper funding for pollution control and abatement. We have not kept faith with the Nation on that commitment. Today we can attempt to rectify the situation. Today we can make good our promise of 3 years ago to fund fully the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Every Member in this Chamber realizes the severity of the problem. Every Member knows that there is an almost unbelievable backlog of applications from cities and States across the country, all seeking help on their treat-

ment facilities programs. The cities and counties cannot be expected to handle this problem alone. Neither can the States. It is up to us to act responsibly. It is up to us to provide the funds and the leadership in this fight. Surely if we could authorize last week hundreds of millions of dollars for military procurement programs, many of which were not even sought by the Pentagon, we can appropriate adequate funds for the battle against pollution control, funds which are desperately needed and desperately sought by local and State governments.

The amendment offers a vehicle for waging all-out war on one of the most devastating developments on the domestic scene: the corruption, through misuse, abuse and negligence, of our natural resources. We cannot wait any longer. I urge every Member to stand up and be counted in this battle. I urge a vote of overwhelming support for the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Minshall amendment authorizing full funding for construction for waste treatment facilities. We must give a top priority to our programs to clean up the Nation's environment.

Pollution of our waterways, as well as of our air, is getting worse, and it is costing us in terms of money, health, and recreation. Virtually every stream, river, lake, and harbor is becoming uglier and more dangerous. In 1968, over 15 million fish were killed by water pollution—an increase of 30 percent since 1965. To quote the comic strip character "Pogo," "We have met the enemy and they are us."

Our population is rapidly increasing and, in order to accommodate our citizens, preservation of our planet and its resources must not be denied. Congress has the opportunity to realize the goal of "clean water" by appropriating the full amount authorized under the Clean Water Restoration Act.

Last week this body authorized over \$20 billion for military defense. How can we deny \$1 billion to clean up and protect our environment?

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the public works appropriation bill which requires full funding for water pollution control.

Pure water is one of man's most basic requirements. The Federal Government must assist communities by giving the financial assistance contemplated and promised by our legislation.

Denial of realistic assistance to communities seeking to provide pure water denies the reality of access to pure water. That is why I urge that we join forces in support of the necessary appropriations.

That there is widespread public demand for Federal assistance with control of water pollution is attested to by the enormous backlog of applications for construction grants—more than 4,600—waiting for nonexistent funds in the offices of Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and State water pollution bureaus.

Caught between high standards set by States in compliance with the Water

Quality Act of 1965 and the demands of citizens on the one hand, and inadequate funds on the other, municipal governments are hard put to build the water treatment plants and sewage systems they need today, not to mention what they will need in an immediate tomorrow. And by municipal I do not mean cities only. Communities under 10,000 now account for almost half of the dollar value of new waste treatment plants. Meanwhile, the press of population and expanding industry is forcing most cities to upgrade, expand, and replace existing systems.

The question is, Will the Federal Government meet its commitment to the people of the Nation to help them keep their water supplies pure?

Reliance on Federal assistance with the vital work of restoring and maintaining pure water supplies was encouraged by the 1966 act. The funds authorized were meaningful. There was hope on the horizon. The funds actually appropriated have been so far short of the authorizations that citizens might well question the integrity of Congress in approving the original bill.

More than 70 percent of the funds authorized for water pollution control for 1968 to 1970 have not been appropriated. Put another way, we have done only about one-third of what we led the people to believe we would do to help them provide clean water for their communities.

The Conservation Foundation newsletter of August 7, 1969, reports that the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration estimates that \$8,200,000,000 in total capital outlays are needed for municipal treatment plants in the 5-year period of 1969-73 if quality water standards are to be met. A 1968 inventory showed that 1,582 communities, with a population of 11.3 million, had no waste treatment. Another 2,117 communities, with a population of 43.7 million, had only primary treatment.

Naturally, each of us is most familiar with the struggle against water pollution in his own State. At present, various local agencies in Hawaii have projects planned which will cost an estimated \$10,386,000. Some \$3,348,000 has been requested, and is urgently needed from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to carry out the work.

The city and county of Honolulu has requested \$803,040 for use in a project estimated at a total cost of \$2,676,801.

Mauue County has requested \$200,870 for use in a project estimated at a total cost of \$608,700.

The Nanakuli Interceptor project has requested \$495,000 for use in a project estimated at a total cost of \$1,500,000.

The Makaha Section 3 Interceptor project has requested \$115,000 for use in a project estimated at a total cost of \$350,000.

The Kailua Interceptor project has requested \$297,000 for use in a project estimated at a total cost of \$900,000.

Kawaihae-Puako has requested \$247,500 for use in a project estimated at a total cost of \$750,000.

Lihue-Nawiliwili has requested \$280,500 for use in a project estimated at a total cost of \$850,000.

Honokowai has requested \$494,000 for use in a project estimated at a total cost of \$1,500,000.

Kaunakakai has requested \$247,500 for use in a project estimated at a total cost of \$750,000.

Lanai has requested \$165,000 for use in a project estimated at a total cost of \$500,000.

These figures demonstrate the heavy burdens that local communities are assuming in their efforts to keep their water supplies pure. I am voting to assist them in their efforts when I vote today for the amendment which will appropriate the full authorization for 1970.

Let us do what we said we would do and begin to mount a truly national campaign against water pollution.

Mr. GILBERT, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Minshall amendment, which is the same as the proposal of my colleague, Mr. DINGELL of Michigan, to increase the appropriation for public works for water pollution control to \$1 billion, which is the amount Congress authorized in passing the Clean Water Restoration Act.

I am deeply concerned about water pollution in my State of New York. In 1965 a \$1 billion bond issue for water pollution control was approved by over 80 percent of the voters. New York State currently has \$1,299,528,965 in matching grant applications pending before the Federal Water Pollution Control Board. If the administration request of \$214 million is approved, New York will receive only \$15.8 million. If we appropriate the full \$1 billion authorized, New York State's share will be \$88.4 million.

I am concerned about two major water pollution projects in my district: one planned for Hunts Point in the Bronx, and one for which the initial grant has been approved for an interceptor sewer, pumping station, and forced main, now underway on Rikers Island, south Bronx. These are important steps toward water pollution control in my State, and there are, of course, a number of similar urgently needed projects planned or already approved and begun, which will have to be curtailed or abandoned if the full \$1 billion is not approved.

Mr. Chairman, I think all of us in this Chamber agree that the dangers posed by water pollution are so great that control and abatement actions deserve top Federal priority.

Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment, to provide the originally authorized amount of \$1 billion for the construction of waste treatment works, and I urge and hope that the House will overwhelmingly approve it.

It is undeniable that water pollution has become a major danger to the people of this country. Right now and day after day, vast quantities of all kinds of polluted matter are being poured into our water supplies through human waste and industrial byproducts.

Of course, this is a period and a time when budget restraint and expenditure reduction is entirely in order. To that essential objective we are all commonly pledged. The only hard and real question is, In what order is the restraint and reduction to be exercised?

Many of us, committed to the support of the increased funding proposed in this amendment are so committed because we believe that water pollution control is virtually a matter of life or death to millions of Americans and, eventually, our entire population. We also believe there can be no higher order of priority and prudent spending than the protection and preservation of human life.

I would further remind my colleagues that, in previous legislative actions here, the Congress virtually promised the various States and localities throughout the country that \$1 billion would be provided in matching grants to them for their local water pollution control programs. Depending upon this promise these various States and communities have initiated some 4,000 to 5,000 applications for Federal assistance and the urgent projects involved in these applications cannot be started or carried on without Federal assistance. In every area throughout the country, including my own State of Massachusetts, every local resource has been exhausted in preparing and planning these projects, on the assumption that Federal aid would be available. To deny such aid now would be tantamount to the betrayal of a trust.

Mr. Chairman, the control of water pollution is imperative in the national interest. The necessity to carry forward existing control projects and initiate new ones grows increasingly urgent every hour. Authoritative polls clearly show that the great majority of the American people well recognize the danger and heartily approve the full funding of \$1 billion for the construction of waste treatment facilities throughout the Nation as a giant step toward complete water pollution control and correction. Therefore, in accord with the expressed will of the great majority of the American people, I again urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. HALPERN, Mr. Chairman, there is a sardonic little folk song that dramatizes just how backward America is when it comes to controlling water pollution. The lyrics are an effrontery to the people of my State, New York, for they suggest just how little we are doing to reestablish the ecological balance resulting from our wasted environment.

"The breakfast garbage they throw out in Troy, they drink at lunch in Perth Amboy . . ." is the way Tom Lehrer describes the Hudson River. And unless New York receives its fair share of the full \$1 billion appropriation for antiwater pollution projects authorized by the 1966 Clean Water Restoration Act for fiscal 1970, then I am afraid, our society will not be able to realize its goals for water purification.

For anyone alarmed by the prospect that children must drink chemically purified water in most regions of the Nation today, the very idea of minimizing our commitment to clean water is repugnant.

Indeed, any attempt to reduce the scope of our efforts to clean water is senseless, because we are already two or three decades behind in terms of controlling our environment. And I am haunted by the thought that whole generations will soon not know what "better" or "pure" means.

Unfamiliar with their environment and narcotized by the artificial world they have inherited, they may see little value in restoring the ecological balance between man and nature's water reserves.

Today, in New York it is unsafe to swim in lakes and rivers which have become aquatic deserts filled with dead plants and fish, to say nothing about the number of cases of respiratory diseases resulting from sulfur dioxide and other chemicals which permeate the atmosphere.

In a nation where 70 percent of the people are crowded onto 1 percent of the land in our cities, polluted water and the disappearance of recreational water facilities suggest that blightedness has overtaken our environment. We are fouling our rivers, lakes, and streams with so much organic waste and bacteria that in some areas the natural composition of water—including its ability to retain oxygen—is being threatened.

What is being done? The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 allocated about \$200 million annually to help municipalities construct waste treatment plants, and the Water Quality Act of 1965 authorizes States to define and enforce regional water quality standards. Incentives are offered business to construct industrial waste treatment facilities, but they are not sufficient, and not nearly enough funds are allotted to help urban areas establish modern sewage systems.

However, the Clean Water Act authorized over 5 years in Federal matching grants to States for sewage treatment facility construction—from \$150 million in fiscal 1967 to \$450 million in 1968, \$700 million in 1969, \$1 billion in 1970, and \$1.25 billion in 1971.

To date only \$567 million has been appropriated. The administration's \$214 million request for fiscal 1970 would have increased this to \$781 million, roughly one-third of the \$2.3 billion authorized.

What this means for New York was spelled out by Governor Rockefeller in a telegram to me yesterday:

State projects are entitled to 50 to 55 percent federal construction grants, but now receive on the average only four percent due to inadequate federal appropriations, result is that the state has already committed \$150 million to prefinance the federal share in addition to state grants of 30 percent.

With federal and state construction aid, municipalities, should pay 15 to 20 percent, but inadequate federal funding has meant they must put up 40 percent. Local Governments in New York have already committed \$160 million which is rightfully a federal obligation. In total, New York and its municipalities have advanced \$310 million because the federal government has not met its obligations in the urgent attack on water pollution.

The House Appropriations Committee recognized the complete inadequacy of present funding in recommending an increase from the present \$214 to \$600 million, but even with full funding of the \$1 billion authorization, New York's share of \$88 million would be far short of the \$752 million to which it is entitled for eligible projects in fiscal 1969-70.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot overemphasize the importance of full funding for the fiscal 1970 appropriation of the clean

water law. The funds are desperately needed if we are to break the inertia that hampered State, local, and Federal agencies in the fight to reestablish the ecological balance between man and one of nature's basic elements, water.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL).

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MINSHALL and Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 146, noes 148.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order?

Are there any amendments to be offered?

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS), a question for the purpose of making legislative history.

On page 52 there is a statement on the Little Blue River Reservoir project, Missouri, the first part of which reads:

The Committee has no objection to the proposed advance of funds by Jackson County to expedite land acquisition in the project area to alleviate hardship and pressure cases.

My question is, May the county court of Jackson County, Mo., proceed to advance its own funds as a part of its contribution to this project to expedite land acquisition in those cases where zoning changes may make the cost of land double or triple in cost? In other words, Mr. Chairman, does the passage of this appropriation bill today give our county court of Jackson County, Mo., the green light to proceed to acquire lands for reservoirs in those areas where delay would be costly? Could you answer these questions?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct. When we act today, we have given consent of the House. It would be wise to wait until the other body has acted before actual purchase. We have no control over the other body. As far as the House is concerned, Jackson County can proceed to acquire these necessary lands as a part of their local contribution to this project.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee for the attention given to the transmission line from Great Falls to Browning, Mont.

I want to thank the committee for that appropriation. I would like to ask the committee if they think this agree-

ment that is mentioned on page 77 between the Bureau of Reclamation and the private power company will take a long time to complete?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I would say to my friend that I would hope the negotiations can be speeded up as much as possible and expedited. I have long felt that this matter should be resolved.

Mr. OLSEN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BOLAND. I think we ought to give the gentleman from Montana the assurance that if a satisfactory agreement is not reached, the Federal line will be constructed.

Mr. OLSEN. I thank the gentleman very much.

The point I wanted to make is that this is a very large Indian reservation with a large population of very progressive people. They have waited 100 years for this service.

I thank the committee for their consideration to see to it that they get it.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We are very sympathetic to the proposition.

Mr. OLSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee about an item on the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission. I notice on page 29 of the bill, you have appropriated \$917,000 for the continuation of the Commission. Last year we authorized \$6,500,000 additional funds for this Commission to operate until 1970.

Can the gentleman tell me how much is left of that \$6,500,000?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri, that the money appropriated in the bill to wind up the work of the Commission is within the authorization ceiling and is needed to complete the analysis and prepare the final work.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Does the gentleman mean that the entire \$6,500,000 will be used up from the amount that is appropriated in this fiscal year?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I understand that an additional \$263,000 under the authorization is planned for fiscal year 1971 to generalize the report scheduled for December 1, 1970.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL: On page 14, line 17, strike out "\$600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$750,000,000."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we have already passed that item in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee just made a unanimous-consent request that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any

point. I would consider that under the unanimous-consent request, regardless of whether we have read beyond the point, the amendment would be very much in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Michigan that the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Tennessee was that the remainder of the bill be considered as having been read and open to amendment at any point, and the Clerk had read two paragraphs beyond the paragraph to which the amendment would apply. So the Chair upholds the point of order.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) rise?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'HARA. Would it be possible to offer an amendment to the language on page 14, lines 15 through 17, in the House after the Committee rises?

The CHAIRMAN. That request would have to be taken care of at the time a motion ordering the previous question is made.

Mr. O'HARA. But if the previous question were not ordered, the amendment would then be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. That question would be determined by the Speaker of the House.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ASPINALL, 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. 14159) making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DINGELL. If the previous question is voted down, would it then be in order to offer an amendment to raise

the sum for water pollution control grants to the States in the sum of \$1 billion?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that, if the previous question is voted down, it would be in order to offer an amendment. The Chair is not going to pass on the amount at the present time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DINGELL. Would I be recognized for that purpose? It would be my intent so to do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not going to give a preliminary opinion as to whom the Chair might recognize.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 215, nays 187, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—215

Abbutt	Findley	Passman
Abernethy	Fisher	Patman
Albert	Flowers	Patten
Alexander	Flynt	Perkins
Anderson, Ill.	Ford, Gerald R.	Pettis
Andrews, Ala.	Fountain	Pickle
Andrews, N. Dak.	Frelinghuysen	Poage
Arends	Frey	Poff
Ashbrook	Fuqua	Pollock
Aspinall	Galifianakis	Price, Tex.
Ayres	Gettys	Pryor, Ark.
Baring	Glaime	Purcell
Belcher	Goldwater	Quile
Bell, Calif.	Goodling	Rarick
Bennett	Griffin	Reid, Ill.
Bevill	Gross	Reifel
Blackburn	Grover	Rhodes
Blanton	Gubser	Roberts
Boggs	Hagan	Robison
Boland	Haley	Rogers, Colo.
Bow	Hall	Rogers, Fla.
Bray	Hammer-	Roth
Brinkley	schmidt	Roudebush
Brock	Hanna	Ruth
Brooks	Hansen, Idaho	Sandman
Brotzman	Hansen, Wash.	Satterfield
Brown, Ohio	Hastings	Scherle
Broyhill, N.C.	Hébert	Schneebeil
Broyhill, Va.	Henderson	Schwengel
Buchanan	Hosmer	Scott
Burke, Fla.	Hull	Sebellus
Burleson, Tex.	Hunt	Shipley
Bush	Ichord	Shriver
Byrnes, Wis.	Jarman	Sikes
Cabell	Johnson, Pa.	Sisk
Caffery	Jonas	Skubitz
Camp	Jones, Ala.	Slack
Carter	Jones, N.C.	Smith, Calif.
Casey	Kazen	Smith, Iowa
Cederberg	King	Smith, N.Y.
Chappell	Kleppe	Snyder
Clancy	Kuykendall	Springer
Clausen,	Kyl	Stafford
Don H.	Landgrebe	Steed
Clawson, Del.	Landrum	Steiger, Ariz.
Cohelan	Langen	Stubblefield
Collier	Lennon	Stuckey
Colmer	Lloyd	Talcott
Conable	Long, La.	Teague, Calif.
Conte	Long, Md.	Teague, Tex.
Cowger	Lukens	Thompson, Ga.
Cramer	McDade	Thomson, Wis.
Cunningham	McEwen	Utt
Daniel, Va.	McFall	Waggonner
Davis, Ga.	McKneally	Wampler
Davis, Wis.	Mahon	Watkins
de la Garza	Mailliard	Watson
Dellenback	Mann	Watts
Dennis	Marsh	White
Devine	Martin	Whitehurst
Dickinson	May	Whitten
Dorn	Mayne	Whidall
Dowdy	Meskill	Wiggins
Downing	Michel	Williams
Duncan	Mills	Wilson, Bob
Edmondson	Mize	Winn
Edwards, La.	Mizell	Wold
Erlenborn	Montgomery	Wyatt
Eshleman	Morton	Wylie
Evans, Colo.	Myers	Young
Evins, Tenn.	Natcher	Zion
Fallon	Nelsen	Zwach
	O'Neal, Ga.	

NAYS—187

Adair	Garmatz	Moss
Acams	Gaydos	Murphy, Ill.
Addabbo	Gibbons	Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson,	Gilbert	Nedzi
Calif.	Gonzalez	Nix
Anderson,	Gray	Obey
Tenn.	Green, Ore.	O'Hara
Annunzio	Green, Pa.	Olsen
Ashley	Griffiths	O'Neill, Mass.
Barrett	Gude	Ottinger
Beall, Md.	Halpern	Philbin
Betts	Hamilton	Pike
Biaggi	Hanley	Pirnle
Blester	Harrington	Preyer, N.C.
Bingham	Harsha	Price, Ill.
Blatnik	Harvey	Pucinski
Bolling	Hathaway	Quillen
Brademas	Hawkins	Rallsback
Brasco	Hays	Randall
Broomfield	Hechler, W. Va.	Reid, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Heckler, Mass.	Reuss
Brown, Mich.	Helstoski	Riegle
Burke, Mass.	Hicks	Rodino
Burlison, Mo.	Hogan	Rooney, N.Y.
Burton, Calif.	Horton	Rooney, Pa.
Button	Hungate	Rosenthal
Byrne, Pa.	Hutchinson	Rostenkowski
Celler	Jacobs	Roybal
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Ruppe
Chisholm	Jones, Tenn.	Ryan
Clark	Karth	St Germain
Clay	Kastenmeier	Saylor
Cleveland	Kee	Schadeberg
Conyers	Keith	Scheuer
Corbett	Kluczynski	Stagers
Corman	Koch	Stanton
Coughlin	Kyros	Stelger, Wis.
Culver	Latta	Stokes
Daddario	Leggett	Stratton
Daniels, N.J.	Lowenstein	Sullivan
Delaney	Lujan	Symington
Dent	McCarthy	Taft
Derwinski	McClory	Taylor
Diggs	McCloskey	Thompson, N.J.
Dingell	McClulloch	Tiernan
Donohue	McDonald,	Udall
Dulski	Mich.	Ullman
Dwyer	Macdonald,	Van Deerlin
Eckhardt	Mass.	Vander Jagt
Edwards, Calif.	MacGregor	Vanik
Ellberg	Madden	Vigorito
Esch	Matsunaga	Waldie
Farbstein	Meeds	Welcker
Fascell	Melcher	Whalen
Feighan	Mikva	Wilson,
Fish	Miller, Ohio	Charles H.
Flood	Minish	Wolf
Foley	Mink	Wright
Ford,	Minshall	Wydler
William D.	Mollohan	Wyman
Fraser	Monagan	Yates
Friedel	Moorhead	Yatron
Fulton, Pa.	Morgan	Zablocki
Fulton, Tenn.	Morse	
Gallagher	Mosher	

NOT VOTING—29

Berry	Howard	Pepper
Burton, Utah	Kirwan	Podell
Cahill	Lipscomb	Powell
Carey	McClure	Rees
Collins	McMillan	Rivers
Dawson	Mathias	St. Onge
Denney	Miller, Calif.	Stepher
Edwards, Ala.	Nichols	Tunney
Foreman	O'Konski	Whalley
Hollfield	Pelly	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hollfield for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Carey with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Lipscomb.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Podell with Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Rees with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. McClure.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Denney.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Collins.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Foreman.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Whalley with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. BETTS changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow of Ohio moves to recommit the bill H.R. 14159 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MINSHALL. I understand that under the precedents of the House, the senior member of the Appropriations Committee does have precedence in making the motion to recommit. I would just state that if that had not been the case, I would have resubmitted my motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state, that is a statement and not a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 397, nays 3, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—397

Abbott	Blester	Cabell
Abernethy	Bingham	Caffery
Adair	Blackburn	Camp
Adams	Blanton	Carter
Addabbo	Blatnik	Casey
Albert	Boggs	Cederberg
Alexander	Boland	Celler
Anderson,	Bolling	Chamberlain
Calif.	Brasco	Chappell
Anderson, Ill.	Bray	Chisholm
Anderson,	Brinkley	Clancy
Tenn.	Brook	Clark
Andrews, Ala.	Brooks	Clausen,
Andrews,	Broomfield	Don H.
N. Dak.	Brotzman	Clawson, Del
Annunzio	Brown, Calif.	Clay
Arends	Brown, Mich.	Cleveland
Ashbrook	Brown, Ohio	Cohelan
Ashley	Broyhill, N.C.	Collier
Aspinall	Broyhill, Va.	Colmer
Ayres	Bucanan	Conable
Baring	Burke, Fla.	Conte
Barrett	Burke, Mass.	Conyers
Beall, Md.	Burleson, Tex.	Corbett
Belcher	Burlison, Mo.	Corman
Bell, Calif.	Burton, Calif.	Coughlin
Bennett	Bush	Cowger
Betts	Button	Cramer
Bevill	Byrne, Pa.	Culver
Blaggi	Byrnes, Wis.	Cunningham

Daddario	Jacobs	Rallsback
Daniel, Va.	Jarman	Randall
Daniels, N.J.	Johnson, Calif.	Rarick
Davis, Ga.	Johnson, Pa.	Reid, Ill.
Davis, Wis.	Jonas	Reid, N.Y.
de la Garza	Jones, Ala.	Reifel
Delaney	Jones, N.C.	Reuss
Dellenback	Jones, Tenn.	Rhodes
Dennis	Karth	Riegle
Dent	Kastenmeier	Rivers
Derwinski	Kazen	Roberts
Devine	Kee	Robison
Dickinson	Keith	Rodino
Diggs	King	Rogers, Colo.
Dingell	Kleppe	Rogers, Fla.
Donohue	Kluczynski	Rooney, N.Y.
Dorn	Koch	Rooney, Pa.
Dowdy	Kuykendall	Rosenthal
Downing	Kyl	Rostenkowski
Dulski	Kyros	Roth
Duncan	Landgrebe	Roudebush
Dwyer	Landrum	Roybal
Eckhardt	Langen	Ruppe
Edmondson	Latta	Ruth
Edwards, Calif.	Leggett	Ryan
Edwards, La.	Lennon	St Germain
Eilberg	Lloyd	Sandman
Erlenborn	Long, La.	Satterfield
Esch	Long, Md.	Schadeberg
Eshleman	Lowenstein	Scherle
Evans, Colo.	Lujan	Scheuer
Evins, Tenn.	McCarthy	Schneebell
Fallon	McClory	Schwengel
Farbstein	McCloskey	Scott
Fascell	McCulloch	Sebelius
Feighan	McDade	Shiplee
Findley	McDonald,	Shriver
Fish	Mich.	Sikes
Fisher	McEwen	Sisk
Flood	McFall	Skubitz
Flowers	McKneally	Slack
Flynt	Macdonald,	Smith, Calif.
Foley	Mass.	Smith, Iowa
Ford, Gerald R.	MacGregor	Smith, N.Y.
Ford,	Madden	Snyder
William D.	Mahon	Springer
Fountain	Mailliard	Stafford
Fraser	Mann	Staggers
Frelinghuysen	Marsh	Stanton
Frey	Martin	Steed
Friedel	Mathias	Steiger, Ariz.
Fulton, Pa.	Matsunaga	Steiger, Wis.
Fulton, Tenn.	May	Stokes
Fuqua	Mayne	Stratton
Gallifanakis	Meeds	Stubbsfield
Gallagher	Melcher	Stuckey
Garmatz	Meskill	Sullivan
Gaydos	Michel	Symington
Gettys	Mikva	Taft
Giammo	Miller, Ohio	Talcott
Gibbons	Mills	Taylor
Gilbert	Minish	Teague, Calif.
Goldwater	Mink	Thompson, Ga.
Gonzalez	Minshall	Thompson, N.J.
Goodling	Mize	Thomson, Wis.
Gray	Mizell	Tierman
Green, Oreg.	Mollohan	Udall
Green, Pa.	Monagan	Ullman
Griffin	Montgomery	Utt
Griffiths	Moorhead	Van Deerlin
Gross	Morgan	Vander Jagt
Grover	Morse	Vanik
Gubser	Morton	Vigorito
Gude	Mosher	Waggonner
Hagan	Moss	Waldie
Haley	Murphy, Ill.	Wampler
Hall	Murphy, N.Y.	Watkins
Halpern	Myers	Watson
Hamilton	Natcher	Watts
Hammer-	Nedzi	Welcker
schmidt	Nelsen	Whalen
Hanley	Nix	White
Fanna	Obey	Whitehurst
Hansen, Idaho	O'Hara	Whitten
Hansen, Wash.	Olsen	Widnall
Harrington	O'Neal, Ga.	Wiggins
Harsha	O'Neill, Mass.	Williams
Harvey	Passman	Wilson, Bob
Hastings	Fatman	Wilson,
Hathaway	Patten	Charles H.
Hawkins	Perkins	Winn
Hays	Pettis	Wold
Hébert	Pickle	Wolf
Hechler, W. Va.	Pike	Wright
Heckler, Mass.	Poage	Wyatt
Henderson	Poff	Wydler
Ficks	Pollock	Wylie
Hogan	Preyer, N.C.	Wyman
Horton	Price, Ill.	Yates
Hosmer	Price, Tex.	Yatron
Hull	Pryor, Ark.	Young
Hungate	Pucinski	Zablocki
Hunt	Purcell	Zion
Hutchinson	Quile	Zwach
Ichord	Quillen	

NAYS—3

Bow	Ottinger	Saylor
	NOT VOTING—31	
Berry	Howard	Pirnie
Brademas	Kirwan	Podell
Burton, Utah	Lipscorn	Powell
Cahill	Lukens	Rees
Carey	McClure	St. Onge
Collins	McMillan	Stephens
Dawson	Miller, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Denney	Nichols	Tunney
Edwards, Ala.	O'Konski	Whalley
Foreman	Pelly	
Hollifield	Pepper	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Berry.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Lujan.
 Mr. Podell with Mr. O'Konski.
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Rees with Mr. Foreman.
 Mr. Nichols with Mr. Collins.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Denney.
 Mr. Tunney with Mr. Lipscomb.
 Mr. Brademas with Mr. McClure.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Pirnie.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Stephens.
 Mr. Dawson with Mr. Powell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and on the Minshall amendment, and that they may include tables in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ROGERS CALLS FOR A CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF U.S. DEFENSES

(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 becoming increasingly concerned, as additional details are made public, as to how a Cuban Mig fighter plane was able to fly over an American submarine base, through American air space to an American Air Force base and literally land his plane next to the plane of the President of the United States, practically undetected and most certainly unchallenged.

Apparently the Secretary of Defense's order to cut back on funds for Air Force radar picket planes took effect just after the President flew into Miami and be-

fore the Cuban Mig flew in. Two of the three regularly scheduled picket planes were taken off their 9-hour shifts, leaving only one picket plane to survey the Caribbean and Gulf of Mexico on a single 9-hour shift each day.

As fate would have it, the single plane which is responsible for detecting any low flying aircraft which might come in under our radar, was not in the air. And fortunately for us, as fate would have it, the Cuban Mig was not on a military mission.

The point I would make here is that we have voted some \$780 million for work on a supersophisticated anti-ballistic-missile system—ABM—to stop some supersophisticated missiles which may or may not someday come at this Nation from thousands of miles away.

Yet a military plane from an unfriendly nation only 90 miles from our coast enters this country and our only response of record was a single, short radar sighting which was unidentified and unverified.

Mr. Speaker, does this mean that the only protection the southeastern part of this Nation gets via the \$80 billion defense budget is an unidentified blip?

Are there so many more pressing items in the Secretary of Defense's budget that we cannot afford to protect the people and the military installations in south Florida and the rest of the southeastern part of the Nation?

It looks to me that we may have built some sort of maginot line around some portions of this Nation and left the southeastern part of the Nation open completely. This despite the fact that while we fret about China and her potential danger, Cuba, just 90 miles away, represents a real and serious danger.

I think the Secretary of Defense should restudy his priorities and give serious consideration to this matter. Before we prepare for China of the 1970's and 1980's, we had better think of today and the possibilities of another Mig, or a rocket, or missile from 90 miles away.

The most immediate and minimal response to this situation, I would feel, would be to put the proper number of picket planes in the air over Florida. Eventually, I would think that a body-type radar system stationed in the straits between Cuba and Florida would also be considered.

All this is not to mention the fact that I consider the entire incident a serious breach of security to the President of the United States himself.

Mr. Speaker, I am writing the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee urging him to immediately investigate the incident.

A FUNDING SON LOOKS AT THE FOUNDING FATHERS

(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, in the September 26, 1969, issue of Life magazine, there appears a fine article by our colleague from Missouri (Mr. SYMING-

TON). This article titled "A Funding Son Looks at the Founding Fathers" was written as a review of the Broadway musical "1776," which Mr. SYMINGTON says "is an intriguing glimpse of history as seen through an 18th century laugh-in."

He goes on to say:

Poetic, or at least prosaic, license is taken with the events and discourses of the period.

At the opening curtain, the Founding Fathers reprimand their testy, independence-minded colleague John Adams with a lusty chorus of "Sit Down, John." Mr. SYMINGTON goes on to say:

I have heard this kind of suggestion whispered under the breath of my colleagues during the pronouncements of their brethren, but I've never been treated to the sight of the whole assembly bursting into song.

In looking at what Mr. SYMINGTON calls the "generation gap" between his colleagues and the granddaddy of all Congresses, he says he mourns the infrequency of humor or robust extemporanea in present-day sessions.

With press and public in the gallery, we are daily answerable—for style as well as content—to a skeptical constituency. We mute our performance accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I think this article written by Mr. SYMINGTON deserves recognition. Although much of the article is written in a very humorous vein, a number of the serious problems of this House are highlighted. Humor is a refreshing way to examine ourselves.

I would like to introduce the article as an insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and congratulate my colleague on a fine job, well done:

[From Life magazine, Sept. 26, 1969]

A FUNDING SON LOOKS AT THE FOUNDING FATHERS—"1776"

(NOTE.—James W. Symington, folk-singing congressman from Missouri and son of Senator and former Air Force Secretary Stuart Symington, recently got around to seeing the musical "1776" and drew some conclusions about the generation gap between his colleagues and the granddaddy of all Congresses.)

Will Rogers used to say that when he needed a laugh he just read what Congress had done that day. The Broadway musical 1776 suggests that even July 4 of that year was just another congressional day—although what was "done" was the adoption of the Declaration of Independence. A freshman congressman like myself soon learns to "doubt a little of his infallibility," as Ben Franklin counseled. But what seems to have escaped my studies—and the notice of historians I had relied on—is that the acrimonious debate over independence was also marked by good-natured raillery and impromptu barbershop. With its cast of caricatures, 1776 is an intriguing glimpse of history as seen through an 18th Century laugh-in.

Poetic, or at least prosaic, license is taken with the events and discourses of the period. An amiable confusion of fact, fiction and farce characterizes this musical as it undoubtedly characterized the Congress depicted, and others since. At the opening curtain the founding fathers reprimand their testy, independence-minded colleague John Adams with a lusty chorus of "Sit Down John!" I have heard this kind of suggestion whispered under the breath of my colleagues during the pronouncements of their brethren, but I've never been treated to the sight of the whole assembly bursting into song.

Senator Dirksen, the choirboy of the Western World, did pirouette around his desk to question the utility of introducing dance into Head Start programs. He lost his point, but won the gallery, and the infrequency of such moments is to be mourned. We need to get back to the time, as in 1776, when that irrespressible trio Jefferson, Franklin and Adams would link arms to relieve the tensions of nation-building by engaging in light-hearted minstrelsy. Their "Egg" song, beginning "Chirp, chirp, chirp," and celebrating the hatching of the American Eagle, would bring any House down.

So would Ben Franklin's hardy colloquies with Pennsylvania loyalist delegate John Dickinson. "What's so terrible about being called an Englishman?" Dickinson asks at one point. "The English don't seem to mind."

"Nor would I," says Franklin, "were I given the full rights of an Englishman. But to call me one without those rights is like calling an ox a bull—he's thankful for the honor but he'd much rather have restored what's rightfully his."

Update the cast, substitute "American" for "Englishman" and this exchange could be quite contemporary. But while matters touching on "patriotism" or judgment on grave issues still evoke earthy exchanges in Congress (read the record of the ABM discussions), not since the Douglas-Kerr debates of the last decade has there been such robust extemporanea. With press and public in the gallery, we are daily answerable—for style as well as content—to a skeptical constituency. We mute our performance accordingly.

Moreover, we have a thousand proposals to review; they had but one, independence, and they had years of experience and months of debate to savor its implications. Their mandate was clear and simple—go thou and create a nation. No lobbyists' dinners and breakfasts, staff meetings or hometown drop-ins. No tours of the Capitol; they had the wisdom not to build one until nationhood was established, a lesson in fiscal logic for us Funding Sons.

The Continental Congress had no President to deal with, only a king, remote in time, distance and understanding. A President with dams to offer here, airport or park construction there, defense contracts, school, job and housing programs everywhere has resources to divide and confuse the resolve of Congress should a near majority seek to oppose him on a major question. Nor were there political parties as such in the Continental Congress, only biases from which parties would sprig, and the sectional interests of each of the 13 colonies. This was also an advantage to an assembly with one overriding issue before it, because party loyalty could not be thrown up to any member to "keep him in line," only loyalty to conscience and country. Without Presidents, parties, interviews, telegrams, telephones, news conferences and other confusing obstacles to the rational use of time, they could actually study the issue they were called upon to decide. Legislation without contemplation was not their problem; it is ours.

It is a very big problem, which we attempt to solve by assigning each legislative proposal to a committee, with the hope that it will there receive attention, respect and appropriate action. It is said that the sum total of human knowledge doubles every 10 years. With good reason, then, members of Congress today do not consider themselves or each other to be experts in everything. The fact is that when a bill comes to the floor many vote on it without having given it extensive consideration. They look to colleagues they trust, and who ought to know, for guidance. Frequently they hope the vote will be taken in an anonymous manner such as the voice vote, a shouting contest, or the teller vote, where members simply file by and are counted in

favor of or in opposition to a proposal. A rollcall vote requires each member to answer "aye" or "nay," and is recorded. The vote on independence had to be nearly unanimous and certainly recorded. If it is true, as the play suggests, that the Pennsylvania delegate James Wilson voted "aye" only to be identified with a majority, regardless of the consequences, we are given an insight into one weakness in man's nature which the parliamentary system could neither correct nor conceal—the desire to go with the crowd to avoid censure or, at worst, share it with good company.

The modest tensions of the play range from the delegates' vacillation to petulance and apprehension on receipt of General Washington's pessimistic messages from the field. At least one of the general's reports, "Is anybody there? Does anybody care?", sounds more like a dispatch from our obedient servant Winnie the Pooh than the father of our country. The audience found such moments convincing. Could one be in Congress only eight months and already be out of touch with the people?

One raisin in this hasty pudding is the issue of whether to delete the denunciation of slavery from the first draft of the Declaration in order to secure Southern signatures. In light of current dialogue the audience recognized the question as more than something to chew on—the all-American jawbreaker, the oversized pebble in the mouth of every Demosthenes who has taken the national stage these men built. Quickly enough the complicity of our Northern seafaring ancestors was brought to our attention, our attention, because at this point in the play we and the Founding Fathers are one, reliving the original sin of our creation. Franklin argues that a less than immaculate conception is better than none at all; the "offensive" passage is deleted and the Southern delegates sign.

1776 looks back at this point with fife and drum, and we with sadness. Thomas Jefferson's deleted passage on slavery, which says of the king: "He has waged cruel war against human nature itself . . ." should give us pause. For since that day, the king's prerogative has been our own. His sovereign power is ours, and his indifference.

VIETNAM MORATORIUM COMMITTEE

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, prominent people around the country, including some of my congressional colleagues, have endorsed the efforts of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee to protest the Vietnam war by organizing work stoppages on October 15, especially in the colleges and universities across the Nation. Perhaps these well-intentioned individuals would have withheld their approval had they been fully aware of the facts.

The Vietnam moratorium is not an independent attempt to influence our Vietnam policy. It is a part of an ambitious program of agitation, propaganda, and disruption known as the "Fall Offensive," a program formulated at a Communist-saturated conference held in Cleveland, Ohio, in July and hosted by the regional affiliates of the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, organizer of last year's violence in Chicago during the Democratic National Convention

The Cleveland conference created the New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam to carry on the work of the now defunct National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam and act as the umbrella group to organize the fall offensive. Leaders of the New Mobilization Committee include: Arnold Johnson, an official of the Communist Party, USA; long-time Socialist Workers Party leaders Fred Halstead, Harry Ring, and Gus Harowitz; Peter Vinther of the Young Socialist Alliance, the youth section of the Socialist Workers Party; David Dellinger, self-professed non-Soviet Communist; Irving Beinin, staff employee for the Communist news-weekly Guardian; Prof. Donald Kalish, reportedly, by his own admission, somewhat to the left of the Communist Party; and Leroy Wolins, leader of Veterans for Peace in Vietnam and an identified member of the Communist Party. The evidence therefore points to Communist domination of the New Mobilization Committee's plans and operations.

Two other groups playing key roles in the fall offensive are the Student Mobilization Committee and Students for a Democratic Society. SDS plans activity in Chicago around the theme "Bring the War Home." I reported to the House on September 18, 1969, the plans of the SDS to launch massive demonstrations in Chicago during the period of October 8 to 11, 1969.

The Student Mobilization Committee, which has specifically endorsed and whose functionaries are actively supporting the Vietnam moratorium, was initiated by Communist Party member Bettina Aptheker in 1966. During 1968, however, the Student Mobilization Committee passed into the hands of members of the Young Socialist Alliance, and it remains today under tight control of the Young Socialist Alliance. The Student Mobilization Committee is organizing its own student strike for November 14, just before the New Mobilization Committee's Washington and San Francisco marches. YSA member and SMC leader Carol Lipman serves with Vietnam Moratorium Committee organizer David Hawk on the New Mobilization Committee's steering committee.

These few facts are only a minute sample of the overwhelming mass of evidence that the fall offensive, of which the Vietnam moratorium is an integral part, is not designed as a legitimate protest movement aimed at correction of defects in our foreign policy. It is rather a propaganda maneuver designed and organized by Communists and other revolutionaries who desire a victory by the North Vietnamese, not to help, but to weaken and harm the United States.

INCREASE OLD-AGE BENEFITS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, almost every day I receive heart-rendering letters from elderly people telling me that they cannot make it on their meager so-

cial security checks. All their lives they have worked hard to set aside something for their old age. Now that inflation has gobbled up their savings they are forced to depend on their social security check as a means of survival.

For this reason I introduced a measure early this session which increases social security benefits under the old age, survivors, and disability insurance program. In addition, it provides for an automatic adjustment of benefits to increases in the cost of living.

I am delighted that the President has asked for an increase in social security benefits.

However, I do not favor the President's proposal of an across-the-board increase. Any increase given to those now on social security is an outright gift to the recipient—not something earned. Therefore, it seems to me that the increase should be based on need and surely those in the lower category need more consideration than those in the top category. After all, the fellow who gets a minimum \$55 a month must pay as much for a loaf of bread or electricity or medicine as one who receives the maximum.

If enacted, my bill would raise the minimum social security benefits from \$55 to \$80 and would create an actual percentage increase ranging from 45.4 percent for those recipients at the lowest level to 5.6 percent for those at the highest benefit level. The people who would be assisted most by such a change are those at the lowest end of the scale and have the greatest need for increase in their social security payments.

In addition to the present need for greater benefits, the rising cost of living will make further increases necessary in the future. As suggested by the President's proposal, my bill provides for benefits to automatically increase as the cost-of-living index rises. This would be on a percentage basis applying equally to all benefits.

Who pays the bill for any social security increases? The President apparently wants to charge it to those who now pay social security.

I cannot agree with this proposal. In my opinion, the costs should be borne out of the general fund. Can anyone here advance one single reasonable argument to show why one who pays social security should pick up the chit while the President, the Supreme Court Justices, and Members of Congress, who respectively received \$100,000, \$39,500, and \$12,500 salary increases, should go scot-free? Any reason why any person not on social security should go home free?

My bill differs from the President's proposal in that it authorizes a contribution from general funds for the amount of the increased benefits. These would be benefits over and above what the recipients previously contributed to social security. The responsibility for taking up the slack belongs to all of society and should be financed by all segments of our economy—not just those persons paying into the social security fund.

I might add that a recent poll of my district shows that 74 percent of the persons polled favor my proposal of taking funds out of the general funds so that all taxpayers pay their fair share.

One of the most appealing aspects of my social security program is a provision to allow older persons to collect benefits while still earning an income. My bill would raise the present earning limit of \$1,680 to a new limit of \$1,800. The President's bill calls for this change.

Under the present retirement test, persons who earn more than the exempt amount of \$1,680 continue to have \$1 in social security benefits withheld for every \$1 they receive.

To avoid this, my bill would eliminate this \$1 reduction for each \$1 earned and replace it with the same reduction for each \$2 earned above \$3,000. This change increases the incentive to work for older persons who badly need this income to meet today's inflation.

Often our elderly citizens must suffer because of meager incomes, and every rise in the cost of living increases their plight, for this burden hits hardest those who live on a fixed income.

If enacted, my bill would immediately raise the benefit payments to the elderly and would not allow the cost of living to destroy these gains by reducing their purchasing power. Thus, the present and expected future problems of social security recipients can be substantially relieved.

In conclusion, I agree with the administration proposal that the social security benefits should be increased on a cost-of-living basis and that people should be allowed to earn more before losing benefits.

In any event, something should be done as soon as possible. Three out of every ten older persons are living in poverty. Most of them were able to support themselves in decency until they became older.

Unless positive action is taken, these older persons are going to suffer even more. For this reason I feel it is urgent that we make the needed changes in the social security laws.

GREECE

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

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, during the recent period of congressional recess I, along with my wife Millie and daughter Theana, was a guest of the Pan-Arcadian Society of America at its annual convention in Athens, Greece.

I was extremely pleased to have been offered the opportunity to make this 2-week journey for a couple of reasons. One, Greece is the country of my parents' birth. I was consequently nurtured in ways Greek since the days of my youth. This opportunity was the very first that I have had to see the country about which I had heard so much in the past. For the first time, I met relatives who had been but names before. I and my family were the recipients of their hospitality and welcomed to our own family.

The second reason which prompted my visit to Greece at this time was the desire to make my own appraisal of the current Greek Government. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have felt it incumbent upon me

to ascertain the realities of Greece's current political situation. Certain newspaper stories and magazine articles have been published, Mr. Speaker, which place the government in Athens in an extremely unfavorable light. Although I was apprehensive that these stories of torture and repression might prove true, I was quite anxious to arrive at my own conclusions on the matter. It is these conclusions about which I should now like to comment.

Mr. Speaker, Greece is justifiably proud of being characterized as the cradle of democracy. I myself am certainly pleased that this designation has been bestowed upon the land of my ancestors. It is, therefore, at once paradoxical and even, on the surface at least, unfortunate to verify the existence of a military government in Greece.

Be that as it may, however, I must submit that the government which now rules Greece is a necessary expedient. When the conditions which have prompted its establishment have disappeared, however, I would be most anxious to observe the resumption of parliamentary processes in Greece. When this time arrives, I hope it will be acknowledged by the present government and that these leaders will relinquish their positions and allow themselves to be guided by the choices of free Greeks voting in a fair election.

Because the ruling junta has served to forestall a possible Communist takeover in Greece, however, its existence was at least born of justifiable aims. Certainly a Greece run by Communists would be far less palatable than a Greece run by former colonels. This is obviously so especially when one views Greece in the context of its role as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Greece has been an integral part of NATO since its formation 20 years ago. Greece continues to serve as an important link in the chain which constitutes our military defense network.

It must also be said here that the junta has enacted certain vitally needed reforms that for one reason or another were not implemented by King Constantine and the Greek Parliament. Farmers have seen their debts erased by the Government, social security benefits have been increased, students no longer pay tuition at Greek universities, the educational system as a whole has been vastly improved, the Greek economy is a vigorous one, and civil peace predominates.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I should like to emphasize this latter point. The absence of a law-and-order problem in Greece was one of my most satisfying observations. Yet this is hardly consonant with the armed camp visions that one usually associates with a dictatorial government. Conversely, whereas crime is rampant in other large cities of the world, its existence in Athens, the surrounding countryside, and throughout the Greek nation is unobtrusive. The feeling, instead, was one of safety in the streets.

The question that must now be posed, of course, is whether external appearances of order mask nefarious conduct behind the scenes. And, more specifically, whether political prisoners are being

brutalized into cooperative submission. In order to determine the credibility of reports indicating that repressive and coercive conduct is prevalent within the confines of Greek police stations, I made a special effort to get out and talk with the Greek citizenry. I sought the people's impressions of their Government and whether they felt it encouraged or even tolerated the repressive activities attributed to it. In following this course, Mr. Speaker, I probably spoke to 100 different people during my 2 weeks in Greece. None of these gave me any evidence to support the truth of the reports about torture. In fact, none could even acknowledge the accuracy of such reports. And none, Mr. Speaker, had ever been the victims of these alleged brutalities.

While I recognize that 2 weeks in Greece is hardly a sufficient period upon which to base a definitive critique on the Greek Government's activities, Mr. Speaker, I am able to state that my impressions were—and it is only my impressions on which I comment—that the reports of systematic torture perpetrated for political reasons in Greece are not well founded. If there was any substance to such reports it seems that I would have been able to gain at least some indication of this from the scores of persons with whom I conversed.

In my discourses with Prime Minister George Papadopoulos, I was assured that his government was neither conducting nor sanctioning the conduct of closed-door malevolence for political reasons. In fact, Mr. Papadopoulos recognized that free elections must be held in Greece. Although he was unwilling to establish a date for such elections, he did indicate a desire to hold them at the earliest possible opportunity. His position was, however, that Greece must first gain the strength with which to adequately govern itself and the tenacity to resist negative influences.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am extremely hopeful these conditions will materialize at an early date. I yearn for the return of democracy to Greece. And though the path of its return may wind, I am hopeful democracy's strength at the end of this interim period of autocracy will be sufficient to justify a temporary digression from the previous way.

THE MORATORIUM

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the moratorium is a worthy effort by the young people of America to express their grave concern over an issue which deeply involves all Americans, but which involves our young people more critically than any other group. This peaceful expression is in the best tradition of our democracy and should be encouraged. I expect to address myself to this issue on the floor of the House of Representatives next Wednesday.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

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

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 3, 1969, I introduced for myself and Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. WINN, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mrs. MAY, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. POFF, and Mr. MCCLORY, H.R. 14188, 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. My distinguished colleagues from the Democratic side of the aisle, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. BLANTON, and Mr. KYROS, introduced a similar bill, H.R. 14224 on October 7, 1969.

I include in the RECORD the text of a statement setting forth my reasons for introducing H.R. 14188:

For some time now there has been general concern on the part of the Administration, many of the Members of Congress, representatives of the District Government, representatives of various community organizations, and citizens of the community itself with the rapidly increasing serious and violent crimes being committed by juveniles in the Nation's Capital. For instance, I note that recent statistics show that in the last six years, robbery by 16- and 17-year-olds has increased 258 percent. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned with the recognized deficiencies in existing legislation for protecting the due process rights of arrested juveniles.

The Department of Justice, in consultation with expert representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the District Government, has undertaken an extensive revision of the Code of Juvenile Procedure for the District of Columbia. The Administration's proposed Code of Juvenile Procedure for the District of Columbia, which is contained in this bill, is held to be a balanced and comprehensive approach to the problem of juvenile crime in the District of Columbia. It supplements the provisions of H.R. 12854, which I introduced on July 15, 1969 and which was subsequently referred to the District of Columbia Committee. H.R. 12854 provides for a comprehensive reorganization of the current court system and the judicial environment in which family problems would be handled in the District of Columbia. The restructured court of general jurisdiction, the Superior Court, would have a Family Division in which would be vested all of the jurisdiction of the now existing Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia and the Domestic Relations Branch of the Court of General Sessions of the District of Columbia. It is intended that all family-related problems, such as delinquency, parent-child problems, etc. would come within the jurisdiction of the Family Division of the Superior Court.

In its proposed legislation, the Administration has provided that those 16- and 17-year-olds who commit specified crimes of violence most dangerous to the peace of the community, such as murder, rape and robbery, will be ineligible for treatment as juveniles. Instead they will be prosecuted as adults with the whole panoply of correctional services available, including supervision and treatment pursuant to the Federal Youth Corrections Act. Retention within the juvenile system of these matured, sophisticated and experienced 16- and 17-year-olds who commit such violent crimes would appear in many instances to only undermine the rehabilitative potential of other juveniles. Together with its proposed waiver provisions in H.R. 12854 and H.R. 13689, the Administration has chosen to limit the bene-

fits of juvenile treatment to those youngsters with the requisite rehabilitative potential and to exclude those who lack such potential and might adversely affect the rehabilitation of others.

The Administration's proposed code of juvenile procedure also incorporates and thereby codifies the requirements of due process outlined by the Supreme Court in its recent decisions. Clear notice of the charge made, provision for counsel at all critical stages, and hearings to determine probable cause for detained juveniles are among the numerous procedural protections accorded juveniles in the proposed code. In addition, the Administration has carefully and wisely established different procedures for handling delinquent children, neglected children, and children in need of supervision. Mental examinations of juveniles are specifically provided for in the bill, and other procedures relating to the juvenile mentally ill are provided for in the proposed code.

By providing a fair and well-delineated balance between the rights of juveniles and the protection of the public, Mr. Speaker, it is submitted that the Administration has recommended a Code of Juvenile Procedure for the District of Columbia which merits prompt consideration as a measure to stem the increasing tide of serious and violent crime being committed by juveniles in the Nation's Capital.

THE PRICE OF GREATNESS IS RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, some things lose their effectiveness with time while other things, like the spoken word, can be vividly remembered and reflected upon for an endless number of years. I draw this particular parallel because I wanted to call to the attention of my colleagues some remarks made back on May 30 of this year by Mr. L. Eldon James, the 1968 commander of the American Legion. Mr. V. H. Monette, Smithfield, Va., sent me the copy of Mr. James' speech. While a little time has passed since this speech was made, I still feel as does Mr. Monette and I believe you will agree that his comments are still timely and will remain timely as long as each of us takes pride in and welcomes the price we must pay for a "free and individual republic"—responsibility.

The speech follows:

THE PRICE OF GREATNESS IS RESPONSIBILITY (By L. Eldon James)

Those words spoken by a great leader—Sir Winston Churchill—should ring loud and clear across this land this morning—this beautiful Friday morning—for this is Memorial Day 1969.

Winston Churchill not only spoke words of greatness—he wrought deeds of responsibility.

So it behooves every American this morning—May 30th 1969—to think seriously about the Price of Greatness.

There is no more fitting time than now to ask these questions:

1. Do you consider this nation one of greatness?

This answer is simple—of course you do.

The second question should be equally easy to answer—but strangely there is much confusion about it today—that second question is—

2. Who made this nation great—and who will keep it great?

The meaning of Memorial Day gives us a key to the answer to this question.

"Let no ravages of time testify to coming generations, that we have forgotten as a people the cost of a free and individual republic."

So spoke General John Alexander Logan over 100 years ago. A young lawyer from Illinois, "Black Jack" Logan fought his way up in the Union Army—a volunteer he was—and after the War Between the States was credited with originating Memorial Day—yes others had a part—even the Confederate women in Mississippi who decorated graves of Union Soldiers—all—to the end as General Logan put it.

That "... no ravages of time"—would cause us to forget "... as a people—the cost of a free and individual republic."

Yet at this very moment there are men of words—without responsibility—using this day—as an opportunity to degrade our flag—and tear down the institutions—and instrumentalities of Government that have permitted men of action to make us a great nation.

So today—on Memorial Day 1969 we assemble here to do honor to men of responsibility who have gone before us—men whose sense of responsibility have made our nation great—perhaps the most magnificent honor we act with responsibility where the welfare of our land is at stake.

The place to start is by showing us—for what it is—the irresponsibility of those who turn their back upon the principles on which this land was built.

Today we are engaged in the longest war in which the United States has participated. Over 35,000 Americans have given their lives, facing their responsibility. They cry out today for other Americans to face theirs.

Our Military Community—the Professional Soldier and the Citizen Soldier when called upon to bear arms have faced their responsibility magnificently. Yet some headline hunting public figures seek to take upon themselves the wisdom to direct military tactics and strategy.

I can't believe that Winston Churchill's Yardstick for Greatness would dictate that we should have 100 U.S. Senators each running our military operations.

The best tribute these men can make to our hero dead—is to remember that our military leaders today—are sons—are fathers—are grandfathers—yes—are men—men of responsibility to do their job.

When a U.S. Senator publicly attacks specific military operations he helps our enemy and harms our land. I will not trespass on your time to justify Hamburger Hill. Anyone who will take the time to inform himself will find no reason to challenge a military leader who found it necessary to eliminate a serious strategic threat to the overall safety of his men and their mission.

Reckless military criticism is only one of the ways some of our citizens are showing their lack of greatness today.

Lack of initiative in meeting problems on our campuses is one—failure to use discipline and firmness where violent confrontations occur is another.

But let me make my point with just this one last observation.

There is no sense of responsibility that I can find in those people today—who practice one thing—destruction. Yes I know before we build something new we must clear away the old. But if those who would tear down—have nothing constructive and good to offer in its place—then they do not understand Mr. Churchill's Yardstick for Greatness—they have no sense of responsibility.

President Thieu of South Vietnam is attempting to form a coalition in his country. Little men in our country are clamouring that he has only 48% of people in his country in his coalition—so they say we should not support him. I was there and saw his government shape and come to power. It

offers the greatest stability his land has ever known. Now—compare his support with that of others.

The present British Government about 47%.

Our own present administration, 43%.

Do those who would criticize and depose Thieu for having only 48% do the same to our present leadership because it was elected with 43%?

"The Price of Greatness Is Responsibility." On Memorial Day 1969 every American would do well to say to himself and to those who have given to us and helped to preserve freedom—yes we are a great nation—and I will bear my responsibility to my land—by backing my words—with deeds that prove I know "the cost of a free and individual republic."

DEMAND FOR PASSAGE OF CRAMER WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FINANCING BILL RENEWED AND PINELLAS COUNTY, FLA., SEWAGE TREATMENT PLAN EVIDENCES NEED FOR IT

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring to the attention of my colleagues the highly successful sewage treatment program developed in Pinellas County, Fla.

Development of this program demonstrates how a community, through proper planning, can overcome the problems inherent in water pollution control.

Following is a synopsis of the Pinellas County development program which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues as well as to communities throughout the United States.

This also demonstrates the need for legislation which I have introduced to provide for the long-range financing of sewage treatment plant facilities in order to carry out long-range programing over and above the funds made available by appropriations, which is contained in H.R. 13358 and H.R. 13562, and which legislation has been cosponsored by over 48 other Members.

One of the most serious problems in America today is the pollution of our lakes and streams and all communities should be encouraged to develop long-range programs similar to those being encouraged in my district.

It is my hope that such long-range financing, which in effect provides for the Federal Government to guarantee the Federal share for sewage treatment plant construction over the life of the bonds with proper bonuses going to the States to encourage them to provide State matching funds up to 25 percent or more, will be implemented in that I believe this partnership program approach is necessary; that is, local, State, and Federal, if stream pollution is to be eliminated and clean water preserved.

Of course, even this is just a start in that there are many other polluters in addition to sewage treatment plants, including industrial, acid mine drainage, silt runoff, aquatic growth, and boat and ship spillage, including oil pollution. A united attack on all fronts is essential

if future generations are to be assured of an adequate supply of clean water.

Pinellas County, Fla., occupies a peninsula which is formed by the western shores of Tampa and Old Tampa Bays and includes the offshore, barrier islands in the Gulf of Mexico, west of that peninsula. The rapid development of unincorporated areas in Pinellas County has persisted since the 1930's. As early as 1935 the county government, faced with the problem of providing safe, potable water to residents of the offshore islands and to other developing unincorporated areas, created the Pinellas County water system. Septic tanks and drainfields provided sewage treatment and disposal in most of these areas until, during the early 1950's, it became apparent that the population densities in many areas had reached, or were rapidly approaching the point, where septic tanks could not provide adequate protection for the public health.

Realizing that only positive action on their part could prevent the development of health hazards in the unincorporated urbanized areas, the board of county commissioners, after consulting with the Pinellas County Health Department, the Florida State Board of Health, and with officials of interested municipalities, authorized Briley, Wild & Associates, consulting engineers, to conduct an engineering study of sanitary sewerage requirements on a countywide basis. The study was authorized April 10, 1956, and a report presenting the results of the study and entitled "A Countywide Sanitary Sewerage Project for Pinellas County" was submitted to the county commission during the spring of 1957.

The 1957 report found only 11 municipal sewer systems in operation. These systems in conjunction with a few privately owned subdivision systems provided adequate sewerage service to less than 20 percent of the area of the county. The 1957 study, serving as a catalyst, has been expanded into a series of feasibility studies and other engineering work which have resulted in the formation of the following sanitary districts whose sewerage systems have been constructed and are in operation:

South Cross Bayou Sanitary District created March 19, 1960;

McKay Creek Sanitary District created November 8, 1960;

Boca Ciega Sanitary District created May 2, 1961;

Jungle Terrace Sanitary District created May 8, 1962; and

Bear Creek Sanitary District created July 24, 1962.

Numerous privately owned sewer systems within the sanitary districts have been acquired by the districts, their treatment plants have been phased out of service and their sewers integrated into the district systems. Other private systems, not within districts, have been acquired directly by the county and are being operated by the county pollution control department until such time as they can feasibly be integrated into the large area sewerage systems.

Capacity has been provided at the two large new county pollution control facilities for the treatment of sewage flows

from adjacent municipalities. Another facility, which is in the planning stage, will also be designed in accordance with this policy of assisting the municipalities. Several municipalities are already delivering their sewage to the county for treatment and discussions are in progress with several others faced with the problem of either upgrading and rebuilding obsolete facilities or arranging for the county to receive and treat their wastes.

The board of county commissioners has placed the operation of all of the district and county systems under the control of a recently formed county pollution control department and has remained abreast of the ever continuing development with timely expansion and extension of the district sewerage systems.

Some of the early—pre-1960—subdivisions and all of the more recent ones which could not be served by existing sanitary districts were furnished with sanitary sewerage systems and small sewage treatment plants by the developers. As in the case of septic tanks, increasing development pressure resulted in proliferation of these small sewage plants until by 1967 there were 47 such privately owned small treatment systems and it became apparent that not only would the cost of inspecting these private systems, as would be required if adequate standards of operation were to be maintained, became excessive but, also, that the multiplicity of small plants could soon become completely unmanageable. Sanitary sewerage facilities had progressed to a point where the recommendations of the 1957 report and those of intervening studies based upon that report, required an intensive review—a review which would highlight the effects upon the county's sanitary sewerage requirements, of changing land use patterns, increasing development pressures and increasing emphasis on the need for a higher degree of sewage treatment prior to the disposal of effluent. The board of county commissioners on July 23, 1968, authorized an overall study and formulation of a master plan for sanitary sewerage systems. The plan and a plan report were submitted on March 31, 1969.

Many of the basic policy recommendations of the master plan are restatements or modifications of those contained in the 1957 and subsequent reports. The county commission has assumed responsibility for sanitary sewerage systems in the unincorporated areas of the county; is pursuing an alert policy for the timely acquisition of private systems and of consolidating these systems as warranted by development progress; and is prepared to assist some of the municipalities by providing treatment capacity at existing or planned, large, conveniently located, county pollution control facilities, thus permitting overloaded and inadequate private and municipal plants to be phased out. These activities are all in keeping with the recommendations of the master plan.

Timely action by the board of county commissioners has resulted in the expansion of sanitary sewers from the modest 20-percent area coverage found in the 1957 report to a point where sanitary

sewers are available in substantially all of the developed areas in the midcounty and south county areas and plans which are now being prepared will, within 5 years, extend coverage to all of the developed areas in the county.

POLLUTION OF THE MERRIMACK RIVER

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting here for the consideration of my colleagues the last of a series of articles on a study of the Merrimack River Basin pollution problem by Lowell Sun reporter, Franz Scholz.

This final installment treats the problem in more technical terms; that is, that rivers are systems, and as such are susceptible to the new management techniques that have proved so successful in our aerospace and defense-related industries. It is written by Dr. Bela Fabuss, director of the Lowell Technological Institute Research Foundation and author of a study on a comprehensive modern management pollution control program which is the basis for the demonstration systems-approach project I have proposed to clean up the Merrimack River Basin.

Dr. Fabuss is highly qualified to speak on the problem. He joined Franz Scholz during the canoe trip on the Merrimack, and his commentary, which follows, is very much worth a careful reading:

POLLUTION OF THE MERRIMACK RIVER

(By Bella M. Fabuss, of the Lowell Technological Institute Research Foundation)

Water and air are man's most fundamental resources. Our water crisis is at the present time more serious than the average American realizes and we must make everyone understand that this problem must become a high-priority matter on our agenda of unfinished business.

To insist upon clean water is meaningless until we decide how much cleanliness we want and are willing to pay for. Cleaning up is a program that will cost billions of dollars over the next ten years and each of us will pay his share of the expense—in additional city, state or federal taxes, higher water prices and higher prices for the products of industry.

Let us look first at the cost question. A recent report of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration estimated that in the years 1969 to 1973, almost \$15 billion must be spent on water treatment facilities or about \$3 billion annually, which is more than 0.35 per cent of the gross national product. What do these figures mean in practical terms? In the year of this study (1968), the entire industry of the United States (from automobiles to meat products and from furniture to cigarettes) spent about 23 billion dollars for new plants and equipment. Compared to this figure, the water treatment industry will spend more than 13 per cent for building new facilities. To put it even into simpler form, we will spend more on water treatment than we will spend on all washing machines, dryers, air conditioners, dehumidifiers, fans, and air heaters.

These numbers clearly show that water treatment is a most important problem. We must talk and think in terms of a large scale water treatment industry rather than about a small treatment plant to be built at the end of our sewer line. The water

treatment and supply industry will shortly represent more than ten per cent of the U.S. industrial capacity and must be discussed in these terms.

PRINCIPLES OF TREATMENT

With the development of urban areas, it became necessary to provide drainage or sewer systems to carry the wastes away. Normally, the wastes were disposed of in the nearest watercourse. It soon became apparent that rivers and other water bodies could handle only a limited amount of waste without turning into open sewers. This led to the development of purification or treatment facilities in which chemists, biologists, and engineers have played an important role.

Natural water bodies can oxidize organic matter without the development of nuisance conditions, but the organic loading must be kept within limits of the oxygen resources in the water. This means that certain levels of dissolved oxygen must be maintained at all times, not only to provide oxygen for the removal of organic waste but also to preserve aquatic life. The removal of excess organic matter, that cannot be disposed of safely in the water, is performed in the wastewater treatment plant.

Figure 1 shows the operating scheme of a wastewater treatment plant.

This plant operates using the "activated sludge process." It was found that a light, floccy sludge full of living bacteria develops when air is blown into a sewage tank. In the presence of air, the bacteria consume most of the organic material in the sewage as food. When the mixing and bubbling of air is stopped, the contents of the tank separate into purified water and settled sludge. To carry out this operation in a continuous manner and for fast removal of the organics from the sewage, plenty of bacteria must be present. Therefore, a part of the settled sludge containing these bacteria is returned to the tank and mixed with the fresh sewage. The products of this process are purified water and sludge.

The figure shows the process carried out in a continuous manner. As currently practiced, the sewage entering from the interceptor sewer is screened and then passes into a large settling tank. This is called primary treatment, which removes 25 to 40% of the organic matter and 40 to 70% of the suspended solids. At the same time, primary treatment removes 25 to 75% of the bacteria from the sewage. The water purified by primary treatment is usually not clean enough and must be further treated. The water flows into the aeration basins together with the activated return sludge. These aeration basins are normally 10 to 30 feet wide and 100 to 400 feet long. Air is introduced into these basins and the aeration period is usually 4 to 8 hours. From the aeration basins, the material passes into a second settling tank in which the sludge settles. Part of the sludge is returned to the aeration basins, the excess is disposed. This part of the process is called secondary treatment, and can remove 95% of the organic matter, suspended solids, and bacteria. The final product water is usually chlorinated and is discharged into a river.

Primary treatment of all waste waters is a must and in most parts of the country, secondary treatment must be carried out to reduce waste loads. Even further treatment techniques, so-called tertiary treatment, must be applied in some critical locations.

THE MERRIMACK RIVER

A very important challenge in water pollution control is to define the real nature of pollution. Frequently, when an industrial plant asked a governing body to state the stream standards, the plant was told to define its own waste water and then the governing body would tell the plant whether its waste water was acceptable for discharge into the stream. The reasons for this game

"if you don't tell me, I won't tell you" are that there are many unclear problems. For example, there is the question of the capacity of a stream to keep itself clean. The river can assimilate a limited amount of waste, but full use of the capacity would limit community and industry growth and prevent the improvement or further development of water recreation areas.

One of the best measures of river conditions is the dissolved oxygen content in the river. During the summer months, the river can dissolve about nine milligrams per liter oxygen. Five milligrams oxygen per liter are necessary for boating, fish habitat, and industrial water supply but are not enough for swimming or drinking. In the summers of 1964 and 1965, the dissolved oxygen was never over this value in the Merrimack on its entire length from New Hampshire to the ocean. The oxygen content was frequently less than two and even zero values were found on some occasions.

This all means that the Merrimack River is highly polluted and effective actions must be taken immediately.

CONCLUSIONS

Since we are considering the rapid development of one of the major industries in our country, we should apply all resources and know-how to reduce the cost and to increase the benefits.

Some 20 state, federal, and regional agencies are today dealing with water pollution and water resources, such as the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, Army Corps of Engineers, Geological Survey, Federal Power Commission, Fish and Wildlife Service, and many others. They all have their tasks, viewpoints and plans. When will the Merrimack River be cleaned up?

Each city and town along the river is preparing its own plans for pollution abatement. A village of 500 people and a city of 100,000 are equally eligible for Federal and State funding. At the same time, the building cost is about \$175 per capita in a community of 500 people and about \$40 per capita in a city of 100,000 people. Which one to clean up first?

In the Rochester metropolitan area in New York State, there are 33 separate wastewater treatment plants serving 600,000 people. These plants are operated by villages, districts, and the city. The result is polluted waters, an impossible job for the regulatory agency, and a manpower nightmare in trying to operate and staff the facilities. The comprehensive plan just adopted calls for consolidation and coordination into three large facilities which can develop professional staffs and meet the objectives. Are we trying out the same round-about way?

When do we finally realize that carrying out such a tremendous task as cleaning up an entire river basin, which affects the lives and future of more than a million people in the Merrimack River area, calls for a modern systems approach utilizing all the techniques that have resulted in the high productivity, efficiency, and organization of our industrial complex?

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to advise Members that it is my understanding that the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), will seek unanimous consent tomorrow to send to conference the bill H.R. 11612, the Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970.

REQUESTS FOR SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following legislative business and any special orders heretofore entered into the following Members may be permitted to address the House:

Mr. ALBERT, today, for 10 minutes.
 Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.
 Mr. CULVER, today, for 10 minutes.
 Mrs. SULLIVAN, today, for 15 minutes.
 Mr. CONYERS, today for 60 minutes.
 Mr. MCCARTHY, October 9, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. HANNA, on October 9, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. LEGGETT, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. RYAN, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. HUNGATE, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. MCCARTHY, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. OTTINGER, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. KOCH, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. WALDIE, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mrs. CHISHOLM, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. MOORHEAD, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. TIERNAN, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. KASTENMEIER, on October 14, for 45 minutes.
 Mr. FRASER, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. BINGHAM, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. HELSTOSKI, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. SCHEUER, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. BRADEMAS, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. CLAY, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. VANIK, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. CONYERS, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. STOKES, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. REUSS, on October 14, for 60 minutes.
 Mr. SIKES, on October 15, for 30 minutes.
 Mr. PUCINSKI, on October 15, for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the several requests of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does not the sum total of reservations requested under unanimous consent total more than 24 hours on October 14?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts tell us the total amount of time requested?

Mr. HARRINGTON. I would be happy to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not keep track of the total time requested.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman from Missouri could hardly be expected to keep track of that.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the total time requested on October 14 is 21 hours and 45 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, would the distinguished majority leader tell us whether other regular business is expected on that day to extend more than 3 hours, which would total the 24?

Mr. ALBERT. It is entirely possible, I would say to the gentleman. We have just agreed tentatively with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) to program the Federal pay bill on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will note that there already have been four or five special orders granted for October 14.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, without reference to individuals and without any lack of comity for our colleagues, and with full realization of their right to have special orders, but in utter lack of feasibility, and in view of the work of the House on that day, I will be constrained to object unless some of those orders are withdrawn so that we can have a normal working day and then those who wish to stay for the remainder of the 16 or 24 hours may do so.

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

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Missouri, it is my understanding the rules of the House will not permit special orders following legislative business of one day to encroach on the legislative business of the following day, so that, in effect, if special orders should be requested by a sufficient number of Members to run through the night, they could not in any case encroach on the legislative business of the following day.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana well knows, I am thoroughly familiar with the rules of the House. I would certainly confirm the gentleman's statement. But that is not the point involved here. The point involved here is asking unanimous consent to do something that is utterly impossible, without question and without reference to any one individual, so I repeat, I will be constrained to object unless some of those named are withdrawn.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would imagine the large number of requests for special orders on the 14th is because many of those Members will not be here on the 15th. They will be out there holding candles on Moratorium Day.

I would like to tell my colleague that some of us have taken special orders for the 15th to discuss the alternatives to the problem of Vietnam, alternatives that might be a little more meaningful than what some people plan around the country for the 15th.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, all power to the gentleman from Illinois and his colleagues who have developed adverse col-

loquy—perhaps that is a good term—on the 15th, but I would be just as firm in my objection to lining up impossible hours, more hours than there are in the day, for the one side as I would for the other side. I want that clearly understood.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Missouri recalls the day last year when it occurred that we went all night long on the question of making an exception to the television rules and regulations in order that a television debate might take place on the presidential campaign.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, again I will tell the young man I have been responsible for prolonging the sessions of Congress myself in the days before the gentleman was a Member, and most of the Members know that. I am fully aware of all the tricks and rules and procedures of the House, and all the latitude that is allowed, as well as the protection the minority Members are given, but I think the gentleman's other question is not apropos.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent requests?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object.

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

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I will simply say to the gentleman I recall once when Speaker Rayburn was in the chair and a Member objected to a unanimous-consent request for a special order, and the Chair observed that such an objection could become contagious. Therefore, the gentleman from Indiana would have to be constrained to recall the objection to the legitimate right or the privilege that is traditional in this House to request special orders and take that into consideration when others are requested in the future.

It could be catching.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the admonition from the gentleman, which he obviously drags up from history since the good former Speaker had long since been dead before the gentleman came here.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I happened to be present on that occasion.

Mr. HALL. Be that as it may, I object to any over the first 12 hours of special orders that were written for the 14th, and if the request should be amended to include only those for the first 12 hours, I shall be glad to withhold the objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Are there further requests from the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there has been objection and that some of the special orders will be necessarily stricken and Members who are not here now are involved, I would request the gentleman from Massachusetts not to make the request tonight, in

order that it might be made tomorrow when those concerned are present.

NIXON'S POLICY OF GENEROUS UNEMPLOYMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the administration, through some kind of double-think thought process only it understands, is now attempting to convince the Nation that economic progress in the United States is directly equated to the rate at which unemployment increases. If we are to accept the administration line, we should all rejoice in the knowledge that joblessness in the country rose from 3.5 to 4 percent from August to September. Our faith in the administration's ability to guide our economy, according to utterances from the White House, should be reinforced by the fact that there are nearly 3 million persons out of work and if our luck holds the figure may nearly double by this time next year. The goal seems to be to return to the employment levels that existed during the last Eisenhower administration when joblessness was climbing toward 7 percent.

Evidence of the administration's new policy is contained in the remarks of White House spokesmen following announcement of the latest increase in joblessness.

Assistant Treasury Secretary Murray Weidenbaum, a key economic policymaker in the Government, was inspired to say that "we may be turning from an overheated, overemployed condition to more sustainable levels." There is no indication of what, in Mr. Weidenbaum's view, these levels might be. But there is every indication that Mr. Weidenbaum has absolutely no commitment to a full employment economy, witnessed by a further observation that no change in policies were contemplated.

Presidential Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler allowed as how he did not think anybody was happy about the unemployment rate but he added that the increase in unemployment seems to be consistent with other evidence that the economy is beginning to cool. A fair translation of that remark means that increased unemployment is consistent with the administration's efforts to combat inflation. "There is a movement toward the beginning of a trend," Mr. Ziegler is quoted as saying.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there is evidence of the trend established by administration policies. Since the beginning of the year, some 350,000 people have been "trended" out of their jobs, and the increase in available jobs has dropped from 250,000 a month to 100,000 a month. Any more of this administration policy and the trend we are on will lead us right into the middle of a recession, at which point the cautious Mr. Ziegler will probably observe that the economy seems to have cooled off quite a bit.

Mr. Speaker, the economic policies of this administration are placing an intolerable burden on the people of this

Nation, particularly on our low- and moderate-income families. High interest-tight money conditions have virtually excluded all those with incomes of less than \$15,000 a year from homeownership, which is another way of saying that only those in the higher income brackets deserve the privilege of buying a home of their own.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the Nixon administration to reverse its economic policies which seems to be leading this Nation down the path to disaster.

CULVER SPONSORS COALITION FARM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL), a companion measure to the coalition farm bill, which has been drafted with the cooperation of 22 national farm and commodity organizations.

As a representative of one of the major farm producing States in the Nation, ranking second in terms of annual farm sales, I have long been concerned about the apparently competing voices we hear in Congress from national organizations representing various segments of our agricultural economy.

This is one of the reasons why I take Congressmen from eastern urban areas to visit farms in my congressional district, to see the common problems Iowa and American farmers do face, and to emphasize the importance of sound agricultural legislation for our entire interdependent economy.

However, if we ever hope to gain the majority support of the House of Representatives, where the farm bloc has declined to less than 50 seats, then the national organizations must begin pulling together, or they will pull the farmer apart.

That is why this farm bill is so significant, because it represents an historic coalition of 22 separate groups:

- The National Farmers Organization.
- The National Farmers Union.
- The National Grange.
- The National Corn Growers Association.
- The National Association of Wheat Growers.
- The Midcontinent Farmers Association.
- The United Grain Farmers of America.
- The National Milk Producers Federation.
- The Pure Milk Products Cooperative.
- The North Carolina Peanut Growers Association.
- The National Rice Growers Association.
- The National Potato Council.
- The Virginia Council of Farmer Co-ops.
- The Farmers Cooperative Council of North Carolina.
- The Grain Sorghum Producers Association.
- The Western Cotton Growers Association.

The National Wool Growers Association.

The Soybean Growers of America, Inc.
The Virginia Peanut Growers Association.

The Peanut Growers Cooperative Marketing Association.

The American Rice Growers Co-op Association.

The Webster County Farmers Organization.

The coalition bill is a package approach to the problems of balancing supply and demand and improving farm prices, through permanent extension of the commodity programs authorized by the 1965 Food and Agriculture Act, with improvements where the coalition feels they are necessary, based on experience since enactment of that legislation.

In addition, it assumes responsibility for hunger and malnutrition in America through a provision directed toward an adequate national food stamp program.

Mr. Speaker, our present farm program expires at the end of the 1970 crop year. To plan efficiently, farmers need some assurance now of the kind of program that will be available beyond that date.

There may be some question about certain provisions of this bill, and other proposals which should be heard as well, before the Congress finally acts on any one piece of legislation. However, this coalition bill represents the most concerted voice of the American farmer which has ever been heard in the Halls of Congress, and deserves the closest consideration by the committee and the full House as such.

I include at this point in the RECORD a statement by the coalition on the measure, as well as the text of the bill itself:

STATEMENT BY COALITION OF SPONSORING FARM ORGANIZATION

Unity exists between general farm organizations and major commodity groups. Farm commodities—each with its own growing cycle and market system—are closely related. The resources and productive capacity of the nation's agriculture are essential to the security of the nation and the well-being of its people. Farm income must be maintained and improved in order to protect the social and economic structure of America.

Permanent extension of the 1965 Food and Agriculture Act is the first step in improving it. We must not be forced to return again and again to pass legislation already approved by Congress. Our purpose must be to improve it. Some improvements cannot wait, and we are proposing them this year.

We reject a massive cropland retirement program as a substitute for existing commodity programs. Programs must be tailored to fit individual commodities. Cropland adjustment should work in combination with commodity programs. The cotton, rice and wool programs must be continued.

We have presented our views to Secretary of Agriculture Hardin. In addition to permanent extension of the 1965 Act, we urged the following improvements:

Establishment of Consumer Protection Reserves of wheat, feed grains, soybeans, and cotton. Consumers must be assured of stable supplies, despite crop failures. Reserves will make supply-management workable by removing the threat of shortages. Production can be planned more accurately to fit market needs.

Export certificates for wheat comparable to domestic wheat certificates.

Increase in direct payments and price support loans for corn, and equivalent increases in other feed grains.

Soybean program to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to call for acreage reductions, and make diverted acreage payments.

We urge the following improvements: amendments to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act to provide for improvements to the Class I Base Plan and to provide for authority for advertising, research, and promotion for milk and dairy products.

Another amendment to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act to extend the provisions of the Act to all agricultural commodities when and if farmers want them.

A fully adequate food stamp program to effectively combat hunger and malnutrition in the nation with removal of the present limitation on expenditures.

H.R. 14206

A bill to improve farm income and insure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities by extending and improving certain commodity programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Agricultural Stabilization Act of 1969".

TITLE I—DAIRY: CLASS I BASE PLAN

SEC. 101. (a) The Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended by striking in subparagraph (B) of subsection 8c(5) all that part of said subparagraph (B) which follows the comma at the end of clause (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(d) a further adjustment, equitably to apportion the total value of the milk purchased by any handler, or by all handlers, among producers and associations of producers on the basis of their marketing of milk during a representative period of time, which need not be limited to one year, and further adjustments to provide for the accumulation and disbursement of a fund to encourage seasonal adjustments in the production of milk, and (e) a further adjustment, equitably to apportion the total value of the milk purchased by any handler, or by all handlers, among producers and associations of producers, on the basis of their marketing of milk during a representative period of time, which need not be limited to one year and which may be either a fixed period of one or more years, or a moving average of one or more years, as provided in the order, and which may be adjusted, and readjusted from time to time, to reflect the utilization of producer milk by any handler or by all handlers in any use classification or classifications. In the event a producer holding a base allocated under this clause (e) shall reduce his marketings, such reduction shall not adversely affect his history of production and marketing for the determination of future bases, or future adjustment of bases, except that an order may provide that, if a producer reduces his marketing below his base allocation in any one or more use classifications designated in the order, the amount of any such reduction shall be taken into account in determining future bases or future adjustments of bases. Bases allocated to producers under this clause (e) may be transferable under an order on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed in the order if the Secretary of Agriculture determines, in connection with such order, that transferability will be in the best interest of the public, existing producers, and prospective new producers. Provision shall be made in the order for the allocation of bases under this clause (e) to new producers and for the alleviation of hardship and inequity among producers, and prescribing terms and conditions under which new producers may

obtain bases on an equitable basis with old producers. Producers holding bases so allocated or obtained shall thereafter participate pro rata in the market in the same manner as other producers. In the case of any producer who during any accounting period delivers a portion of his milk to persons not fully regulated by the order, provision may be made for reducing the allocation of, or payments to be received by, any such producer under this clause (e) to compensate for any marketings of milk to such other persons for such period or periods as necessary to insure equitable participation in marketings among all producers. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 8c(12) and the last sentence of section 8c(19) of this Act, order provisions under this clause (e) shall not be effective in any marketing order unless separately approved by producers in a referendum in which each individual producer shall have one vote and may be terminated separately whenever the Secretary makes a determination with respect to such provisions as is provided for the termination of an order in subparagraph 8c(16)(B). Disapproval or termination of such order provisions shall not be considered disapproval of the order or other terms of the order."

(b) Such Act is further amended (1) by adding to subsection 8c(5) the following new paragraph:

"(H) Marketing orders applicable to milk and its products may be limited in application to milk used for manufacturing."; and (2) by amending subsection 8c(18) by adding after the words "marketing area" wherever they occur the words "or, in the case of orders applying only to manufacturing milk, the production area."

(c) The legal status of producer handlers of milk under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, shall be the same subsequent to the adoption of the amendments made by this Act as it was prior thereto.

(d) The Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of subsection 8c(5) the following new subparagraph (I):

"(I) Establishing or providing for the establishment of research and development projects, and advertising (excluding brand advertising), sales promotion, educational, and other programs, designed to improve or promote the domestic marketing and consumption of milk and its products, to be financed by producers in a manner and at a rate specified in the order, on all producer milk under the order. Producer contributions under this subparagraph may be deducted from funds due producers in computing total pool value or otherwise computing total funds due producers and such deductions shall be in addition to the adjustments authorized by subparagraph (B) of subsection 8c(5). Provisions may be made in the order to exempt, or allow suitable adjustments or credits in connection with, milk on which a mandatory checkoff for advertising or marketing research as require under the authority of any State law. Such funds shall be paid to an agency organized by milk producers and producers' cooperative associations in such form and with such methods of operation as shall be specified in the order. Such agency may expend such funds for any of the purposes authorized by this subparagraph and may designate, employ, and allocate funds to persons and organizations engaged in such programs which meet the standards and qualifications specified in the order. All funds collected under this subparagraph shall be separately accounted for and shall be used only for the purposes for which they were collected. Programs authorized by this subparagraph may be either

local or national in scope, or both, as provided in the order, but shall not be international. Order provisions under this subparagraph shall not become effective in any marketing order unless such provisions are approved by producers separately from other order provisions, in the same manner provided for the approval of marketing orders, and may be determined separately whenever the Secretary makes a determination with respect to such provisions as is provided for the termination of an order in subsection 8c(16)(B). Disapproval or termination of such order provisions shall not be considered disapproval of the order or of other terms of the order."

(e) The first sentence of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1446), is amended by striking the words "milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and milk". Paragraph (c) of section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1446(c)), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The price of milk shall be supported at such level not in excess of 90 per centum nor less than 75 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines necessary in order to assure an adequate supply. Such price support shall be provided through purchases of milk and the products of milk."

The amendments made by this subsection shall become effective for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1970.

TITLE II—WOOL

Sec. 201. Section 703 of the National Wool Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1782) is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof.

TITLE III—CORN AND FEED GRAINS

Sec. 301. (a) Section 105(a) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, beginning with the 1969 crop, price support shall be made available to producers for each crop of corn at a national average rate of not less than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor, including any payment, with a loan rate of not less than \$1.15 per bushel."

(b) Section 105(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "the 1966 through 1970 crops" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the 1966 and subsequent crops".

(c) The seventh sentence of section 105(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "may" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall".

(d) Section 105(e) of such Act is further amended by inserting after the fourth sentence thereof a new sentence as follows: "In no event shall the farm projected yield for any crop of feed grains for any year be reduced by more than 5 per centum below what it was for the immediately preceding crop if the actual yield from such farm was reduced as the result of drought, flood, or other natural disaster."

Sec. 302. The first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 16(1) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended by striking out "the 1966 through 1970 crops" and inserting in lieu thereof "the 1966 and subsequent crops".

TITLE IV—COTTON

Sec. 401. (a) The proviso at the end of section 344a(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Provided, That the authority granted under this section may be exercised beginning with the calendar year 1966, and all transfers hereunder shall be for such period of years as the parties thereto may agree".

(b) The first sentence of section 346(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "through 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "and subsequent".

(c) The first sentence of section 350 of such Act is amended by striking out "through 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "and subsequent".

SEC. 402. Paragraph (1) of section 103(d) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "through 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "and subsequent".

SEC. 403. Section 402(d) of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1965, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Section 408(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended, effective beginning with the 1966 crop, by changing the period at the end of the first sentence thereof to a colon and adding the following: 'Provided, That for upland cotton a cooperator shall be a producer on whose farm the acreage planted to such cotton does not exceed the cooperator percentage, which shall be in the case of the 1966 crop, 87.5 per centum of such farm acreage allotment and, in the case of each subsequent crop, such percentage, not less than 87.5 or more than 100 per centum, of such farm acreage allotment as the Secretary may specify for such crops, except that in the case of small farms (that is farms on which the acreage allotment is ten acres or less, or on which the projected farm yield times the acreage allotment is three thousand six hundred pounds, or less, and the acreage allotment has not been reduced under section 344(m) the acreage of cotton on the farm shall not be required to be reduced below the farm acreage allotment.'"

TITLE V—WHEAT

SEC. 501. (a) Section 506 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 is amended by striking out the language preceding the colon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows".

(b) Section 107 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended by section 506 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, is amended—

(1) by striking out that portion which precedes paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 107. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act, beginning with the 1969 crop—

"(1) (A) Price support for wheat accompanied by domestic wheat certificates shall be at 100 per centum of the parity price therefor; and (B) price support for wheat accompanied by export certificates shall be at such level not more than 90 per centum or less than 65 per centum of the parity therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate taking into consideration the factors specified in section 401(b).

"(2) Price support for wheat not accompanied by marketing certificates shall be not less than \$1.25 per bushel after subtracting national average storage and interest costs, as determined by the Secretary, in cases where wheat is placed under Government loan."

(2) by adding at the end of such section a new paragraph as follows:

"(5) For any crop of wheat harvested during the calendar year 1969 and any subsequent calendar year, the Secretary shall provide, in the case of each farm, for the payment of a special export wheat payment of 65 cents per bushel on a number of bushels determined by multiplying not less than 40 per centum of the number of acres in the farm acreage allotment for wheat by the projected farm yield (as defined in section 301(b) (13) (K) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended). Export payments under this paragraph shall be in addition to any price support payments otherwise provided and shall be available only to cooperators."

SEC. 502. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph 13(K) of section 301(b) is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and in no event shall the projected farm yield for any crop of wheat for any farm be reduced by more than 5 per centum below what it was for the immediately preceding crop if the actual yield from such farm was reduced as the result of drought, flood, or other natural disaster".

(2) Subsection (d) of section 332 is amended by striking out "in the calendar years 1966 through 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the 1966 and subsequent crop years".

(3) The first sentence of section 339(b) is amended by striking out "in the calendar years 1964 through 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the 1966 and subsequent calendar years".

(4) Section 379b, as amended by section 502 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, is amended by striking out "in the calendar years 1966 through 1969" in the first sentence, and inserting in lieu thereof "in 1966 and subsequent calendar years".

(5) Section 379c(e) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "A producer shall be entitled, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary, to receive, at the time he agrees to participate in the wheat marketing allocation program, an amount in cash equal to not less than 50 per centum of the face value of the domestic and export marketing certificates to be issued to him."

(6) The last sentence of section 379e is amended by striking out "for the marketing years for 1966 through the 1970 wheat crops" and inserting in lieu thereof "for the 1966 and subsequent marketing years for wheat".

SEC. 503. The Agricultural Act of 1964 is amended as follows:

(1) Amendment (7) of section 202 is amended by striking out "effective only with respect to the crops planted for harvest in 1965 through 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "effective beginning with the crop planted for harvest in calendar year 1965".

(2) Amendment (13) of section 202 is amended by striking out "effective only with respect to the crop planted for harvest in the calendar years 1965 through 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "effective beginning with the crop planted for harvest in calendar year 1965".

(3) Section 204 is amended by striking out "effective only with respect to the marketing years beginning in the calendar years 1964 through 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "effective beginning with the marketing year which begins in the calendar year 1964".

SEC. 504. Section 502 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 is amended by striking out the language preceding the colon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Section 279b is amended to read as follows".

TITLE VI—SOYBEANS AND FLAXSEED

SEC. 601. The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of title I a new section as follows:

"PRICE SUPPORT FOR SOYBEANS AND FLAXSEED

"SEC. 108. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, beginning with the 1969 crop, price support shall be made available to producers for each crop of soybeans and flaxseed at such level of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines is fair and reasonable taking into consideration such factors as he deems appropriate, including those in section 401(b) of this Act. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, in the case of any crop for which an acreage diversion program is in effect for soybeans and flaxseed, the level of price support for such commodities for such crop shall be at such level not less than 75 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines necessary to achieve the acreage

reduction goal established by him for such crop.

"(b) The Secretary shall require, as a condition of eligibility for price support on any crop of soybeans and flaxseed which is included in any acreage diversion program formulated under section 16(j) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, that the producer shall participate in the diversion program to the extent prescribed by the Secretary, and if no diversion program is in effect for any crop, he may require as a condition of eligibility for price support on such crop of soybeans and flaxseed that the producer shall not exceed his soybean-flaxseed base. Any acreage on any farm which is diverted from the production of soybeans or flaxseed pursuant to a contract entered into after the date of enactment of this section under the cropland adjustment program shall be deemed to be acreage diverted from the production of soybeans and flaxseed for purposes of meeting the foregoing requirements for eligibility for price support.

"(c) Such portion of the support price for soybeans and flaxseed acreage included in the acreage diversion program as the Secretary determines desirable to assure that the benefits of the price-support and diversion programs inure primarily to those producers who cooperate in reducing their acreage of soybeans and flaxseed shall be made available to producers through payments-in-kind of feed grains. Such payments-in-kind shall be made available on the maximum permitted acreage, or the Secretary may make the same total amount available on a smaller acreage or acreages at a higher rate or rates. The amount of the payment-in-kind in feed grains shall be determined by the Secretary, taking into consideration the feeding value of soybeans and flaxseed meal in relation to feed grains, the yield per acre, the equivalent dollar value of soybeans and flaxseed, as compared with feed grains, and such as other factors as the Secretary deems necessary to arrive at a fair and equitable payment. For purposes of such payments, producers on any farm who have planted not less than 90 per centum of the acreage of soybeans and flaxseed permitted to be planted shall be deemed to have planted the entire acreage permitted.

"(d) An acreage on the farm which the Secretary finds was not planted to soybeans or flaxseed because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster shall be deemed to be an actual acreage of such commodities planted for harvest for purposes of such payments provided such acreage is not subsequently planted to any other crop for which there are marketing quotas or voluntary adjustment programs in effect.

"(e) The Secretary shall make not to exceed 50 per centum of any payments hereunder to producers in advance of determination of performance.

"(f) Payments-in-kind shall be made through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem for feed grains (such feed grains to be valued by the Secretary at not less than the current support price made available through loans and purchases, plus reasonable carrying charges) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, assist the producer in the marketing of such certificates. The Secretary shall provide for the sharing of such certificates among producers on the farm on the basis of their respective shares in the soybean and flaxseed crop produced on the farm, or the proceeds therefrom, except that in any case in which the Secretary determines that such basis would not be fair and equitable, the Secretary shall provide for such sharing on such other basis as he may determine to be fair and equitable.

"(g) If the operator of the farm elects to participate in the acreage diversion program, price support for soybeans and flaxseed included in the program shall be made available to the producers on such farm only if such producers divert from the production of such commodities, in accordance with the provisions of such program, an acreage on the farm equal to the number of acres which such operator agrees to divert, and the agreement shall so provide. In any case in which the failure of a producer to comply fully with the terms and conditions of the program formulated under this section preclude the making of payments-in-kind, the Secretary may, nevertheless, make such payments-in-kind in such amounts as he determines to be equitable in relation to the seriousness of the default.

"(h) The Secretary is authorized to use the capital funds and other assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of making payments under this section and to pay the administrative expenses necessary for carrying out this section."

Sec. 602. Section 16 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"ACREAGE DIVERSION PROGRAM FOR SOYBEANS AND FLAXSEED

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) Whenever the Secretary determines that the total combined stocks of soybeans and flaxseed of the Commodity Credit Corporation (including such stocks under Government loan) as of August 31 of any year (A) exceed one hundred and fifty million bushels (including the bushel equivalent of any soybean and flaxseed meal and oil held by the Corporation), or (B) exceed by 15 per centum or more the number of bushels or such commodities utilized (domestic and export) in the immediately preceding years, he shall formulate and carry out during the next crop year an acreage diversion program for soybeans and flaxseed, without regard to provisions which would be applicable to the regular agricultural conservation program, under which, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, conservation payments shall be made to producers who divert acreage from the production of soybeans and flaxseed to an approved conservation use and increase their average acreage of cropland devoted in 1967 and 1968 to designated soil-conserving crops or practices including summer fallow and idle land by an equal amount. Payments shall be made at such rate or rates as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable return for the acreage diverted, but not in excess of 50 per centum of the estimated basic county support rate, including the lowest rate of payment-in-kind, on the normal production of the acreage diverted from the commodity on the farm based on the farm projected yield per acre. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, the Secretary may permit all or any part of such diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, crambe, and plantago ovato, if he determines that such production of the commodity is needed to provide an adequate supply, is not likely to increase the cost of the price support program, and will not adversely affect farm income subject to the condition that payment with respect to diverted acreage devoted to any such crop shall be at a rate determined by the Secretary to be fair and reasonable, taking into consideration the use of such acreage for the production of such crops, but in no event shall the payment exceed one-half the rate which otherwise would be applicable if such acreage were devoted to conservation uses. Such soybean-flaxseed diversion pro-

gram shall require the producer to take such measures as the Secretary may deem appropriate to keep such diverted acreage free from erosion, insects, weeds, and rodents. The acreage eligible for participation in the program shall be such acreage (not to exceed 50 per centum of the average acreage on the farm devoted to soybeans and flaxseed in the crop years 1967 and 1968 or twenty-five acres, whichever is greater) as the Secretary determines necessary to achieve the acreage reduction goal for the crop. Payments may be in kind from feed grain stocks in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. In determining the amount of the payment-in-kind in feed grains to be made to any producer the Secretary shall consider the feeding value of soybeans and flaxseed meal in relation to feed grains, the yield per acre, the equivalent dollar value of soybeans and flaxseed as compared with feed grains, and such other factors as he deems necessary to arrive at a fair and reasonable payment. The Secretary may make such adjustments in acreage as he determines necessary to correct for abnormal factors affecting production, and to give due consideration to tillable acreage, crop-rotation practices, types of soil, soil and water conservation measures, and topography. Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the Secretary may, upon unanimous request of the State committee established pursuant to section 8(b) of this Act, adjust the soybean-flaxseed bases for farms within any State or county to the extent he determines such adjustment to be necessary in order to establish fair and equitable soybean-flaxseed bases for farms within such State or county. The Secretary shall make not to exceed 50 per centum of any payments to producers in advance of determination of performance.

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, not to exceed 1 per centum of the estimated total soybean-flaxseed bases for all farms in a State for any year may be reserved from the soybean-flaxseed bases established for farms in the State for apportionment to farms on which there were no acreages devoted to soybeans or flaxseed in the crop years 1968 and 1969 on the basis of the following factors: Suitability of the land for the production of soybeans or flaxseed, the past experience of the farm operator in the production of soybeans or flaxseed, the extent to which the farm operator is dependent on income from farming for his livelihood, the production of soybeans or flaxseed on other farms owned, operated, or controlled by the farm operator, and such other factors as the Secretary determines should be considered for the purpose of establishing fair and equitable soybean-flaxseed bases. An acreage equal to the soybean-flaxseed base so established for each farm shall be deemed to have been devoted to soybeans and flaxseed on the farm in each of the crop years 1968 and 1969 for purposes of this subsection except that producers on such farm shall not be eligible for conservation payments for the first year for which the soybean-flaxseed base is established.

"(3) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out this section.

"(4) The Secretary shall provide by regulations for the sharing of payments under this subsection among producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis and in keeping with existing contracts.

"(5) Payments in kind of feed grains shall be made through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem for feed grains in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall, in accordance with regu-

lations prescribed by the Secretary, assist the producer in the marketing of such certificates. Feed grains with which Commodity Credit Corporation redeems certificates pursuant to this paragraph shall be valued at not less than the current support price made available through loans and purchases, plus reasonable carrying charges.

"(6) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may, by mutual agreement with the producer, terminate or modify any agreement previously entered into pursuant to this subsection if he determines such action necessary because of an emergency created by drought or other disaster, or in order to prevent or alleviate a shortage in the supply of soybeans or flaxseed."

TITLE VII—CONSUMER PROTECTION RESERVE

Sec. 701. It is the policy of the Congress to establish and maintain reserves of storable agricultural commodities adequate to meet any foreseeable food and fiber shortage which might arise in the Nation as a consequence of any natural disaster, adverse food production conditions for one or more years, military actions, or other causes and to assist other nations of the world in any food or fiber emergency. It is further the policy of Congress to establish such reserves in years of surplus production and to maintain them to the maximum extent practicable in the control of procedures, to assure their segregation from the commercial market so that existence of the reserves will not adversely affect the level of market prices.

Sec. 702. Whenever, during any marketing year the uncommitted stocks of wheat, feed grains, soybeans or cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation fall below the reserve level for such commodity specified below, the Commodity Credit Corporation may purchase at prevailing market prices such quantities of the commodity at such times and places as will effect the orderly establishment and maintenance of the Commodity Credit Corporation's stocks of the commodity at such reserve level. The reserve level of the commodity under this section for any marketing year shall be:

For wheat.....bushels..	200,000,000
For feed grains.....tons..	15,000,000
For soybeans.....bushels..	35,000,000
For cotton.....bales..	3,000,000

In any marketing year for any crop for which the Secretary determines that the estimated production from such crop will exceed estimated domestic consumption and exports during such marketing year by more than 10 per centum, the reserve level under this section shall be increased by one hundred million bushels for wheat, seven and five-tenths million tons for feed grains, fifteen million bushels for soybeans, and one million bales for cotton.

Sec. 703. (a) In order to assure that the Commodity Credit Corporation reserve stocks of wheat, feed grains, soybeans, and cotton will be insulated from the market, whenever the Commodity Credit Corporation's stocks of any such commodity are below the level specified for such commodity in the schedule prescribed in subsection (b) of this section, the Commodity Credit Corporation, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, shall not sell for unrestricted domestic use or value for redemption of payment-in-kind certificates such commodity at less than the price specified in such schedule.

(b) The following stock levels and prices shall apply with respect to the Commodity Credit Corporation:

(1) For wheat, when the Commodity Credit Corporation's uncommitted stocks are not more than two hundred million bushels, the minimum price shall be 100 per centum of the current parity price, adjusted for class, grade, and location, less than current cost of the marketing certificate charged to processors.

(2) For feed grains, when the Commodity Credit Corporation's uncommitted stocks are not more than fifteen million tons, the minimum price shall be 100 per centum of the current parity price, adjusted for class, grade, and location, less the current price support payment rate with respect to the maximum permitted acreage for the feed grain.

(3) For soybeans, when the Commodity Credit Corporation's uncommitted stocks are not more than thirty-five million bushels, the minimum price shall be 100 per centum of the current parity price, adjusted for class, grade, and location.

(4) For cotton, when the Commodity Credit Corporation's uncommitted stocks are not more than three million bales, the minimum price shall be 100 per centum of the current parity price, adjusted for class, grade, and location.

SEC. 704. Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other Act, for the purpose of efficient management of the reserve stocks, including rotation thereof, Commodity Credit Corporation may sell any commodity in its reserve at the domestic market price, but any such sale shall be offset by a prompt purchase of a substantially equivalent quantity of such commodity at the domestic market price.

SEC. 705. (a) The Secretary shall make available a program for extending the maturity dates of price support loans for any crop of wheat, feed grains, soybeans, or cotton if he determines that the estimated production from such crop will exceed estimated domestic consumption and exports during the marketing year for such crop. The Secretary shall estimate the production from each crop and the domestic consumption and exports for the marketing year for such crop within thirty days after the beginning of such marketing year and at any subsequent time during the marketing year when he finds that changed circumstances require a new estimate. If in any marketing year when the Secretary has made such a determination, extended loans on wheat, feed grains, soybeans or cotton of any crop are called and the quantity of the commodity under such extended loans is not substantially offset by the quantity placed under the extended loan program from the current crop, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall purchase such additional quantity of the commodity at the prices specified in section 602 of this title as will substantially offset the quantity of the commodity under extended loans which are called.

(b) The Secretary shall make extended loan programs available under subsection (a) or otherwise and exercise the right to call extended loans in a manner which will enable producers to maintain at the end of each marketing year carryover stocks under such programs of approximately one hundred and fifty million bushels of wheat, seven and five-tenths million tons of feed grains, and twenty million bushels of soybeans. In the case of any marketing year for any crop for which the Secretary determines that the estimated production will exceed domestic consumption and exports during such marketing year by more than 10 per centum, the Secretary may conduct the program in a manner which will enable producers to maintain the end of such marketing year carryover stocks of up to two hundred million bushels of wheat, fifteen million tons of feed grains, and thirty-five million bushels of soybeans.

(c) The Secretary shall offer to enter into agreements with producers under which the producers shall agree to keep such commodity in storage under his control for periods of not to exceed three years, and the Secretary shall agree not to call the loans in such cases unless the prevailing marketing price for the commodity has reached the level at which the Commodity Credit Corpo-

ration may sell such commodity for unrestricted domestic use under the pricing schedule provided in section 603 of this title and the Secretary determines that the commodity is needed to meet a shortage which has arisen as a consequence of a natural disaster, adverse food or fiber production conditions for one or more years, military actions, or other causes. Notwithstanding the foregoing restrictions, the Secretary may call the loans in the case of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or as to which there is a danger of loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage or for the purpose of establishing claims arising out of contract or against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity. The Secretary is authorized to provide incentives necessary to encourage farmers to store under such agreements approximately one hundred and fifty million bushels of wheat, seven and five-tenths million tons of feed grains, and twenty million bushels of soybeans. To the extent that the quantity of any commodity stored by producers under this subsection falls below such level, the Commodity Credit Corporation may purchase an additional quantity of the commodity to offset the deficiency.

TITLE VIII—MARKETING ORDERS

SEC. 801. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 8c(2) is amended by inserting after the third sentence ending with the words "Southwest production area." the following: "Notwithstanding any of the commodity, product, area, or approval exceptions or limitations in the foregoing sentences hereof, any agricultural commodity or product thereof, or any regional or market classification thereof, shall be eligible for an order, exempt from any special approval required by the preceding sentences hereof, if after referendum of the affected producers of such commodity the Secretary finds that a majority of such producers voting in such referendum favor making such commodity or product thereof or the regional or market classification thereof specified in the referendum, eligible for an order: *Provided, however*, That such referendum shall not be required for any commodity or product for which an order otherwise is authorized under the preceding sentences of this subsection (2) and for which no special approval or area limitation is specified therein."

(2) Sections 8(c)(6) (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E) are amended by inserting "species or other classification" after the words "grade, size, or quality" wherever the latter words appear.

(3) Section 8c(6), as amended, is further amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(J) With respect to orders providing for minimum prices on a classified use basis (1) providing for the payment to all producers or associations of producers of uniform minimum prices for the commodity or product marketed by them (within their allotments, if any), irrespective of the use or disposition thereof, subject, however, to adjustments specified by the order, including but not limited to adjustments for place of production or delivery, grade, condition, size, weight, quality, or maturity, or any other adjustments found to be appropriate to provide equity among producers, and (ii) providing a method for making adjustments in payments as among handlers (including producers who are also handlers), to the end that the total sums paid by each handler shall equal the value of the commodity or product purchased or acquired by him at the classified use minimum prices fixed pursuant to such order."

(4) Section 8c(6), as amended, is further amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(K) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title—

"(i) allotting, or providing methods for allotting, the quantity of such commodity or product or any grade, size, or quality thereof, which each producer may be permitted to market or dispose of in any or all markets or use classifications during any specified period or periods on the basis of (a) the amount produced or marketed by such producer or produced on or marketed from the farm on which he is a producer in such prior period as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be representative, subject to such adjustment for abnormal conditions and other factors affecting production or marketing as the Secretary may determine, or (b) the current quantities available for marketing by such producer, or (c) any combination of (a) and (b) to the end that the total allotment during any specified period or periods shall be apportioned equitably among producers. Allotments hereunder may be in terms of quantities or production from given acres or other production units. If the Secretary determines that such action will facilitate the administration of a marketing order hereunder and will not substantially impair the effective operation thereof he may fix, or provide a method for fixing, a minimum allotment applicable to producers and producers whose production does not exceed such minimum shall not be subject to the regulatory provisions of the order except as prescribed therein;

"(ii) any producer for whom allotment is established or refused under the authority of this subsection may obtain a review of the lawfulness of his allotment as prescribed by the order of the Secretary establishing the allotment and rules and regulations thereunder, which shall constitute the exclusive procedure for review thereof and section 8c(15)(A) of this title shall not apply thereto. Under such order, rules or regulations any officers or employees of the Department or any committees or boards created or designated by the Secretary of Agriculture may be vested with authority to perform any or all functions in connection with such review proceedings including ruling thereon. Committees or boards created or designated for this purpose shall be deemed agencies of the Secretary within the meaning of subsection 8c(7)(C) and section 10 of this title. The ruling upon such review shall be final if in accordance with law. The producer may obtain a judicial review of such ruling in accordance with the provisions of section 8c(15)(B) of this title; and

"(iii) when allotments for producers are established under this subsection the order may contain provisions allotting or providing a method for allotting the quantity which any handler may handle so that any and all handlers will be limited as to any producer to the allotment established for such producer, and such allotment shall constitute an allotment fixed for each handler within the meaning of section 8a(5) of this title."

(5) Amend section 8c by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph (20) as follows:

"PRODUCER ADVISORY COMMITTEES

"(20) The Secretary of Agriculture may establish a producer advisory committee with respect to any commodity, or group of commodities, for which a marketing order is potentially authorized. Such committee shall be composed of producers of the commodity or commodities for which the committee is established. Such committees may be called on by the Secretary of Agriculture to provide advice and counsel with respect to the initiation of proceedings for the promulgation of a marketing agreement or marketing order for such commodity or com-

modities and may also formulate specific proposals for purposes of a public hearing concerning such a proposed marketing agreement or marketing order. The establishment of such a committee shall not, however, be deemed necessary to the initiation of any such proceeding to promulgate a marketing agreement or marketing order."

(6) Amend section 10(b)(2) by adding at the end thereof a new subparagraph (iv) as follows:

"(iv) If the order contains provisions authorized by section 8c(6) (K) it shall provide that the assessments payable by handlers under subsection (ii) shall initially be payable pro rata by the producers of the commodity to such handlers thereof, who shall be responsible for the collection thereof from producers and payment to the authority or agency established under such order."

SEC. 802. Nothing in this title shall supersede the provisions of other statutes relating to marketing quotas, acreage allotments or limitations or price support, with respect to agricultural commodities and no action taken or provisions in an order issued under this title shall be inconsistent with the provisions of such other statutes or actions taken by the Secretary of Agriculture under such other statutes.

TITLE IX—CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT

SEC. 901. (a) The first sentence of section 602(a) of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "calendar years 1965 through 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965 and subsequent calendar years".

(b) Subsection (k) of section 602 of such Act is hereby repealed.

TITLE X—RICE

SEC. 1001. The first sentence of paragraph (7) of section 353(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out "for 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, or 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "for 1966 or any subsequent year".

TOO MUCH, TOO LITTLE, OR NO INFORMATION ON THE CYCLAMATES?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. SULLIVAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, after noting a news article this morning that Secretary Finch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is upset over "varying assessments" by the Food and Drug Administration of the dangers, if any, from the cyclamate sweeteners, I tried to obtain a copy of his remarks but was told there was no transcript available of his comments to the press on this matter. The article in the Washington Post indicates, however, that Secretary Finch is unhappy because some experiments conducted by FDA scientists have been widely publicized.

These experiments indicated—did not prove, but indicated—that birth defects could possibly result from the use by expectant mothers of foods containing artificial sweeteners. The experiments involved only chicken eggs and chicks, not humans. The Commission of Food and Drugs was then quoted as having said the findings are only tentative as to animals and may not mean a thing in the case of humans.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see any "waffling" on this by FDA, to use the Sec-

retary's words. All we know for sure is that 15 percent of the chicks born from eggs which were injected with cyclamates were defective. There is no reason in the world why this information should have been suppressed. It is legitimate information for the public to have.

SUPPRESSION OF SCIENTIFIC DATA?

It certainly does not prove that cyclamates added to soft drinks or other foods cause birth defects in humans. But I hope the Secretary is not now planning to suppress scientific information which, at the least, sounds a warning to prospective mothers about the unrestricted use of any food product. The implications of the Secretary's statement as quoted in the Post this morning are very disturbing if they indicate a possible crackdown on carefully stated scientific information. The Food and Drug Administration requires certain warnings now on the labels of soft drinks containing cyclamates. This has not seemed to reduce their use. If there is any reason why expectant mothers should be particularly cautious, we should know about it.

Mr. Speaker, the article referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1969]

FINCH RAPS FDA ON SWEETENERS

Secretary Robert H. Finch roundly criticized a unit of his own Department of Health, Education, and Welfare yesterday for its handling of safety questions about the widely used artificial sweeteners that contain cyclamates.

"I am not at all satisfied with the present situation there," Finch said. "I think it's just inevitable that we're going to have some rather substantial reorganization of procedures and personnel in the Food and Drug Administration."

The secretary was particularly critical of what he termed varying FDA assessments of possible health hazards associated with cyclamate use.

He singled out a recent FDA experiment, widely reported on national television, demonstrating a 15 per cent incidence of birth defects after cyclamate injection into chicken eggs.

"We have appeared to waffle on it," Finch said in an interview. "Some have been overzealous saying, 'Sure, this may not be final or conclusive' . . . but we still ought to run up the flag and sound the bugle," he said. "And others have gone too far the other way."

Finch mentioned no names. But he apparently was referring to Dr. Jacqueline Verrett, the FDA scientist who conducted the chick experiment, and to FDA Commissioner Herbert L. Ley Jr.

Dr. Verrett has been quoted as advising pregnant women to exercise care with cyclamates unless and until all doubts are removed.

[In an interview last week on NBC television, Dr. Verrett was asked, "What statement can you make?" She replied that cyclamates have "serious effects on chick embryos . . . work should be done on mammals to see if there is crossing of the placenta . . . and any possible damage . . . Next step is to find out if there are some effects in other animal species." As for pregnant women, she advised that they "avoid everything unnecessary unless okayed by an M.D."]

Dr. Ley has emphasized that the findings are tentative from the cyclamate studies on animals. Also, he said, the effect of the

drug on a lower animal is not always the same as on man.

SHOULD BE USED ONLY BY PERSONS WHO MUST RESTRICT INTAKE OF ORDINARY SWEETS

Mr. Speaker, if the Food and Drug Administration had definite evidence that the cyclamates were dangerous to use as food additives, it could prohibit their further use. Obviously, the agency does not have such proof. But it has been working on this matter for some time because of the fact that there are doubts. Consumers have been advised by the Government for some years that products containing the artificial sweeteners "should be used only by persons who must restrict their intake of ordinary sweets." It always disturbs me to see healthy, active, and even underweight children drinking quantities of soft drinks bearing such a warning on the label but, as I said, there is no proof that they are being harmed. The quicker this issue is cleared up, the better we will all feel about it.

But I would certainly hate to have the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare suppress scientific data dealing with possible harm from the use of this product merely because the information is not absolutely conclusive. If there should be conclusive information that the product is dangerous, the public would no longer have any need for the information because the product by then would have had to be removed from the market.

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

SENATOR BIRCH BAYH TAKES A CLOSER LOOK AT JUDGE HAYNSWORTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, BIRCH BAYH, the able junior Senator from Indiana, has performed, in my judgment, an invaluable service to those in the other body who need further factual information with regard to the nomination of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

It is an examination that dispassionately speaks for itself and hopefully will be carefully studied by those who may be called upon to ratify the President's nomination.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BIRCH BAYH,
OCTOBER 8, 1969

In recent years our judicial system has come under increasing attack, not only by the citizenry at large, but by lawyers and members of the legislative branch of both national and state governments. As our ideas, opinions and judgments of law and its application have changed over the past 180 years, so have changed the expectations of the American public of our public officials. Particularly now, when public confidence in the integrity of the federal judiciary at the highest level has so recently been severely shaken, it is of the utmost importance that only men who are truly distinguished and truly above reproach sit on the bench of our highest court.

Since the nomination of Judge Clement F. Haynsworth to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, numerous facts that raise a serious question as to the propriety of his conduct while a member of the Federal Judiciary have come to my attention. An intensive investigation aimed at uncovering the truth has resulted in the following bill of particulars which has convinced me that Judge Haynsworth falls short of the demanding ethical standards required of an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. I issue the bill of particulars with no malice toward Judge Haynsworth but with some considerable regret. The question is not whether Judge Haynsworth is dishonest but whether he has shown the temperament necessary to sit in the highest judicial council.

CAROLINA VEND-A-MATIC

Judge Haynsworth was an organizer and founder of Carolina Vend-A-Matic in 1950, with an original investment of \$2,400.00.

He was Vice President and a director of Carolina Vend-A-Matic until 1963. He stated that he orally resigned from the Vice Presidency in 1957, but the corporation records show he was listed as Vice President until 1963 and indeed regularly attended meetings of the Board of Directors and voted for slates of officers through the years. He was in fact paid director's fees in amounts as high as \$2,600.00 per year, and the records show his wife, Dorothy M. Haynsworth, served as Secretary of the corporation for two years while he was on the Federal bench.

Although the Judge claims he was an inactive officer, the minutes of the corporation indicate that such was not the case. Directors were active in locating new business and Judge Haynsworth took an active part in director's meetings, often making motions himself. While he was director of Carolina Vend-A-Matic, he took part in decisions to buy and sell land to himself and other directors and the profit sharing trust.

Judge Haynsworth endorsed notes for the corporation in amounts as high as \$501,987.00. Some of these notes were endorsed after he assumed the bench.

In 1963 more than three-fourths of CVAM's total business was with textile concerns. Thus any precedent setting decision affecting the textile industry would also affect CVAM through its customers.

For some years there had been an exodus of textile concerns from the North to the South in an effort to take advantage of lower wages as a result of strong regional pressures against collective bargaining in the South. The *Darlington Mfg. Co. v. NLRB* case was a landmark case in the textile industry because it enabled textile concerns to close plants attempting to organize. Thus, it gave them an important weapon.

The case of *Darlington Mfg. Co. v. NLRB* came before the Fourth Circuit Court of Judge Haynsworth in both 1961 and 1963, while CVAM had a vending contract with Deering Milliken Corp., Darlington's parent company, for \$50,000 per year. While the litigation was still pending, CVAM signed a new contract with Deering Milliken Corp., increasing their vending business with that company to \$100,000 per year. The Darlington case was eventually decided in favor of Darlington, with Judge Haynsworth casting the deciding vote and thus establishing an important legal precedent for the textile industry in a decision later substantially modified by the Supreme Court.

In 1957, after Judge Haynsworth assumed the bench, the gross sales of CVAM and its subsidiaries increased tremendously. Gross sales increased only slowly from \$169,355 in 1951 to \$296,413 in 1956. But in 1957, the year Judge Haynsworth assumed the Federal bench, sales jumped to \$435,110 and continued a precipitous climb, reaching \$3,-

160,665 in 1963, the last full year in which Judge Haynsworth owned a major share of the company.

Between 1958 and 1963 Judge Haynsworth sat on at least six other cases involving customers of CVAM.

1. *Homelite v. Trywil Realty Co., Inc.* 272 F2d 688 (1959). Gross sales to Homelite by CVAM in 1959 totaled \$15,957.22.

2. *Kent Mfg. Corp. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue* 288 F2d 812 (1961). CVAM gross sales to Runneymeade, a subsidiary of Kent Mfg. Corp., in 1961 totaled \$21,323.63.

3. *Textile Workers Union of America v. Cone Mills Corporation* 268 F2d 920 (1959). CVAM gross sales to Cone Mills and its subsidiaries Carlisle Mill and Union Bleachery in 1959 totaled \$97,367.12.

4. *Leesona Corp. v. Cotwool Mfg. Corp., Deering Milliken Research Corp. and Whittin Machine Works* 315 F2d 895 (1963). CVAM gross sales to Deering Milliken plants in 1963 totaled \$100,000.00.

5. *Leesona Corp. v. Cotwool Mfg. Corp., Deering Milliken Research Corp. and Whittin Machine Works* 308 F2d 895 (1962). CVAM gross sales to Deering Milliken in 1962 totaled \$50,000.00.

6. *Textile Workers Union of America v. Cone Mills* 290 F2d 921 (1961). CVAM gross sales to Cone Mills and its subsidiaries in 1961 totaled \$174,314.92.

OTHER CASES INVOLVING CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There are at least five cases in which Judge Haynsworth held a financial interest in one of the litigants substantial enough to require disqualification under 28 USC 455 and to constitute impropriety under the Canons of judicial ethics.

Brunswick Corp. v. Long 392 F2d 348 (1967).

Farrow v. Grace Lines Inc. 381 F2d 380 (1967).

Merck v. Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. 253 F2d 156 (1958).

Darter v. Greenville Community Hotel Corp. 301 F2d 70 (1962).

Donohue v. Maryland Casualty Co. 363 F2d 442 (1966).

DEMONSTRATED LACK OF CANDOR

I. Denial of active participation in the business of CVAM.

In a letter to the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee dated September 6, 1969, Judge Haynsworth said:

(Paragraph 12) "The specific locations of vending machines were simply not a matter of interest to me and, as stated before, I was never involved in any way in securing new vending machine locations."

In testimony before the Judiciary Committee on September 16, 1969, the following exchange occurred:

"CHAIRMAN. Did you have anything to do with the preparing of bids or soliciting business for Carolina Vend-A-Matic?"

"JUDGE HAYNSWORTH. Nothing whatsoever. "Senator TYDINGS. As a part of your work, or as a part of your association with Carolina Vend-A-Matic, did you formally or informally seek to obtain business for Carolina Vend-A-Matic?"

"JUDGE HAYNSWORTH. Never. I did not."

Fact: Judge Haynsworth was consistently and intimately involved with the operation of Carolina Vend-A-Matic from June 1957 until October 1963 and regularly accepted funds from CVAM during that period subsequent to a resolution by the Board of Directors which appears in the minute books of the corporation and states that: "It was pointed out that the main sales and promotional work of CVAM had been done by its directors who are also the officers of the corporation and that any new locations were the result of many conversations, trips and various forms of entertainment of potential

customers by one or more of the directors or officers over an extended period of time. A review was had of the various locations that had been acquired during the past several years and new locations that were being considered and practically without exception, these were the result of the Board of Directors."

II. Denial of having sat on any cases in which he had a substantial financial relationship with one of the litigants.

In a letter to the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, dated September 6, 1969, Judge Haynsworth said:

(Paragraph 13) "I have disqualified myself in all cases in which my former law firm or any of its members were counsel, cases in which certain relatives were counsel, and all cases in which I had a stock interest in a party or in one which would be directly affected by the outcome of the litigation."

And in testimony before the Judiciary Committee on September 17, 1969, Judge Haynsworth said:

"And I suggest to you that I have not made or retained any investment in any concern which was likely to be involved with frequency in my court."

Fact: Judge Haynsworth sat on at least five cases in which he had a substantial stock interest in litigants before him:

Brunswick Corp. v. Long, 392 F2d 348 (1967).

Farrow v. Grace Lines Inc., 381 F2d 380 (1967).

Merck v. Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., 253 F2d 152 (1958).

Darter v. Greenville Community Hotel Corp., 301 F2d 70 (1962).

Donohue v. Maryland Casualty Co., 363 F2d 442 (1966).

III. Denial of having retained positions as a director and officer in Carolina Vend-A-Matic and the Main Oak Corporation.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judiciary Machinery on September 17, 1969, Judge Haynsworth said:

"Of course, when I went on the bench I resigned from all such business associations I had, directorships and things of that sort. The only one I retained is the trusteeship of this small foundation which I mentioned in my main statement, and I think that perhaps the best rule for a judge to go by now is stop doing even that."

Fact: Judge Haynsworth retained his position as director and officer of the Main Oak Corporation and CVAM when he went on the bench and until October, 1963.

He also had remained as a trustee of the Furman Charitable Trust from the time he went on the bench until today.

VIOLATION OF 29 USC 301-308

The Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act provides that an administrator of a pension fund must file with the Secretary of Labor an initial description of the plan and annual reports thereafter. Willful violation of the act can lead to six months imprisonment or a fine of \$1,000 or both. Judge Haynsworth was a trustee of the CVAM profit sharing and retirement plan from 1961 until 1964 and qualified as an administrator with the Secretary of Labor. On September 17, 1969, the director of the Office of Labor-Management and Welfare-Pension Reports of the U.S. Department of Labor advised my office by letter, "Our records do not show that any reports have been received under the name of Carolina Vend A Matic Company, Inc., for a Profit Sharing and Retirement Plan."

VIOLATIONS OF THE CANONS OF ETHICS OF THE ABA

I. Canon 4 states: "Avoidance of Impropriety. A judge's official conduct should be free from impropriety and the appearance of impropriety; he should avoid infractions

of law; and his personal behavior, not only upon the Bench and in his performance of judicial duties, but also in his everyday life, should be beyond reproach."

Judge Haynsworth has violated 29 USC 301-308 by his failure to comply with the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act and has violated 28 USC 455 and the law of due process as interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Tuney v. Ohio* 273 US 510 (1927), *In Re Murchison* 349 US 133 (1955) and *Commonwealth Coatings Corp. v. Continental Casualty Co.* 393 US 145 (1968), no less than 12 times by sitting on cases involving customers of CVAM and in cases in which he held stock interest in a litigant as cited above.

II. Canon 13 states: "Kinship or Influence. A judge should not act in a controversy where a near relative is a party; he should not suffer his conduct to justify the impression that any person can improperly influence him or unduly enjoy his favor, or that he is affected by the kinship, rank, position or influence of any party or other person."

By sitting on cases involving customers of CVAM and ruling in their favor at least five times in five years Judge Haynsworth conducted himself in such a manner as to "justify the impression" that he may have been improperly influenced.

III. Canon 24 states: "Inconsistent Obligations. A judge should not accept inconsistent duties nor incur obligations, pecuniary or otherwise, which will in any way interfere or appear to interfere with his devotion to the expeditious and proper administration of his official functions."

By acting as a director and Vice President of CVAM, Judge Haynsworth clearly accepted duties likely "to interfere or appear to interfere" with the proper administration of his official functions. Shortly after investigating bribery charges in the 4th Circuit Court of Appeals in 1963-64, Judge Simon Sobeloff, in an article for the *Federal Bar Journal* observed:

"One can readily see that if a judge serves as an officer or director of a commercial enterprise, not only is he disqualified in cases involving that enterprise, but his impartiality may also be consciously or unconsciously affected when persons having business relations with his company come before him."

IV. Canon 25 states: "Business Promotions and Solicitations for Charity. A judge should avoid giving ground for any reasonable suspicion that he is utilizing the power or prestige of his office to persuade or coerce others to patronize or contribute, either to the success of private business ventures, or to charitable enterprises. He should, therefore, not enter into such private business, or pursue such a course of conduct, as would justify such suspicion, nor use the power of his office or the influence of his name to promote the business interests of others; he should not solicit for charities, nor should he enter any business relations which, in the normal course of events reasonably to be expected, might bring his personal interest into conflict with the impartial performance of his official duties."

Judge Haynsworth's financial interest and active participation in the affairs of CVAM constituted a clear breach of this standard. The remarkable rise in gross sales of CVAM after he assumed the Federal Bench justified the suspicion that the prestige of his office was used to promote his own interests as well as those of his fellow stockholders. In addition, his practice of taking part in cases involving customers of CVAM furnishes further grounds for the belief that his office was used to promote patronization of a business in which he had substantial interest.

V. Canon 26 states: "Personal Investments and Relations. A judge should abstain from making personal investments in enterprises which are apt to be involved in litigation in

the court; and after his succession to the Bench, he should not retain such investments previously made longer than a period sufficient to enable him to dispose of them without serious loss. It is desirable that he should, so far as reasonably possible, refrain from all relations which would normally tend to arouse the suspicion that such relations warp or bias his judgment, or prevent his impartial attitude of mind in the administration of his judicial duties.

"He should not utilize information coming to him in a judicial capacity for purposes of speculation; and it detracts from the public confidence in his integrity and the soundness of his judicial judgment for him at any time to become a speculative investor upon the hazard of a margin."

Judge Haynsworth breached this Canon on at least six occasions. His largest investment has been Georgia Pacific Corp., which was the subject of a consent decree by the S.E.C. in 1966. The decree was entered in the Second Circuit, but fraudulent stock transfers could have led to litigation in the Fourth Circuit. In the Brunswick case, Judge Haynsworth bought stock in Brunswick while a case involving that company was before his court. Other investments made by Judge Haynsworth can be considered investments which "are apt to be involved in litigation in the court" since in fact W. R. Grace Co., Greenville Community Hotel Corporation, Maryland Casualty Ins., and Monsanto Chemical Corp. did appear before his court.

VI. Canon 29 states: "Self-Interest. A judge should abstain from performing or taking part in any judicial act in which his personal interests are involved. If he has personal litigation in the court of which he is judge, he need not resign his judgeship on that account, but he should, of course, refrain from any judicial act in such a controversy."

By deciding cases involving customers of CVAM on at least seven occasions, he exercised judicial discretion which could have affected the business of CVAM and hence Judge Haynsworth, a clear breach of this canon. In interpreting Canon 29, Opinion #170 of the Ethics Committee of the ABA clearly states that a judge shall exercise no act of judicial discretion in cases where he owns stock in a corporate litigant. In the Brunswick case, by participating in the decision and denying the motion for an extension of time, Judge Haynsworth clearly violated Canon 29 as interpreted by the ABA. Similarly, by sitting in the W. R. Grace Co., Maryland Casualty Ins. Co., Greenville Community Hotel Corp., and Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. cases the Canon was breached.

VII. Canon 33 states: "Social Relations. It is not necessary to the proper performance of judicial duty that a judge should live in retirement or seclusion; it is desirable that, so far as reasonable attention to the completion of his work will permit, he continue to mingle in social intercourse, and that he should not discontinue his interest in or appearance at meetings of members of the Bar. He should, however, in pending or prospective litigation before him be particularly careful to avoid such action as may reasonably tend to awaken the suspicion that his social or business relations or friendships constitute an element in influencing his judicial conduct."

By sitting in cases involving important customers of CVAM Judge Haynsworth gave grounds for the suspicion that business relations influenced his conduct.

VIII. Canon 34 states: "A Summary of Judicial Obligation. In every particular his conduct should be above reproach. He should be conscientious, studious, thorough, courteous, patient, punctual, just, impartial, fearless of public clamor, regardless of public praise, and influences; he should administer

justice according to law, and deal with his appointments as a public trust; he should not allow other affairs or his private interests to interfere with the prompt and proper performance of his judicial duties, nor should he administer the office for the purpose of advancing his personal ambitions or increasing his popularity.

Judge Haynsworth in view of the facts detailed above has obviously not conducted himself in such a manner that his conduct is above reproach "in every particular."

I would like to point out in closing that this bill of particulars is less complete and comprehensive than I would like due to the extreme difficulty we have experienced in gaining access to all of the material we have requested. It is unfortunate that the Justice Department has not only been less than candid with the Senate Judiciary Committee but appears to have embarked on a calculated effort to sanitize the records upon which individual members of the Senate must decide this important question. Some records are incomplete and because of countless delays we have had less time than we would like to assess the material that has recently become available. I consider this to be in the nature of a preliminary report which will be updated as we acquire more complete records and have the opportunity to study at greater length those we already have.

COMPREHENSIVE AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

(Mr. BUSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation providing comprehensive amendments to the social security law. My bill is in nearly all essentials identical with the comprehensive proposal that President Nixon has made for fundamental improvements in our social security law. However, my bill provides for a benefit increase effective on January 1 of next year and also includes a minor technical improvement in existing law.

The bill proposes a series of improvements that include:

A 10 percent across-the-board benefit increase effective January 1, 1970, for all social security beneficiaries.

An increase in the amount social security beneficiaries can earn without suffering diminution in benefits from \$1,680 to \$1,800. An amendment would also be included insuring that no earnings would reduce benefits by more than \$1 for every \$2 earned. Earnings in excess of \$2,880 in a year reduce benefits under present law by \$1 for every \$1 earned.

Increase the amount of benefits a widow would receive under present law from 82½ percent of her husband's benefit to 100 percent. Combined with the across-the-board benefit increase, this would provide widows with approximately a 33-percent increase in benefits.

Provide that benefits will be kept up to date through automatic increases commensurate with increases in the cost of living. This would afford social security beneficiaries protection similar to that now enjoyed by civil service retirees, the military, and other individuals under some private pension plans.

Provide that the amount a social security beneficiary may earn without incurring a loss in benefits will be automatically adjusted in the future as earnings levels increase.

Provide that the wages of a worker that will be included in computing his benefits in the future will automatically be increased as earnings levels increase.

Additionally, the bill includes a series of technical amendments that will simplify the law, improve administration, and improve equity in a number of very worthwhile cases. These technical improvements reflect the President's emphasis on improving the "nuts and bolts" aspects of Government—the administration of basic programs that are important to all our people even though they may not be politically glamorous. Among the amendments in this category, the bill includes proposals that would:

Improve the formula on which a male worker's benefits are computed by extending to them a more generous computation formula that is now only available in the case of women.

Provide parent's benefits in the case of retired or disabled workers. Under present law benefits are provided only for the parents of deceased workers.

Provide disability benefits for a child who becomes disabled after 18 and before age 22. Present law provides disability benefits in these cases only where the disability occurs before age 18.

Provide noncontributory wage credits for individuals who served on active duty in the military between 1957 and 1967. Under existing law there is a gap in the scope of protection that individuals who served in this period enjoy.

The President's proposal also courageously faces up to the need not only to adequately finance the huge deficit in the hospital insurance trust fund that was inherited from the previous administration, but also completely finances the liberalization in benefits provided in his recommendation. In doing this it is important to point out that the administration has actually reduced the rates below the level that are scheduled to prevail under existing law. One of the most important factors in providing this sound financing is the recommendation for automatically adjusting the taxable wage base in the future. In view of the escalation in payroll taxes as well as other taxes in our economy, the President is to be commended for working out a package of meaningful improvements within a framework that will enable us to reduce taxes below the levels scheduled in existing law.

Many economists have contended that the increasing level of payroll taxes may reach a point of diminishing returns, having an adverse impact on employment. Certainly we must all be concerned that the increasing level of these taxes may discourage the healthy growth we have experienced in private savings mechanisms and private pension programs in recent years. The bill I have introduced today should go a long way toward alleviating the anxieties that many of us have experienced in this area.

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF A SEPARATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as a member of both the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over most national health programs, and of the Government Operations Committee, which has jurisdiction over the organization and reorganization of the executive branch, including the creation of new Cabinet-level departments, I have for some time felt that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare needs a complete reorganization. Toward this end, and with a view toward stimulating public discussion and consideration of this problem, I am today introducing legislation to establish a separate Department of Health.

I think that it is intolerable to continue all of the many vital social programs enacted in the last two decades under one roof. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, while still a relatively young department, has the second largest budget, and its \$50 billion budget is many times the size of the third largest departmental budget—Treasury at \$17 billion. This budget, and its fantastic growth over the past few years, reflects a growing concentration on national social problems. It seems that most of our concerns—most of our Federal programs today—are administered by one Department—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The result of this phenomenal growth in only one Department has not been surprising—growth in bureaucracy and chaos, but little growth in policy and less in performance. I do not blame the officials at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—whether Democrats or Republicans. Rather I do not expect anyone to be able to successfully administer the multitude of not only programs and people—but totally diverse areas of responsibility. Not only are these areas diverse and unrelated, but they are of enormous significance—so significant that besides the national security protected by the Department of Defense, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare commands the largest budget concerned with specialized domestic problems.

I believe that this Department should be reorganized and divided into at least two separate departments so that the many vital special programs presently committed to it can be better administered.

Of its \$50 billion budget, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare spends nearly one-third of it on health programs—over \$13 billion. Further, this impressive figure represents only 75 percent of the total Federal health expenditures, a total above \$18 billion. I believe that as many of these programs as possible and appropriate should be transferred to a new executive department and administered by a secretary solely responsible for the health needs of our

Nation. I know that many dedicated public servants at the top level of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are concerned with our health needs—but they must also be concerned with education and welfare and cannot devote the time and talent necessary to assure a sane, logical, and effective development of our national health needs.

I hope that such a separate department could correct what appears to me to be the two most pressing deficiencies in our health field—the lack of any overall health policy and the fragmentation of our health programs. Today, according to the American Medical Association, 10 executive departments and at least as many agencies have programs related to health. Even worse, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare itself, the health and medical programs are not all under a single Assistant Secretary with primary responsibility for health care.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today does not pretend to have resolved all of the questions evoked by a Department of Health nor does it pretend to have thoroughly answered which agencies and programs ought to be administered by a Secretary of Health. Rather, I am introducing a bill today which I hope will arouse the public discussion and participation by all of the parties concerned in the hope that I can refine this idea for reintroduction next session. I am open to all suggestions and comments from my colleagues, the executive department personnel concerned, and the many private organizations and individuals concerned with the health care of our citizens. I am not irrevocably committed to any of the ideas presented in this legislation—perhaps we should make three separate departments out of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare rather than two; but I do know that we must do something.

I am pleased to say that it is the position of the American Medical Association to establish a separate Department of Health and that I have had their cooperation in my efforts so far.

ROGERS INTRODUCES DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES SERVICES AND FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1969

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act of 1969 which would amend and extend for 3 years, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. The present authorization expires on June 30, 1970.

I am joined in introducing this legislation by my colleagues Mr. JARMAN, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. RHODES, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. DINGELL, Mr.

STUCKEY, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SATERFIELD.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes significant and progressive changes in the present law in an effort to broaden existing Federal grant programs by providing a new range of services and facilities for the mentally retarded and other persons affected by developmental disabilities.

The term "developmental disability" is defined in the bill as:

A disability attributable to mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, or a neurological impairment of an individual which originates before such individual attains age eighteen, which has continued or can be expected to continue indefinitely, and which constitutes a substantial handicap to such individual.

Title I of the bill would assist the States in preparing and implementing comprehensive plans for the care and treatment of persons suffering from mental retardation or other serious chronic mental or physical disabilities originating in childhood.

In addition, title I of the bill would combine parts C and D of the existing act which authorizes funding of construction grants and grants for the staffing of community mental retardation facilities. The combination of these separate parts into a single part which would authorize grants for planning, provision of services, and construction of facilities will enable us to reach more of the developmentally disabled through a more effective coordination of effort at the State level.

Moreover, this bill would permit State agencies to combine grant funds with other program funds where proportionate benefit to the developmentally disabled will result. This is desirable because under present practice, many State health departments do not have the primary responsibility for mental retardation and other developmental disabilities. Even in the States which include mental retardation within the scope of their mental health agencies, there is no assurance that the mentally retarded will receive their proportionate share of funds. In the Partnership for Health Act, Congress recognized that, more often than not, State health departments do not have the primary responsibility for mental health. Therefore, Congress sought to protect the existing programs for mental health services and facilities by requiring that at least 15 percent of the basic formula grant to each State for health services must be placed at the disposal of the State mental health authorities. No such protective provision was made available for the mental retardation program.

This legislation would remedy that by providing specific Federal financial assistance to the States for mental retardation services and facilities and would permit each State to apportion its mental retardation grants among its various governmental agencies in accordance with the particular State plan devised under the Partnership for Health Act, and to include persons with related disorders.

I am proposing that \$60 million be authorized for this combined grant effort in 1971, \$85 million for 1972 and \$105 million for 1973.

Title I would also establish a National Advisory Council on Services and Facilities for the Developmentally Disabled which would consist of 12 members to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Council would first, advise the Secretary with respect to any regulations promulgated or proposed to be promulgated by him in the implementation of the title I; and second, study and evaluate programs authorized by this title with a view to determining their effectiveness in carrying out the purposes for which they were established.

The Secretary, moreover, must by March 1, 1970, after consultation with the Council, prescribe the kinds of services which are needed to provide adequate programs for persons with developmental disabilities; standards for the scope and quality of services; and the general manner in which a State shall determine priorities for services and facilities.

After such determination by the Secretary, grants to the States may be made for planning and compensation of personnel to provide services. Such grants shall provide financial assistance to a State for 6 years and 3 months from the first day of the first month such grant is made and the grant will be made on the basis of diminishing Federal participation: a maximum of 75 percent of the cost for the first 15 months; 60 percent for the first year thereafter; 45 percent for the second year thereafter; and 30 percent for the third, fourth and fifth years thereafter.

I might add that the definition in the bill of "services for persons with developmental disabilities" means "specialized services or special adaptations of generic services directed toward the alleviation of a developmental disability or toward the social, personal, physical, or economic habilitation or rehabilitation of an individual affected by such a disability, and such term included diagnosis, evaluation, treatment, personal care, day care, special living arrangements, training, domiciliary care, education, sheltered employment, recreation, counseling for the individual affected by such disability and of his family, protective and other social and socio-legal services, and information and referral services."

Title II of the bill would extend part B of the act for 3 fiscal years, through 1973, and would expand the area of impact to provide construction, demonstration, and training grants for university-affiliated mental retardation facilities.

I am proposing that \$10 million be authorized for the fiscal year 1971, \$12 million for 1972, and \$15 million for 1973.

In addition, I am anxious to see the junior colleges participate more fully in the university-affiliated facilities program, and, consequently, I am proposing that the Secretary shall give priority to any application for a demonstration or training grant when such application shows that the applicant has made arrangements for a junior college to participate in the programs for which the application is made.

There is an urgent need for training new types of personnel to meet the critical shortage in our existing system of care for the mentally retarded. The key

lies in the area of paramedical personnel, and I believe there is an untapped resource of such potential personnel in our junior colleges. Young men and women in these institutions must be encouraged to enter the field of care for the developmentally disabled, and to pursue educational careers in this area after their graduation from junior college.

Mr. Speaker, we are making significant progress in helping the mentally retarded to realize self-sustaining and productive lives in society, and we have done most of this since 1963, when the Congress first enacted the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act, as part I of a combined mental health-mental retardation bill—Public Law 88-164.

In 1967, the basic act was amended to provide staffing grants to complement these community facilities construction grants. By July 1969, the month in which the grants were awarded, 285 applications requesting \$14.4 million in Federal funds had been received. Yet, only \$8.3 million had been appropriated. As of September 1, 1969, 237 staffing projects were operational, and all of the \$8.3 million appropriated for fiscal year 1969 had been obligated.

The university-affiliated facilities construction program has not received the consideration and support that it has needed and consequently, only 19 university training programs, out of some 60 proposed, have been made possible.

However, approximately 300 community mental retardation facilities have been assisted with Federal funds, at a total cost of only \$56 million, less than one-third the total cost of these facilities.

In its forthcoming report entitled "MR 69," the President's Committee on Mental Retardation notes that some three-quarters of this Nation's retarded people could become self-supporting if given the right kind of training early enough; another 10 to 15 percent could become partially self-supporting. Some 5 million of the Nation's estimated 6 million mentally retarded are never reached by any kind of service developed specifically to meet the needs of the retarded. Many of the 200,000 institutionalized mentally retarded persons continue warehoused in dehumanizing residential programs that make no serious attempt to rehabilitate residents.

This report will tell us as a nation that we have much to do to improve the care and rehabilitation of the developmentally disabled. I believe that the legislation which I am introducing today will contribute to that effort, but State and local governments must do more, and the private sector must take a more active interest in this national problem if the battle is to be won.

One group within the private sector that has for many years been a guiding force in obtaining better care and facilities for the developmentally disabled is the National Association for Retarded Children. This voluntary organization of some 1,375 affiliated units work together to help the developmentally disabled help themselves. This association of 215,000 parents and friends of the mentally retarded is presently holding its 20th annual convention in Miami Beach, Fla., and I commend that group for their untiring effort.

LAW AND ENVIRONMENT—PART II

(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 second article in the Christian Science Monitor series on "law and environment" discusses some of the broad legal implications of the suits filed by citizens to protect the Nation's environment. It is pointed out that some advances have been made toward establishing working principles for bringing the suits but so far, the court victories have been mainly procedural.

The conservationist's goal is to achieve a "landmark" decision dealing with the environment. That goal may seem a long way off but I am encouraged by the dedication and perseverance of many individuals and groups all over the country in pressing for a "law of the environment." The path to such a concept is strewn with obstacles, not the least of which are the tremendous costs, but as the Monitor indicates, there is hope.

The article follows:

LAW AND ENVIRONMENT—II: BATTLE JUST STARTING TO GUARD LAND AGAINST POLLUTION

(By Robert Cahn)

WASHINGTON.—At first glance, conservation groups appear to have won some significant victories in recent court skirmishes against land-changing development activity by big business or big government. But the battle has only begun.

Consolidated Edison has been blocked thus far in its efforts to build a power plant that would alter the scenic area near Storm King Mountain along the Hudson River.

In another case, a United States district court upheld a conservation argument that federal government agencies had acted illegally in issuing a land fill permit to build a six-lane Hudson River Valley expressway.

Housing subdevelopers had their bulldozers ready to bite the earth in a Colorado area being considered by Congress for a national scenic monument when conservationists got a court injunction to stop the work temporarily.

IMPLICATIONS DISCUSSED

All of these were valuable conservation achievements as far as they went. The problem is that they were either procedural victories or holding actions. So far, however, not a single case has resulted in a clear-cut Supreme Court decision on environmental conflict that could be as basic to the conservationists as *Brown v. Board of Education* in the field of civil rights.

At the recent "law and the environment" conference in Warrenton, Va., a select group of lawyers discussed the implications of major cases already decided, or now in court. They looked for the possibility that in these cases, or in new methods yet untried in courts, they could establish national precedents.

Most participants in the conference agreed that the scenic Hudson (Storm King) decision has been the most important case to date. Conservationists representing citizens in the area sought to block a bid by Consolidated Edison Company of New York for a Federal Power Commission license to construct a pumped storage hydroelectric project at Storm King Mountain along the Hudson River 50 miles north of New York City.

The Federal Power Commission took the position that citizens could not obtain court review of the decision made by the FPC to grant the license because the citizens were not "aggrieved" parties.

The federal court of appeals in December, 1965, reversed the FPC decision and declared, "The Constitution does not require that an 'aggrieved' or 'adversely affected' party have a 'personal economic interest' to bring a lawsuit. Thus the FPC had a duty to consider noneconomic concerns of citizens such as the environment.

The FPC is now reconsidering the application and examining all environmental factors. Consolidated Edison may still get its power plant. But a precedent has been established in at least one section of the country that citizens have standing to raise environmental issues and request review of governmental decisions. The scenic Hudson decision has been used ever since to support citizen efforts elsewhere around the country. Although the decision is not binding outside the Second Circuit, it is extremely influential.

COST A KEY PROBLEM

Discussion at the law and the environment conference extended beyond the issue of standing. David Sive, lawyer for the Sierra Club, which has intervened in the case that has not yet been decided, noted both the length (four years so far) and expense of such citizen action. The amount spent by the scenic Hudson people is "several hundred thousand dollars," and the major legal firm involved is charging only one-third of its usual rates.

Another type of legal remedy discussed at the conference is the injunctive approach. Lawyer Victor J. Yannacone Jr. explained how the Defenders of Florissant, the group he represented, was able to get a temporary restraining order against a land company which was poised to start residential development on 1,800 acres within the proposed 6,000-acre Florissant Fossil Bed National Monument near Colorado Springs.

A bill to authorize establishment of the proposed national monument, which would preserve for posterity fossil beds 34 million years old, had passed the Senate and was being considered by the House Interior Committee last July, when the land developers prepared to start bulldozing.

Mr. Yannacone's request to the United States district court for a temporary restraining order was turned down. He immediately went to the three-man federal appeals court. Although Mr. Yannacone admitted that no specific statute would be violated by the planned real estate excavation, the arguments on the public interest persuaded the appellate court to issue a temporary restraining order on the basis that the fossil beds "are a unique, natural resource" and that excavation would "result in serious, permanent, and irreparable damage."

While the restraining order was still in effect, Congress passed the authorization act establishing the Florissant National Monument.

CITIZEN PRESSURE NEEDED

The Florissant case was cited at the conference as an example of how courts can sometimes act quickly when no administrative remedies are available to citizens and when proceeding with development might result in irreversible environmental damage. It also showed the importance of legislative response to conservation pressure. If Congress had not acted quickly, the injunction might not have been upheld, and the citizens might eventually have lost the case.

In another type of legal maneuver, an injunction is being sought to prevent the Hoerner-Waldorf Paper Mill of Missoula, Mont., from polluting the air.

As lawyer for the Environmental Defense Fund Mr. Yannacone is attempting in this case to establish the Ninth Amendment of the Constitution as a basis for environmental litigation. The Ninth Amendment provides that rights guaranteed by the Constitution "shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Thus Mr. Yannacone contends that the

people in the Missoula regional ecosystem have a constitutional right to a salubrious environment free of smog produced by a paper mill. He is arguing that it is technologically feasible for the paper company to abate smog pollution, and that no other administrative remedies are immediately available. The case is still before the United States District Court.

CONSTITUTIONAL HELP DEBATED

In discussing the merits of use of the 9th Amendment, a number of participants said that it is too vague and does not satisfactorily resolve conflicts posed by other individual rights. Among these would be property rights or even the public interest of the consumer. Such interest might, in some cases, favor development over some degrees of pollution abatement.

Another approach to environmental litigation is illustrated by the Hunting Creek case, where citizens near Washington, D.C., are seeking to prevent the granting by the State of Virginia of submerged lands in the Potomac River estuary to a developer for the construction of a high-rise complex.

It is being argued that the state holds these submerged lands "in trust" for the people, a carryover of common law from olden times when the king owned all lands and held them for the people. The citizens argued that this land could not be given to a private person for private purposes. The case is still before the United States District Court.

Expanding on this use of the "trust doctrine," Anthony Roisman told the conference that the trust-doctrine theory could also be expanded to cover the use of privately owned property. The trust theory, however, was acknowledged to be a theory requiring additional legal research and testing.

Most participants seemed to feel that courts may not be comfortable at present with such sweeping theories as the 9th Amendment or the trust doctrine. Instead, many recommended approaches toward finding legal ways to shift the burden of proof away from the environmental plaintiff to the user or developer who is intending to change the environment.

GI BILL ACTION NEEDED NOW

(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, 2 months ago, the House passed and sent to the Senate H.R. 11959 which would increase GI education and training allowances by approximately 27 percent.

It had been the hope of many of my colleagues that the Senate would act promptly so that the rate increases could have been effective with the beginning of the fall semester. Inasmuch as hearings began on similar proposals in the Senate in June I am very much disturbed that it does not expect to pass this much needed legislation until the end of October.

Living and education costs have skyrocketed since the last rate increase and it is particularly unfair to make these ex-GI's continue to bear this increased inflationary cost.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I would like to insert an editorial which recently appeared in the Army Times and invite my colleagues to read it:

[From the Army Times, Oct. 1, 1969]

GI BILL DELAY

Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D., Tex.) chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee which has jurisdiction over GI

Bill legislation, seems to be placing the blame at the wrong door for delay in advancing that program.

And while he's doing so, the more than 635,000 GI Bill beneficiaries who had planned on a raise in educational allowances this fall aren't likely to get one now until next semester—thanks to foot-dragging by the Senate committee.

The fault can be found closer to the old homestead.

Some of the blame for delay in raising GI Bill allowances rests with Sen. Alan Cranston (D., Calif.), chairman of the Labor Committee's subcommittee on veterans affairs.

His group began hearings on the legislation on June 24. Here we are, going into October and the subcommittee still hasn't come up with a rate increase proposal to present to the full committee.

The best guess is that if and when the smaller body does act its recommendations won't receive full committee consideration until some time after mid-October.

In addition to its own recommendations, the subcommittee has before it legislation already approved by the House which would raise GI Bill allowances by 27 percent. Under the House-approved legislation, allowances for single veterans would go from \$130 to \$165 monthly; for married veterans from \$155 to \$197 monthly, and for men with two dependents from \$175 to \$222.

Now it's up to the Senate Labor Committee and to Senators Cranston and Yarborough to get something started—and real soon—on their side of the national legislature.

Senator Yarborough also ought to put aside some of his politically-motivated and unsoundly-based charges against the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense. In numerous speeches recently, he has accused these two government agencies of "deliberately" holding down GI Bill enrollment, charging that they want to "spend money on a war in Southeast Asia worse than they want to educate our young people."

We feel that GI Bill enrollments aren't as woefully low as Senator Yarborough would like people to believe. The VA expects a 22 percent gain in GI Bill enrollment this fall over last year, a record for the three-year-old program. This would bring enrollment up to 635,000 compared to 520,524 last fall and 380,037 in 1967.

It is true that enrollment figures among the disadvantaged veteran aren't what they should be. Only one out of 10 veterans without high school diplomas have taken advantage of GI Bill educational opportunities. The VA through its "outreach" program is making a bigger effort to get more of these veterans into school.

But unless Congress approves an increase in allowances, and soon, all of these efforts will be to small avail. Now is the time for action on a GI Bill rate increase.

GILBERT GUDE: THE QUIET CONGRESSMAN

(Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post on October 6, 1969, published a very fine profile of one of our colleagues, GILBERT GUDE, the distinguished Republican Member from Maryland's Eighth Congressional District.

It was an article worthy of attention as a justified tribute to a Member who, while accurately described as quiet, mod-

est, and one of the "forgotten Americans—the nice guys," has proven his passion for and deep commitment to many worthy causes and purposes. GIL GUDE is not the forgotten American in terms of accomplishments.

As a member of the Maryland Legislature, Mr. GUDE did battle for improvements in the quality of our environment as well as conservation in general. He has carried the thrust of these concerns into the halls of Congress. His signal achievements in the Congress, despite the fact that this is only his second term, include his successful sponsorship of an air pollution control measure for the District of Columbia and his strong efforts to curb pollution of the Potomac River. His leadership in attempting to enhance the role of the District of Columbia to give it power to really act on today's urban problems is much to be commended.

All of us who live in the Washington area—who have suffered as a result of untended urban ailments and neglect—should be personally grateful for Mr. GUDE's dedication to the best interests of the area, including his constituents, and of the Nation as well.

The text of the Washington Post article follows:

REPRESENTATIVE GILBERT GUDE: QUIET, DILIGENT, INTERESTED IN CONSERVATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By Peter Osnos)

"Now I want you to understand," Rep. Gilbert Gude (R-Md.) said to a visitor recently, describing his views on a conservation bill, "I'm really very much in earnest about this."

It was, say those who know him well, an apt self-characterization. The genial congressman from Maryland's Eighth District is known to be earnest about nearly everything.

And by all accounts it is a quality that has served him well. As Gude moves into the second half of his second term in office, he carries the considerable plus of a reputation for sincerity and good will.

"Gilbert Gude will never bowl you over with dynamism," a congressional aide said last week, "but he's hard to fault on the way he does his job."

The congressman has garnered that sort of praise by diligent membership on the District of Columbia committee—which he wants to revamp—and by pursuing a lifelong interest in conservation.

Notwithstanding an occasional dramatic tour of local sewers or a turn on an aging merry-go-round, Gude goes about his business quietly while at the same time, two other area Republicans embroil themselves in one brouhaha after another.

Reps. Joel T. Broyhill (R-Va.) and Lawrence J. Hogan (R-Md.) are both noted for their conservative views, although Hogan is considerably less rigid than Broyhill. Gude, on the other hand, has one of the highest ratings among Republican congressmen from the liberal Americans for Democratic Action.

His 67 per cent voting record means that on selected issues the ADA agreed with Gude's votes about two-thirds of the time. His rating from the conservative Americans for Constitutional Action is a meager 29 per cent.

Among Gude's "liberal" votes in the 91st Congress have been those to seat Adam Clayton Powell and to tighten restrictions on cigarette advertising.

The ADA disapproved of the congressman's

stance for extending the income tax surcharge and preventing picketing at the Pentagon and against permitting future "Resurrection City" type demonstrations on federal property.

Gude belongs to a group of GOP congressmen who favor a closer look at military expenditures; he thinks President Nixon's decision to go ahead with the supersonic transport was a mistake and he thinks Vietnam is an awful mess.

Overall, Gude's attitude seems determinedly moderate, much like his temperament, with just enough of a liberal streak to please the large middle ground of a generally white, well-to-do constituency like Montgomery County. There the Democratic registration edge is 5-3.

But it would be wrong to portray Gude as a man devoid of deep commitment. His passion for preserving our natural resources is real, born from an association with the family's decades-old nursery and landscaping company.

Gude has sponsored several conservation measures in the House and has been an active member of the Government Operations Committee's conservation and natural resources subcommittee.

Introducing two bills in June aimed at protecting the Potomac Valley, Gude said in a statement on the floor of the House:

"I wish to make it crystal clear that the important debate and choice is not among these and other proposals but rather a choice between beginning action toward saving the valley environment as opposed to the deadly inertia of the past.

"The choice is between a river comprised of wilderness, open space, developed recreation areas and farmland, interspersed with towns and areas of commerce or a mammoth open storm drain running through a nightmarish strip of oversized cities, suburbs and Coney Islands."

The congressman was, obviously, in earnest. In our cynical age, the term is often slightly mocking, but Gude's concern for the endangered Potomac has won him the respect of both his constituents and his colleagues.

Gude's concern for the quality of environment extends to his work on the District of Columbia Committee where he successfully sponsored an air pollution control measure for the city. The act, the congressman proclaimed in a 1968 campaign pamphlet, "stands as my major legislative accomplishment as a freshman member of a minority party."

This congressional session, Gude's major effort has been a bill to completely overhaul the District Committee by transforming it into a 35-member committee on urban and Washington affairs.

The burden of Gude's argument is that many members of the present District Committee can't or won't devote as much time to the city's needs as is needed. And, since "the overwhelming number of Washington's problems are the same as those of other cities," it seems logical to create a body that would have broad jurisdiction over urban areas.

Gude claims support for his idea from two other members of the District Committee, Brock Adams (D-Wash.) and Andrew Jacobs (D-Ind.). Seven other congressmen have also cosponsored the legislation.

For the moment, however, the bill is bottled up in committee and shows little sign of movement.

Gilbert Gude is basically a modest person say his friends, but he wouldn't be in politics if he didn't have a zest for power. Therefore, few who know him rule out a bid someday for higher office, the Senate perhaps.

If and when Gude gets tapped, they say, it won't be because of the headlines he earned or the searing quality of his legislative proposals. Instead, their contention is, it will be a victory for one strain of the forgotten Americans—the nice guys.

FDA MUST ACT URGENTLY ON CYCLAMATES

(Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the serious questions raised over an extended period of time by the news media and the scientific community on the possible health hazards involved in their use underscore the urgent need for the Food and Drug Administration to accelerate its current evaluation of pertinent data on the effects of cyclamates and, in fact, to take immediate steps to warn the public against unrestricted use of cyclamates until a final determination of the drug's hazards has been made.

Unfortunately, the evidence indicates that the FDA has not been vigorous or decisive on the question of cyclamates. As the reputable Consumer Reports magazine observed in its May 1969, issue:

The Food and Drug Administration certainly seems to have had second thoughts—nearly 20 years after it gave cyclamates a clean bill of health.

The article refers to FDA studies based primarily on animal experiments in 1955 and 1965 after which, in each instance, the FDA concluded that cyclamates were safe.

In 1967, said Consumer Reports, the issue was reopened when England's Food Additives and Contaminants Committee reported new evidence of harmful effects of cyclamates and called for further investigation "a matter of urgency." Consumer Reports continued:

By the summer of 1968, FDA had commissioned still another study by the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council; an interim report of that study was released by FDA late last year. The interim report, like the previous ones FDA funded, was mainly a review of the available scientific literature, as well as of several unpublished studies.

Last October 3, FDA Commissioner Herbert Ley ordered a similar study of more current findings, with a report due within 30 days, on the basis of which he said he "will decide the best method of restricting the use of cyclamates." It is to be devoutly hoped so, for that decision is long overdue.

Last April, Dr. Ley proposed restrictions—that is, labels on products stating cyclamate content in milligrams and warning adults and children against ingesting more than specified amounts—but the new bottle of artificial sweetener in my office carries no such labels.

Again, this is an action that is long overdue. Precautionary labeling is an essential first step—and a justifiable step—which should be taken at once for the public's protection.

It seems to me that these facts are indeed a sad commentary on the FDA capacity to fill its watchdog assignment. It does little good to shuffle papers, or study a subject to death, when there are innumerable indications that cyclamates may indeed be as harmful to man as to the animals used in tests.

Newsweek magazine of September 29

CVX—1842—Part 21

introduced an article called "Bitter Sweeteners?" with the following relevant summary:

This year, weight-watching Americans will consume almost 20 million pounds of cyclamates, the artificial sweeteners used in dietary soft drinks, and as liquid and solid sugar substitutes. A spectacular rise in consumption of these sweeteners in recent years (the 1967 production was only 13 million pounds) has been accompanied by increasing doubts about their safety. The doubts concern not the cyclamates themselves, but cyclohexylamine, a product created in the human body, probably by the interaction between the cyclamates and substances in the digestive system. This happens—for some reason—in at least one-third of the population. Moreover, in tests done with animals, cyclohexylamine has been suspected of breaking down chromosomes and harming fetuses.

Scientific researchers have reported experiments using varying doses of cyclamates for injections which caused chromosome breaks in both bone-marrow cells and reproductive cells of rats, retardation of growth of rats and pigs, heart lesions in hamsters which resemble the human coronary attack, and so forth. The FDA's own chief researcher, Dr. Marvin Legator, was quoted in the Washington Post of September 13 as stating:

Unless you can show differences between how animals handle a given material—such as that used in these experiments—and how it would be handled in man, you must allow the animal results to stand unless and until refuted.

There is real reason to consider the unrestricted use of cyclamates a matter of grave concern. It is a time for the FDA to demonstrate, through positive action, that it is willing to fulfill its watchdog function as protector of the American public.

Until labeling regulations and other warnings are put into effect, dieters, diabetics, and other unsuspecting Americans of all ages will continue their unrestricted consumption of products containing cyclamates. The real issue here may be the adequacy and efficacy of the FDA itself.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. DENNEY of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) for October 8 and balance of week, on account of official business.

Mr. GRIFFIN until October 21 on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today through Monday, October 13, on account of official business for the Committee on Crime.

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. PUCINSKI, for 60 minutes, on October 14.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT):)

Mr. McCARTHY, for 60 minutes, on October 9.

Mr. HANNA, for 60 minutes, on October 9.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ASPINALL (at the request of Mr. RHODES) to follow the remarks of Mr. RHODES during general debate on H.R. 14159.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois to follow the remarks of Mr. HOLIFIELD during general debate on H.R. 14159.

Mrs. MAY to follow the remarks of Mr. PRICE of Illinois during general debate on H.R. 14159.

Mr. OTTINGER immediately prior to the vote on the amendment offered by Mr. SCHERLE in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McCLOSKEY), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON in four instances.

Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. LUJAN in two instances.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. SCHWENDEL in two instances.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. BLACKBURN.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. REID of New York.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARRINGTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. STUCKEY.

Mr. MINISH in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. DADDARIO in five instances.

Mr. POWELL in six instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. OBEY in six instances.

Mr. KOCH in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. FRASER in four instances.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. STOKES in four instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in two instances.

Mr. HANNA in two instances.

Mr. COLMER in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1718. An act to provide for the conveyance to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., of certain real property of the United States heretofore donated to the United States by such city; to the Committee on Government Operations.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9825. An act to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 265. An act for the relief of John (Giovanni) Denaro;

S. 330. An act for the relief of Dr. Konstantinos Nikolaos Baballarios;

S. 620. An act for the relief of Richard Vigil; and

S. 1110. An act for the relief of Nickolas George Polizos.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 7, 1968:

H.J. Res. 851. Requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation calling for a "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival".

On October 8, 1969:

H.R. 3165. For the relief of Martin H. Loeffler;

H.R. 3560. For the relief of Arie Rudolf Busch (also known as Harry Bush);

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; and

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 9, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1232. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report

on the status of war reserve materiel in Europe, Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1233. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the readiness posture of 7th Army units in Europe, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1234. A letter from the President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a report of a violation of a fiscal year 1969 Panama Canal Company allotment under section 3679 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1235. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on borrowing authority for the period ended June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1236. A letter from the acting executive director, Blinded Veterans Association; transmitting the audit of the association for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1969; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1237. A letter from the executive director, Military Chaplains Association of the U.S.A., transmitting the audit of the association for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1238. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting reports of Veterans' Administration activities during fiscal year 1969 for sharing medical facilities and exchanging medical information, pursuant to the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 5057; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (for himself, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. RHODES, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SATTERFIELD):

H.R. 14237. A bill to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 to assist the States in developing a plan for the provision of comprehensive services to persons affected by mental retardation and other developmental disabilities originating in childhood, to assist the States in the provision of such services in accordance with such plan, to assist in the construction of facilities to provide the services needed to carry out such plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 14238. A bill to establish the Department of Health; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. COWGER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DENNY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. FISH, Mr. GROVER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. KING, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. LUKENS, Mrs. MAY, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. PELLY):

H.R. 14239. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, provide for automatic

benefit increases thereafter in the event of future increases in the cost of living, provide for future automatic increases in the earnings and contribution base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TEAGUE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WINN, and Mr. ZION):

H.R. 14240. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, provide for automatic benefit increases thereafter in the event of future increases in the cost of living, provide for future automatic increases in the earnings and contribution base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14241. A bill to amend the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act to require cigarette packages to bear a statement of the fire hazards presented by smoking; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 14242. A bill to provide more efficient and convenient passport services to citizens of the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 14243. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 14244. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. DWYER (for herself, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ERLBORN, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. MYERS, Mr. COWGER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WEICKER, and Mr. STEIGER of Arizona):

H.R. 14245. A bill to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 14246. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 14247. A bill to extend certain benefits to the National Guard technicians, to correct certain inequities in the crediting of National Guard technician service in connection with civil service retirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 14248. A bill to provide for the termination of programs of price support for agricultural commodities by December 31, 1975; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 14249. A bill to amend section 4005 of title 39, United States Code, to restore to such section the provisions requiring proof of intent to deceive in connection with the use of the mails to obtain money or property by false pretenses, representations, or promises; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr.

BURKE of Florida, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. FISHER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FISH, Mr. CONTE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. CORDOVA):

H.R. 14250. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HICKS, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. KYROS, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. PELLY, Mrs. MAY, Mr. KING, Mr. BROCK, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. WYATT, Mr. HARVEY, and Mr. SCHERLE):

H.R. 14251. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. AYRES, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ERLNBORN, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. RUTH, and Mr. BOGGS):

H.R. 14252. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MELCHER:

H.R. 14253. A bill to authorize the transfer of the Brown unit of the Fort Belknap Indian irrigation project on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., to the landowners within the unit; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 14254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for his higher education, or for the higher education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 14255. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.R. 14256. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 14257. A bill to amend section 11(a) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to require the use by the United States of privately owned U.S.-flag vessels, when available, to carry cargo; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 14258. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for sex education in elemen-

tary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 14259. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high-timber yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 14260. A bill to establish in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor a Youth Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. STOKES, Mr. REES, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. BURTON):

H.R. 14261. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning the use of drugs and for other related educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 14262. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 15-percent across-the-board increase in the monthly benefits payable thereunder, with a minimum primary benefit of \$80 and subsequent cost-of-living benefit increases, to liberalize the retirement test to provide that the costs of these changes shall be paid from appropriated funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 14263. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 14264. 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. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 14265. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require that reasonable arrangements be made under a State's medical assistance program to permit patients in skilled nursing homes to be temporarily absent for legitimate purposes without losing their rights to continued accommodations in such homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. REES, Mr. POWELL, Mr. HAMMER-SCHMIDT, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. REIFEL):

H.J. Res. 937. 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. CRAMER:

H.J. Res. 938. 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. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 939. Joint resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continu-

ing 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. QUILLEN:

H.J. Res. 940. 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. RYAN:

H.J. Res. 941. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.J. Res. 942. 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. GRIFFIN:

H. Con. Res. 400. Concurrent resolution urging the adoption of policies to offset the adverse effects of governmental monetary restrictions upon the housing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. LEGGETT):

H. Res. 573. Resolution relating to withdrawals from Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 14266. A bill for the relief of Daniel Chien-Sheng Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 14267. A bill for the relief of Antoinette Bruck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 14268. A bill for the relief of Joseph Waselak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 14269. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julian Casimiro Gregorio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 14270. A bill for the relief of Dusko Curcic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 14271. A bill for the relief of Jack A. Duggins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14272. A bill for the relief of Halce Welcome; to the Committee on the Judiciary.